

Ventura College Academic Senate
Minutes
Thursday, October 1st, 2015
2:00-3:30pm
Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) – 312

I. Call to Order at 2:06pm

Senator	Division Represented	Initials	Present	Absent
Gardner, Ty for Algiers, Kammy	Mathematics & Sciences	TG for KA	X	
Beatty, Donna	Mathematics & Sciences	DB	X	
Beynon, Sharon	English / Prof Development	ShB		X
Branca, Stephanie	Career & Technical Education	SB	X	
Carrasco-Nungaray, Marian	Student Services	MCN	X	
Coffey, Colleen M.	Senate Secretary	CMC	X	
Dalton, Heidi	Career & Technical Education	HD	X	
Forde, Richard	Career & Technical Education	RF	X	
Hendricks, Bill	Social Sciences & Humanities	BH	X	
Horigan, Andrea		AH	X	
Kim, Henny	English & Learning Resources	HK	X	
Kolesnik, Alex	Senate President	AK	X	
Lange, Cari	Mathematics & Sciences	CL	X	
Martin, Amanda	English & Learning Resources	AM	X	
Morris, Terry	Athletics, Kinesiology & Health	TM	X	
Mules, Ron	Social Sciences & Humanities	RM	X	
Munoz, Paula	Student Services	PM	X	
Joannamarie Kraus	ASVC	JMK		X
Sezzi, Peter	Senate Vice-President	PHS	X	

II. Public Comments

SB: Re: newly hired faculty and what will Facilities do to increase number of parking spaces? AK adds that we also are out of offices.

AH raises issue of campus cleanliness. She has sent an email to dean of M&O area because our campus and classrooms are filthy and need to be cleaned.

III. Acknowledgement of Guests—Dan Clark (new Bio faculty); Michael Bowen (Curriculum Committee).

IV. Discussion Items

- a. Ranking of enrollment management concerns—CL asks AK to clarify the document that lists enrollment management concerns as to what it is showing and what we are doing with it. AK responds that PHS compiled these after our first senate meeting of the year. RM says that it would be constructive and helpful to Kim Hoffmans to have

us rank these and share the information—emphasizes that this is a significant issue. TM says he has heard the 15 number for years; now it's up to 35 or you're cut. He asks where the number is? RM replies that if you have 15 students on the day the course begins your class goes; anytime before that, administration can cancel it regardless of number enrolled. PHS: asks what should this body do? These are all comments that the senate came up with—when and where should this issue be raised? And how do we weight these concerns? Senate needs direction so that AK can meet with the college President and he can be alerted. AK adds that he also meets regularly with Kim. He suggests that we rank the top concerns and put them into a resolution. MCN relates re: a class of 18 that met one time, and then was cancelled. PHS comments that counseling is a little bit different. She also asks why all these concerns (and adding the waitlist issue) cannot be presented (i.e. why do we have to vet/rank/eliminate any of them)? She suggests ways in which the senate might collapse these items. She suggests a proactive approach—where senate asks the questions and administration responds: each department needs to say this is what we want/need and we want your support. AK suggests forming a work group to put together some narrative/resolution. Work group: RF, RM, KA, BH, TM (RM will chair workgroup). PHS says that there needs to be a timeline. AK requests an action item by 10/15. PHS says we ought to ask the administration to respond in writing by 12/1. SB asks for clarification on how the workgroup will compile and organize this data. She likes that approach of “this is how we think you should do it...” We should also emphasize that this is how it should be done going forward. TM says he proved in math terms that one class should not have to pay for everything else. Fitness center had to keep 35 students every 3 hours. He says this (a giant class) should not have to cover for other things.

- b.** Enrollment Management/Fill Rates Document—This topic emerged out of a discussion of the senate's role in the recent divisional reorganization agendized as information item “b”. CL motioned that item “b” be moved to discussion. TG seconded. Vote was unanimous.

RM: Says that there is a section of the packet sent out that has all the courses listed by CRN. Faculty were assured that data would be aggregated and not singled out (by success %) by CRN. AK apologizes and says that this was not his intention; he intended only to send those two pages (without that identifying data). RM responds that his concern still stands: we (faculty) were assured that data would be aggregated (not identified by instructor). RM says this kind of report opens the door to enrollment management in a way faculty have not consented to. SB says in that case, department chairs could disseminate this. AK & RM discuss whether this constitutes a public document.

TG asks about what the intent of this whole document was to begin with. PM says the issue is that faculty were assured this would not occur, and this is exactly what *is* happening, so that is the issue. PHS asks where this came from. AK says it came from Kim Hoffmans and the intent was to look at the division of labor by dean. PHS says he has seen this before when he was Senate President (it pulls daily from Banner) and he argued then that it can be used for purposes not anticipated at the time report created.

AH says her concern is that we were specifically told that they would not disaggregate this data by course, not CRN (i.e. instructor). Clearly this is not what occurred. Also, without reasonable examination of data there are a lot of factors that can affect fill-rates. Do these courses fill because they are easy or because students can get away with never showing up?

SB: Cautions the danger of taking too much away from any faculty who's classes fill quickly—their popularity may be based on other factors besides educational quality. She wants to hear the faculty voice on this because we (faculty) know best. Motion by CL: that the Academic Senate requests a written explanation from administration as to why this document was created and how it is currently being used. PHS offers an amendment: who are you directing to ask whom and by what date to report back and to whom? Friendly amendment accepted. CL clarifies: Academic Senate directs the Academic Senate President to ask the college president to report back by our next meeting as to why this document was created and how it is currently being used. PM 2nds. SB proposes that we add to that and “who has this document been shared with.” Vote: Unanimous.

Discussion re-focuses on the original topic: re-organization of divisions--senate role therein. AK reviews with the senators what has occurred for those who are not aware re: reorganization of divisions.

CL says she had people asking her immediately, what was the senate's role in this? She asks AK if he was consulted in the conversation about this reorganization? He replies no. CL says she asked that this be agendaized and we have no note of this at all. Why is senate is not being more pro-active in this discussion? CMC comments that in her division (one of those split by the reorganization) this reorg was only announced two weeks ago—during our last senate meeting. TG says that his concern is that the hiring process seemed to occur before the application process. AK replies that the advertising was for 2 interim deans. RM asks about the creation of the new division. PHS asks SB how this occurred at MC. SB replies that at MC reorganization of the divisions happened almost every semester. She said senate was not part of this conversation. That is why the senate moved to department representation on PG committees, rather than division, because divisions kept shifting around. Senate at MC was not consulted. CL passes around her proposed resolution on this issue. AH says that she reads this as a violation of the 10+1. AK asks about which one? RM replies that it falls under “college governance.” Senators discuss this. AK says one of the things that we could do is we could make this request that any organizational changes that occur at the college come under 11. CL says this is what she's getting at: we need to push this--that we need this to be one of the plus ones. AK says if we want as a body to play a role, we can request the college organizational structures be one of our plus ones, talk to the other two senates, and then present it was plus one. CL argues that we present it like this first, then if they (admin) balks at it, then we get on the other two colleges too. AH says that this reflects that administration does not view senate as a very important body or we would have been consulted. PHS: weighs in and says he does not see this as a part of the 10+1. But, we are not limited to just what is here (10+1). We need to work towards added such a one with BOT—i.e.

solving this problem and adding a plus one as a district (BP 410). We should start with a formal resolution at the next senate meeting as to what the plus one will be, then AK takes it to the other two senates, then it goes to the BOT to change the policy. That said, all this does not mean administration should not ask Senate's input on these matters. They *should* have asked our opinion, even if they did not *have* to ask our opinion. There are consequences when they do not. He says not 10+1, but he agrees it should be. CL emphasizes that this (resolution) was meant to start that discussion. TG asks if this is an interim arrangement or a permanent arrangement. AK replies that Kim's idea is that she wants to do some re-organization due to workload issues & he explains.

PM says senators are the voice of faculty and faculty are clearly upset. We need to be involved in this and the administration needs to talk to us. She says we need to move forward with some kind of statement.

SB says she thinks we need to prepare ourselves that these reorganizations are going to occur. She says we should focus on how we can productively participate in these kinds of changes. Senators further discuss this.

AK adds that since so many committees are based on division representation, we may need to rethink that. CL asks if senate can have something actionable next time?

AK says if this is something we want to have a voice in, he needs to meet with the other two AS presidents. So Senate needs to direct him to do that. And then a conversation with bullet-points of operational concerns that senate needs to be consulted about.

MCN brings up the CPC as an example of a committee that is merely a watchdog, not an actor. Now she feels the same way in senate—and we should not be. She asks why this division reorganization was not brought up at CPC at least?

MB: He asks about senate's direction to the committees (such as Curriculum Committee) that rely on division representation?

This will be an action item at next meeting.

V. Action Items

- a. Approval of minutes —3 minutes—PHS Motion; HD 2nd (Vote 8-1-5: CL votes no; BH, PM, AH, SB, TM, TG and DB abstain)
- b. 3SPS Plan (1st Reading)—15 minutes—not ready for reading/vote.
- c. Call for nominations for Faculty Staffing Priorities Committee—Senators discuss how the membership on this committee is determined and what areas still need representation. PHS says Senate Executive has 4 seats, and we only have 3 on Exec. So it is for the senate to determine how to fill that position? The last few years we've just had one more at large person. BH asks when the committee will meet? AK answers that we need to meet by mid-Nov because we have a deadline to CPC. AK also wants to re-do the rubric, and then second meeting to do the rankings. Revised Rubric will have to be put forth at next senate meeting.

RF will represent CTE—but then the date conflicts with a water conference, so we need to fill the CTE. MCN will serve. CL will serve. BH will serve.

PHS suggests two alternates be asked for as well. Meeting date will be 11/13.

Motion by PHS, 2nd by AH. Vote: Unanimous.

Time ran out—meeting adjourned at 3:37pm.

- d. By-law changes (1st Reading)—15 minutes
- e. “Making Decisions” document—15 minutes

VI. Information Items

- c. Re: *Brown Act* as it pertains to communications among senators

VI. Consent Items—None.

VII. President’s Report

VIII. Senate Subcommittees Reports

IX. Campus Committees Reports

X. Announcements for the Good of the Order

XI. Requests for Future Agenda Items

XII. Adjournment at 3:37pm

* * *

Academic Senate means an organization whose primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters.

Academic and Professional matters means the following policy development matters:

1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites.
2. Degree and certificate requirements.
3. Grading policies.
4. Educational program development.
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success.
6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles.
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes.
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities.
9. Processes for program review.
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development.
11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon.