

**Ventura College
Academic Senate Agenda
Thursday, October 2, 2014
2:00---3:30 pm
Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) – 312**

I. Call to Order: 2:00pm. Senators in attendance as follows:

Senator	Division Represented	Initials	Present	Absent
Algiers, Kammy	Mathematics & Sciences	KA	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	Social Sciences & Humanities	AH		X
Kim, Henny	English & Learning Resources	HK	X	
Kolesnik, Alex	Mathematics & Sciences	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	TM X	
Mules, Ron	Social Sciences & Humanities	RM	X	
Sanchez, Robert (ASVC PR Director) filling in for Reyes, Tony	ASVC External Affairs Director	TR	X	
Sezzi, Peter H.	Senate President	PHS	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: Gloria Arevalo (Articulation Officer); Dan Kumpf (Dean of Math & Sciences); Paula Munoz (Student Services)

II. Public Comments: PM encourages Senate to ask a lot of questions about the presentation about 3SP funds being made, particularly with respect to administrative positions using these or general funds.

III. Acknowledgement of Guests: Robert Sanchez, PR Director for ASVC, is here filling in for Tony Reyes, the ASVC External Affairs Director

a. **Debbie Newcomb (SLO Facilitator):** ISLO no. 3 is being worked this year. It has now to come to the SLO committee's attention that this is not really a workable ISLO. The problem is that if you're doing, for example, welding, there is really no evidence you can draw upon to show competency. Accordingly, the SLO committee is asking for this new criteria to be

added to the rubric (in red ink on the handout). Motion by AK, RF seconds. Discussion: AK asks if there is a way to state this in the document (i.e. not all points may be relevant to all classes). Debbie says that would mean changing all the rubrics. AK says that he is thinking more for the long term. KA asks about where they are locating this in the rubric (i.e. under exceeds expectations). Debbie says that is a good suggestion. AK agrees to accept friendly amendment to his motion (i.e. move new criteria out of the “Exceeds Expectations” column). Vote: Unanimous.

b. **Dr. Patrick Jefferson (EVP):** Here to discuss agenda item VI (f). Dr. Jefferson says he is here to clear up any confusions resulting from draft 3SP plan sent out (in error). He says he would like to begin by hearing any concerns or questions from the senators. PHS asks about the \$1.6m amount, but only \$900K budgeted? What is the plan for the remaining dollars? PJ answers that the plan was based on a lower/previous figure—i.e. they just found out they have \$1.6m. Money can be spent for core services only; very tight parameters. He says they need to sit down and decide this—they knew more money would be forthcoming, they had no idea it would be \$700K+. PW says she thinks this is just missing a lot of information, for example CalWorks, EOPS, transfer/career center. PJ acknowledges there are some deficits. He says part of his objective was to give VC flexibility in terms of what they report to the state. Example: interventions for probationary students. He is not going to give every particular (box us in) with this strategy, rather you send a more general work plan so we have more campus control over final. What counts for us is the reporting of services. We need a very coherent/streamlined way of reporting campus services (so that we can receive our monies). What we do for students has a direct impact on how much money we will receive the subsequent year. PW says she just wants to make sure we don't end up in a situation where the plan is very general, and then later when asked to fund one thing or another the answer is “oh, it's not in the plan.” PJ addresses this concern. PJ says he does not want to spend the money to just keep doing the same thing; he wants to spend money to do innovative things. PHS says (“with due respect to Student Services”) that this is exactly what the report sounds like right now—it just summarizes what we've been doing for the last 10 years; he does not believe the report evidences innovative approaches. The example is given of the new “major talks” being organized by MCN/Transfer Center—many good things being heard about these events. Why isn't this in the report?

AK raises issue that there are a lot of inaccuracies in the Math Department's information—he says the report is inaccurate as to nos. 3 & 4. AK says his issue is that no one came to get the information from that department. PJ agrees. Gloria talks about no. 2 (p. 7 of the report, page 24 in the agenda packet) re: student assessment/placement: in particular that VC does not accept MC's self-placement. Senators discuss this. MCN then says that in fact, we DO accept from MC. Senators discuss the wording of this section—that is portrays VC as not accepting placement results vs. courses. Senators discuss the Common Course Assessment guidelines expected to come from the state.

PHS asks about in what format PJ wants these changes/revisions: AK will send math revisions to PJ; MCN will send student services revisions to PJ.

Additional specific changes raised by senators: PHS p. 45: wording not clear (makes it seem like counselors have an enormous amount of discretion); MCN p. 7/42: suggestions re: language used. She thinks language needs to be cleaned up; she will send some suggested language. AK says it sounds like overall counselors need to be better consulted.

PM raises issue of 3 administrative positions: PJ says there were never 3 positions from 3SP funds; it was 1 (director of 3SP). PJ says wrong information was given at CPC. AK asks about the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. PJ says he is asking for this position to be funded by

Equity Funds completely; no general funds. PHS asks if that will eat up all the Equity funds? PJ says at this point no assistant to that person is funded. PM asks about Assistant Dean position. PJ says he is forwarding that for funding consideration. PJ says we don't have a good structure in Student Services; he does not have enough administrative support. He says he sees this as a product of having just one person oversee all of student services. He is trying to develop a structure that he is more comfortable with. PM says they (undefined) want to meet with him about why there is not enough administrative oversight. He says he is not comfortable with the current structure. He acknowledges that this is a new structure for VC, but not for other colleges—many smaller than VC is. He says he needs to have more confidence in our administrative structure. Example: transfer & career center report directly to him; this is a strange structure. PHS asks about funding. PJ says it will be a general fund position but it will be a neutral because Registrar position will be abolished and that releases those funds. PHS asks about existence of Assistant Registrar, and about why Registrar is talked about in 3SP report. PJ says that nothing has changed yet. PHS asks about why Director of 3SP as opposed to Coordinator level. PJ addresses this as to responsibilities inappropriate for a Coordinator level position. Gloria Arevalo comments that in many colleges (including MC), they are creating a dean position to run 3SP. Discussion had about merits of Director vs. Coordinator vs. Assistant Dean.

PJ says we have to develop this report every year and that he will take responsibility for developing a more inclusive process. He says to please send him changes. He says spending the \$700K+ within the parameters is not easy—he welcomes senators to send him their ideas ASAP.

KA asks about faculty being able to convey information directly to counseling after talking to students/sending them to counseling. PJ says he would like to see a more “intrusive” counseling process—not just sending students to counseling, but an intervention kind of team to contact students and intervene. Says we need to develop some ideas in this regard.

IV. Approval of minutes from 9/25/14: Removed from agenda. This will be agendized for 10/16.

V. Study Session

a. Development of questions for future Senate visits by College President & District

Chancellor: RM asks about HR and conveys his department's difficulty in getting someone from HR to come meet with them. PHS answers that the Vice Chancellor HR is a direct report to Chancellor—senators can ask the Chancellor to direct HR in this regard. PHS raises issue of asking chancellor about Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. For president: senators would like to ask him about proposed Assistant Dean of Student Services.

MCN says there is a deficit at the district level with respect to Student Services. Maybe this for the chancellor: we have all this hiring, but no voice for Student Services. She suggests asking about adopting more student friendly policies like payment plans, etc. PHS answers that this may have to do with the vendor that processes these.

PW asks about previous questions from “Coffee with the Chancellor” and to follow up with her on these subjects raised.

VI. Action Items

a. Approval of faculty membership of College and District committees: Motion by RM, 2nd by SS. Discussion: none. Vote is unanimous.

b. AP 7120 F: Interim Managers: Recruitment and Selection (Second Reading): Not discussed due to lack of time.

c. Basic Skills Report (First & Second Reading): Dan Kumpf is here to speak about this. Senators pose questions to him about this report and the way in which these funds are being spent. PHS asks question about p. 8 of the BSI report. MCN asks about using BSI monies to serve counseling functions to assist BS students. Dan says that she can appear at Basic Skills Committee to make an appeal for that. Short discussion re: this in past and during this year. Gloria Arevalo asks about first page under “Narrative”. Dan responds that Eric Martinson wrote this portion of the narrative and he is almost certain that the numbers came from the Basic Skills Cohort Tracker. She says this does not specify the baseline number, just the percentage increase—seeing the baseline would be useful. She asks about tutoring services for ESL—agreed that this data needs to be clarified. Dan says that Karen could respond to this or he can look at the actual budget (on his desk). Gloria says she has one other recommendation re: no. 4A, 4B and 5 (Long Term Goals...), these need to be added (they’re blank currently). Dan says he will find out the answer to ESL tutoring and report back via email. Motion by MCN to accept BSI report with the direction to add see charts of 4a, b and 5 and narrative, and to verify whether tutoring services are rendered to basic skills and ESL. Second by AK. Vote is unanimous.

d. ISLO-3 – Critical Thinking and Problem Solving [Revision] (First Reading): See above under III(a)

e. VCCCD Mission Statement [Revision] (First Reading): CC motioned, MCN seconded to suggest revising the VCCCD Mission statement by removing everything after the first sentence. Vote is unanimous.

f. Ventura College Academic Senate Goals for 2014---2015 (First Reading): Will be re-agendized for 10/17 meeting.

g. Student Success and Support Program Plan (First Reading):** Motion by MCN to move to a 2nd reading; second by RF. Discussion: PHS raises the concern that this plan has not been developed in concert with the faculty, staff, etc. Title V specifically calls out faculty, students, administrators, staff—this simply has not happened. The plan lists a committee of participant/stakeholder people, but senate was not consulted. PHS says he is going to ask that this wherever it states that a faculty member was representing the Senate, that the term Faculty Senate be redacted. Discussion ensues about how to proceed and what the report’s deficits are. Motion by MCN and second by RF are withdrawn.

RM motions to have senators’ names taken off of the stakeholder list at the end of the report, and to formally object to senate not being consulted about this report. Seconded by RF. Discussion ensues regarding the possible formation of a sub-committee to draft the senate’s own response/remedy various deficits of the report and present for 1st and 2nd reading at next meeting. Senators debate the efficacy of this. HK and AM have suggestions/revisions to this report from their department—when/in what venue can they present these? PHS replies that this can be taken up with the sub-committee to be formed. Further discussion ensues over the charge of said sub-committee. Vote 6-3-2 (CC, MCN, and PM opposed; ___ and ___ abstain). Motion fails. While a sub-committee will not be formed, the term “Faculty Senate” will be removed from all faculty member names in Appendix A and the Senate will object to the rushed nature in which this report was developed.

- VII. President's Report:**—time ran out

- VIII. Senate Subcommittee reports:**—time ran out
 - a. Curriculum Committee report
 - b. Other Senate Committees reports

- IX. Campus Committee reports:** —time ran out
 - a. Campus Committees reports

- X. Announcements for the Good of the Order:** —time ran out

- XI. Requests for Future Agenda Items:** —time ran out

- XII. Adjournment :** at 3:36p.m.