

**Ventura College Academic Senate
Minutes
Thursday, April 16th, 2015
2:00-3:30pm
Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) – 312**

I. Call to Order at 2:02pm. The following senators were present:

Senator	Division Represented	Initials	Present	Absent
Algiers, Kammy	Mathematics & Sciences	KA	X	
Beatty, Donna	Mathematics & Sciences	DB		X
Carrasco-Nungaray, Marian	Student Services	MCN	X	
Coffey, Colleen M.	Senate Secretary	CMC	X	
Forde, Richard	Career & Technical Education	RF		X
Hendricks, Bill	Social Sciences & Humanities	BH	X	
Horigan, Andrea		AH	X	
Lange, Cari	Senate Vice-President	CL	X	
Kim, Henny	English & Learning Resources	HK	X	
Kolesnik, Alex	Senate President	AK	X	
Martin, Amanda	English & Learning Resources	AM	X	
McCain, Mike	Mathematics & Sciences	MM	X	
Morris, Terry or Anglin, Gary	Athletics, Kinesiology & Health	TM / GA		X
Mules, Ron	Social Sciences & Humanities	RM	X	
Joannamarie Kraus	ASVC	JMK	X	
Sha, Saliha	Mathematics & Sciences	SS	X	
Wendt, Patty or Paula Munoz	Student Services	PW / PM	PW X	
Zacharias, Mary	Career & Technical Education	MZ		X

Guests Present: Peder Nielsen, Olivia Long, Kathleen Schrader, Michael Bowen.

II. Approval of Agenda—Motion by CMC; 2nd by BH. Discussion: RM questions legality of the meeting itself; specifically, if we approve the agenda, are we then transforming the meeting from an informational meeting only to one which is for taking action? AK clarifies that approving the agenda does not imply anything beyond what we will discuss. Vote is 4-4-4 (approved HK, SS, CMC, AK; opposed by BH, AH, MCN, CL, MM; abstain KA, RM, PW, AM). **Vote from Mike McCain not recorded?**

III. Public Comments—None.

IV. Discussion/Action Items:

- a. College “Making Decisions” document (first reading): AK shows senators the document that was presented at yesterday’s forum. Last update was in 2011/2012. Describes the role of constituent groups, particularly faculty, students, classified staff, and administrators. Peder and Olivia are here to comment in this document. Olivia spells out particular sections of interest to senators and students. She begins with the second sentence in Guiding Principles (...collaboration, communication, and mutual respect....); this document has to do with participatory governance and she reads relevant language to the senators. Also, reads Standard IV re: leadership & governance. Classified senate (in the person of Peder) has drafted a resolution re: staff roles in college governance (handout distributed)—they want to get support of academic senate in support of their resolution. This is required to be spelled out by accreditation standards and they would like to see this resolution added to the document. Peder says that this came up when they reviewed the documents and looked at the history, and they want to make sure they meet the standard. This is nothing more than they have right now. This is valuable for the accreditation team. MCN recommends that this be added to the next meeting’s agenda (so that there is time to check with constituents). CL says that she is pleased to see the classified senate drafting resolutions in support of what they do. AK clarifies that these will remain on future agendas until such time as we can have first/second readings of same. CL asks if it is necessary for them to come through academic senate? AK replies that including this in the document due to the accreditation standard it is in purview of academic senate. Peder further explains that he views this as a family—and all need to be included in the conversation and to get the “blessing” before adding it to this document. KA asks about classified role in communicating degree and certificate requirements to students. Olivia responds about classified in A & R (i.e. counseling assistants).

Michael Bowen is here in his capacity as Curriculum Committee Co-Chair. Part of changes proposed in this revision of Making Decisions is to eliminate the standing sub-committees of Curriculum and make those work groups. MB wants to update senators re: changes made to this document as they relate to the CC and its sub-committees/sub-workgroups. They are hoping to update and apply some information in terms of the history of the Curriculum Committee and commit these to paper. Recently, the CC voted to not have a sub-committee re: distance ed but to have the CC proper vote on relevant items, so that sub-committee will be going away. With the two remaining sub-committees, they want to clarify the membership of these work groups and clarify that those would not be bound by Brown Act. In addition to creating those, they have reviewed the charge of the CC and are updating that; modernized position titles, etc. Also, a set of by-laws has been added to codify operational details. RM asks about advantages of moving from a sub-committee to a workgroup. MB answers that since these sub-committees have been operating fairly informally, moving to a workgroup designation allows these groups to continue as they have been operating—i.e. advisory—and also relieve them of the responsibility to Brown Act rules.

PM asks about if the move away from sub-committee status was discussed by faculty? PM clarifies that she is asking about “strong faculty support” or was this not decisive? MB responds that a larger portion of the group was in favor of keeping these groups informal (i.e. workgroup).

CL begins by thanking MB for his level of work and commitment to this committee and its work. CL asks about a formal vote at the CC level to move away from sub-committees to workgroups. In other words, wasn't this an issue that requires a formal vote at the CC to make these changes to the CC? AK says that these kinds of changes do require a vote of the senate—we are the ones responsible for CC (one of the 10+1 charges). So we have to approve these by-law changes, and then the changes to the charge, mission, etc. CL clarifies that CC does not need to make a formal vote, but academic senate will need to vote. CL says these changes that they propose will need to be in writing for senators to see. AK has these and will forward them to the senate in next agenda packet.

PW asks about CC deciding whether the sub-committees being changed. PW wants to see how the CC votes on this issue so that senators can decide whether this is a good move or not. Does the committee itself actually support this change? MB answers that CC has had its last meeting for this school year, and given the changes in the registration dates, such a vote will take place the first week of class in August. MCN asks if the change in CC dates is due to registration date changes? He replies yes. AH asks about the DE sub-committee? He answers that whole CC will work these, and there is another DE committee on campus so there has been some overlap. What a DE sub-committee would have done for the CC was already being done by the other DE committee.

MCN asks about who will be doing Articulation submissions to the state this summer. MB answers that he does not know the answer to that. He agrees that this is a pressing issue. MCN asks whether that process ought not to be spelled out in this? MB clarifies the CC's historical involvement in that; CC handles the approvals but the Articulation Officer handles the submissions. MB stresses that the President & EVP need to be asked directly about this issue. MCN states that this is a real crisis; most of these deadlines, set by the state, are coming up in summer. Many classes are hanging in the balance. Senators concur that this is a very serious matter.

AEM says she agrees with PW to know where CC stands on these changes. MB clarifies that at first meeting of next school year, he will ensure that vote gets taken. Also clarifies that implementation of this document will not occur until next fall.

- b. In addition to the CC, other senate subcommittees are called out in the new document. AK reviews these. New: Faculty and Staff Professional Development Committee. Probably this should be called "College Professional Development Committee" since even administrators, per current state regulations, are to be involved. However, there is a particular role that is only applicable to faculty. We still need to have a group that makes contractual decisions specific to faculty (ex: travel pool).

PM reminds senators that on 3/27 she sent Prof Development Committee and all senators an email about this issue. She has looked at the regulations and these do not require that all these 3 groups be lumped together in the same professional development group. Language does not say it has to be altogether. She advises retaining separate professional development committee because faculty has particular interests. AK talks about issues pertinent only to faculty would remain with faculty, but if there are events/issues that effect the whole campus, that would be addressed by this group. CL clarifies that if there is information distributed to all senators, process for doing so.

MCN says we need to keep focus on issue: does it make sense to keep faculty professional development separate, or to have a combined group? RM asks about clarifying the language to spell out administrators (which current draft does not). AK agrees and says this does need to be changed/added.

Other committees addressed in the document: Learning Communities Committee. This committee would like to move away from under the umbrella of the academic senate and be an advisory committee. It would still be a shared governance committee and give an opportunity to give college community as a whole a chance to weigh in. CL asks AK if he can ask Eric or Robert to write up a rationale for the proposed change. Suggestion made that any committee requesting this change should do so. RM asks if this is a CC issue/group. AK clarifies that they are not a specific curriculum issue; rather, a shared governance advisory committee. They would have representation from management, classified, and faculty. RM expresses skepticism and concern that they would no longer report back to academic senate. AK says we could still ask them to. RM clarifies concern about LCC reporting anywhere else except academic senate (who has purview over curriculum). RM & AK discuss pros/cons of this proposed change. Decision to bring Robert or Eric in to speak to this.

KA asks about possibility of having individuals from these committees come to the senate to speak to these changes (i.e. maybe during next semester)? AK says concern is that we have a self-study to write and decision-making is part of this; he acknowledges that this document has come to us rather late. He says he would be happy to have as many people as possible come into the meetings to speak to these kinds of issues, but we will need to move this quickly in fall so that we can write our self-study.

- c. Academic Senate Subcommittees, possible By-Law changes (first reading): AK tells senators that one of the issues that has arisen is the need to have a formal, 2/3 ballot (hard copy)—rather than having all the committee membership and charges in the by laws, have all that in the Making Decisions document (still subject to Senate approval), but then anytime we want to change meeting times or membership, we don't have to move to a full vote of all the membership. As it is, something as simple as what time a committee meets (senate right now says it meets 1:30-3:30, but block schedule changed that—even changing that would require a 2/3 vote to change). So he sees this as expeditious with respect to membership and meeting times. PW asks about whether the exec team discussed these; AK clarifies that if the Making Decisions document is adopted as is, we will need to make by-laws changes. We could just put that into the by-laws, but there cannot be this disconnect between Making Decisions and our By-laws. This information must be consistent across both documents. PM says that senate has to agree on Making Decisions document first. She says that senators need to see what changes senators will be asked to make. AK says he would just change the by-laws to match what is in Making Decisions (i.e. there is no new language to show senators: it would mirror the Making Decisions document).

RM says he hears what AK is saying for sake of efficiency. But his concern is that the Making Decisions document then becomes the engine driving our By-Laws. In other words, what is the advantage of making these? AK clarifies that we have some things in our By Laws that may need to be changed fairly often, and therefore there is some advantage in time/effort

in terms of excluding these things from By-Laws. PM says whether cumbersome or not, the voting, etc is part of the By-Laws for a reason and it is for our protection. AK says we could keep the information we have, but it will have to be amended so that the two match. RM says we need to decide what we as senators want, and then the Making Decision document *should match what our By-Laws say*. CL says this is a moot point per our Constitution, and she reads relevant passages. Senators discuss the requirements of the 2/3rds vote—this will need to be clarified and it may not be so cumbersome to change by-laws as we suppose.

Other committees not called out in our By-Laws that are in Making Decisions: SLO Committee. AH says that they (i.e. that committee) did rewrite their charge, membership, etc to align with accreditation requirements.

Student Affairs Committee: This committee has not met in any recent history. If this is not to be revived, it should be removed. RM says this may be beneficial as a workgroup to the new VP of Student Services.

Student Financial Support Services Committee: Has not met in at least last 10 years. Unless someone wants to resurrect it, it should be removed as well. PM says this kind of group provides checks and balances. AK clarifies that there is no problem keeping these, but they need to be revived. If they do not exist, they need to be removed.

Co-Curricular Fund Committee: Historically has been run as an operational committee by VP of Business Services. Senators discuss how this might be changed. AK clarifies that we need to then revisit this in by-laws and Making Decisions.

One Book One Campus Committee: Proposed that this become a college advisory committee with representation of all segments of the college.

Proposed by-laws changes (Article VI, starting at Section C)

CC and its workgroups
Faculty Prof Development Funds Committee
Faculty Sabbatical Leaves Committee
Faculty Staffing Priorities Committee

CL reminds senators about the marriage of Constitution & By-Laws, we can use constitutional changes to clarify and solve a lot of these issues. Her memory is that Peter last revised and the Exec worked it twice, then brought it to the senate as a whole. Senators like this idea.

PM asks about Equity and 3SP. AK responds that if these address 10+1 issues, it would be senate's prerogative to address these as well.

Senators discuss the proposed Student Success Council. AK tries to clarify how this might function with respect to Basic Skills vs. Equity, etc and how monies might be shared among. PM says she sees value in having 3SP part of senate otherwise its advisory only and faculty have no real power. KA asks about value in continuing to draft the charge for the Equity Committee and this is discussed briefly. RM says he often feels disconnected from budgeting; he sees value in having a regular report from BRC so that senators can understand how monies come in and

where they go. Senators briefly discuss Basic Skills monies in particular. PM asks about how senators should communicate with each other (i.e. outside of meetings)? Answer is either here (i.e. meeting, open to public environment), or else sent out via agenda packet. Senators ask about appropriateness of email communication to all senators. AK says this is a violation; appropriate venue is public comment. PM wants senate to get Brown Act training. AK answers that we will have participatory governance training on 5/11—exact schedule to be determined.

d. College management reorganization—AK shows senators the new org chart from yesterday’s forum and answers questions.

V. President’s Report— None.

VI. Announcements for the Good of the Order—None.

VII. Requests for Future Agenda Items—None.

VIII. “Adjournment” at 3:38pm. Next meeting is May 7th.

DRAFT