**Ventura College Academic Senate**

**Minutes**

**Thursday, September 15, 2016**

**2:00-3:30pm**

**Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) – 312**

I. Call to Order at 2:03pm. The following senators were present:

Daniel Algattas (DA)—Health/Kin/ICA/Performing Arts

Colleen Coffey (CMC)—Senate Secretary

Chris Frederick (CF)—English/Math/Learning Resources

Angelica Gonzales (AG)—Student Affairs

Bill Hendricks (BH)—Visual Arts/Behavioral and Social Sciences/Languages

Andrea Horrigan (AH)--Visual Arts/Behavioral and Social Sciences/Languages

Alex Kolesnik (AK)—Senate President

Amanda Martin (AM)--English/Math/Learning Resources

Paula Munoz (PM)—Student Affairs

Peter H. Sezzi (PHS)—Senate VP

 Brent Wilson (BW)—Health/Kin/ICA/Performing Arts (via phone)

Guests present: Michael Bowen (Curriculum Committee); Laura Woyach (Business); Marta de Jesus (Sciences); Ryan Petitfils (Curriculum Committee); Joshua Ruiz (Student Trustee).

II. Public Comments

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 Alex Kolesnik/Peter H. Sezzi, 4667 Telegraph Road, Ventura CA, 93003.

PM announces that there is an all VCCCD/AFT membership meeting tomorrow. Very importantly that all faculty attend. CMC asks about future meetings being made available electronically (ex: via Skype or similar). Intent is to gather/network faculty across the district, of course. Campus meetings will take place the following week.

III. Acknowledgement of Guests: Michael Bowen (Curriculum Committee)

IV. Informational Items

a. Curriculum Committee Update: Michael Bowen updates senators re: recent activity of the CC. CMC asks him to clarify re: the timeframe for courses being modified only to add DE offering to the COR.

V. Action Items

1. Minutes (9/1/16): Motion by AG, 2nd by PM. Discussion: One correction to page 2 made. Unanimously approved.
2. Approval of senate goals: Motion to approve 2016/2017 senate goals by PS; 2nd by PM. Discussion: There is some confusion re: goal 3 (“Facilitate faculty-led discussion(s) about FTES…”). AK clarifies the intent. BH asks whether “…faculty-led” is really accurate? PM replies that it is for the reason that faculty need to be very aware of FTES et al coming down the pike. Faculty should have all the information about this issue and be able to speak up on these subjects. It should be part of Department Chair meetings as well. Vote: Unanimous. PHS reminds senators that we will revisit these in spring in order to measure progress on these goals.
3. Approval of By-Law amendment vote (concurrent with senate executive elections): AK reviews proposed By-Law changes with senators. PM asks about Article II and clarification of the “executive session” term—PHS clarifies this as it relates to the Brown Act. Change “executive session” to “closed session”. Also the name of the SLO Committee will be changed to “Advisory Workgroup.” DA raises concern that under this proportional structure (by division rather than 2 per department) it is too easy for the large divisions/department to dominate the discussion/outcomes. Discussion ensues re: respecting majority perspective (by division) but also perhaps putting a cap on representation for very large divisions (**REVISION:** **maximum of 3 senators per division**). Senators concur. MDJ asks if officers count toward representation? Answer is no. **REVISION: Ex-officio officers on committees will not be counted as division reps.** MB raises [mathematical] issue of quorum if voting membership is an odd number. **REVISION: Language will be changed throughout to “majority” instead of 50%+1 for both Senate and Curriculum Committee.** PHS makes motion to send By-Laws (with revisions discussed/outlined above) out to membership with senate executive committee election; 2nd by PM. Vote: unanimous.
4. BP/AP 7211, AP 7120-E (1st reading): AK reviews the “B: Criteria for Equivalency…” with Senators. MDJ suggests that language be added re: situation of having a degree higher than a Master’s. She has a problem with the “Bachelor’s degree can be in any discipline.” This can create a situation where faculty has no experience in classes they will be assigned to teach. Says that a certain number of people that apply [in Biology] have MD’s (higher than a Masters) but they had an Art degree as an undergrad. This issue in her department has the potential to create a very large number of problems. LW asks about what these criteria mean in terms of the candidate getting into the hiring pool. AK clarifies that the hiring committee still has control over the criteria for hiring. He says the main purpose is to diversify the pool of peoples we see (i.e. the very strict requirements have prevented candidates from being in the pool to even be considered). BH asks where this originated from? AK says that there has been discussion of this for a long time because of so many disgruntled candidates who are denied access to the pools but believe themselves to be qualified. PHS says that one problem with B is that there are some disciplines (like Library Science) where there is no Bachelor’s Degree. Senators discuss this and whether these two options cover this scenario. Ultimately, the hiring committee would decide.

Re C (“Disciplines in which a master’s degree is not generally…”) **PHS says we need to add the word “current” industrial certification to the third bullet point.** AG asks if we want to clarify re: degree-applicable units. AK reiterates that this is the decision that the hiring committee can make—intention is only to diversity the hiring pool and empower the committee to decide.

Motion to approve as to 1st reading by PHS; 2nd by PM. Vote: Unanimous except for AH who abstains because she was late to the discussion.

AK reviews AP re: “Procedure for the Determination of Qualifying Degrees…” and specifically about the procedure for creating a pre-determined/agreed upon list of qualifying/equivalent degrees. AG asks about no. 3 “…aforementioned individuals endorse or deny…”—what does that mean? Consensus by the committee? Majority? AK clarifies that this occurs at DCHR (a consensus body). MDJ says that in Biology 3 members of the department met with a representative from [district] HR and they created a list of equivalent degrees and a list of degrees that were *not* equivalent. All the participants in that process agreed to the lists created. PHS asks about the vote and suggests that it be stipulated as follows: 1) how the voting will work; 2) what the role of DCHR is; 3) if list is denied by DCHR there should be a written explanation of any suggestion as to the removal of a degree or other change to the proposed list; and 4) these lists should be public knowledge so employment applicants don’t waste time seeking equivalence. AK replies that NeoGov will do just that. PHS says we should add a #5 specifying that these lists will be available on the job announcement and in the application. #4 will have an appendix to the AP that will list the pre-qualified degrees.

Change “unanimous” in terms of equivalency committee to “majority”

Further discussion ensues.

Motion by PHS as to 1st reading of AP 7120; 2nd by PM. Vote: Unanimous.

1. Assignment of disciplines (minimum qualifications) to course outlines: AK explains this to Senators as to “A: New Courses” in Curricunet. Motion is made by PHS as follows: 1st reading here (i.e. in Senate) and before Senate has 2nd reading senate should receive input/revision/approval from Curriculum Committee; then back to Senate for a 2nd reading. Motion 2nd by AH. AG asks about a program like Chicano Studies that has historically been under the History Department. AK reiterates how the process will work between course creator, the relevant department, and the Curriculum Committee. Senators discuss the scenario of when a new MQ is created. They concur that a “c” needs to be added to address this. MB asks about the form discussed in this—AK clarifies that this will be a modification of the existing form. Vote: unanimous.

VI. Consent Items

1. BP/APs 2015, 2745, 3510, 3515, 3540, 2430 (1st & 2nd readings). AK asks if any of these need to be pulled –*we no longer have quorum so no vote taken. Consent agenda will be moved up on the agenda for the next meeting. Adjourned for lack of quorum at 3:40pm.* 3510 & 3515 will be removed from the Consent Agenda on the next meeting agenda.

VII. President’s Report

VIII. Senate Subcommittees/Task Forces/Work Groups Reports

IX. Campus Committees Reports

X. Announcements for the Good of the Order

XI. Requests for Future Agenda Items

XII. Adjournment

\* \* \*

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.