Ventura College Academic Senate
Minutes
Thursday, April 16th, 2020
3:30-5:00 pm
Meeting held via Zoom https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/92833869045

VENTURA COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERS		
Constituency	**Representative**	**Attended**
President	Dan Clark	X
Vice President	Preston Pipal	X
Treasurer	Andrea Horigan	X
Secretary	Colleen Coffey	X
Curriculum	Michael Bowen	X
Career Education: Business, Child Development, Criminal Justice, Allied Health and Nursing (3 Faculty Reps)	Deanna Hall	X
	Rachel Johnson	X
	Lazaro Salinas	X
Career Education: Technology and Workplace (1 Faculty Rep)	*** Vacant ***	
English, Math, Communication, and Learning Resources (4 Faculty Reps)	Gabe Arquilevich	
	Chris Frederick	X
	Jaclyn Walker	X
	*** Vacant ***	
Health, Kinesiology, Athletics, Visual and Performing Arts (3 Faculty Reps)	Nathan Cole	X
	Bill Hendricks	X
	Mary McDonough	
Library, Languages, Behavioral & Social Sciences (3 Faculty Rep)	Ron Mules	X
	Michael Ward	X
	*** Vacant ***	
Sciences and Distance Education (3 Faculty Reps)	Kammy Algiers / Chloe Branciforte	X (KA/CB)
	Erin Brocker	X
	Marta De Jesus	X
Self-Nominated Part-Time Faculty Member	Greg Cooper	
Student Services (4 Faculty Reps)	Paula Munoz	X
	Gema Espinoza Sanchez	X
	Yia Vang	X
	*** Vacant ***	

Agenda Item	Discussion Notes	Action ?
I. Call to Order		
II. Public Comments (2 min. per comment)	Not recorded.	
III. Acknowledgement of Guests (1 min.)	Lisa Putnam (Dean)	
IV. Informational Items *(These are agenda items intended to provide the body with brief updates or reports of activities or actions from outside. If the Senate wishes to debate or discuss an item presented as information, they must request that it be placed on an agenda at future meeting as an action or discussion item.)* a. Federal proposed by-pass of curricular process b. "W" and "EW" update c. Senate Awards	a. DC/PP gives senators an update about this. These are in Federal Register (tens of thousands of pages)—proposed changes would provide flexibility to institutions to modify curriculum at the recommendation of industry advisory boards, etc., without relying on recommendations of faculty. In short: this could lead to two parallel curriculum processes for industry-oriented programs, and non. From chat: Also: Under Definitions (which covers all DE courses) see also pg 18645 (end of third column) through 18647 (1st half of 1st column) pg 18660 for history of credit hour timing calculations The portion I just mentioned under Definitions, proposes changes to the definition of "credit hour" particularly for LABS for all (DE) courses (which could ripple to all LABS). b. DC updates senators about this. Question: can faculty see whether students used a "W" or an "EW". Question: about pass/no pass vs. "EW". Answer: Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness, et al. is going to be addressing this. Info should be forthcoming. c. PP is going to put a link in the chat that connects to the senate awards page. We need to talk to Philip Briggs about how he conducts surveys so we can ensure that people don't vote twice (his use email). This will be addressed at 5/7 meeting. From chat: https://www.venturacollege.edu/committees/academic-senate/senate-awards	

V. Action Items (*These are agenda items that require a vote from the Senate*):	a. Motion by AH; 2nd by KA. Discussion: None. Vote: unanimous with 1 abstention.	
a. Approval of April 2nd minutes b. Accreditation Midterm Report (2nd reading) c. SEP (1st Reading) d. Approval of "Response to Immigration Officials on Campus" document e. Priority Registration Resolution (1st reading) f. Quality Online Teaching Resolution (1st reading)	b. Motion by PP; 2nd by AH. Discussion: LP is here and she gives some opening comments to the senators. Question: Can LP share with us about the process? Answer: Each action plan had a small group that went out and investigated what the status was and collected the evidence to show what progress had/hadn't been made. Says if there is further input, this can still be changed. Question: About work groups for standard 4. Answer: Yes, we do need to go in and do a bit more work with that. That was Philip's group and the participatory gov. manual. So individuals who worked on that should be included here. Also of the items in standard 4 were CPC generated, that is why PB was in charge. LP will reach out to PB and ask him for who was working (from CPC) on that. Academic Senate also had representation on that and DC needs to email names to LP to add (this was during Lydia's tenure). Question from chat: Will this report include information from this semester, particularly the immense changes to instruction and/or morale and institutional emergency preparedness and effectiveness with a view to the future? Answer: Yes, it should. That should be added probably in the Quality Focused Essay. It wouldn't have a place in the report because it was not previously an action item. It could be under "Next Steps". Question: Does it relate to p. 13 when you mention "Modern Think"? This doc doesn't actually talk about Modern Think survey, does it? (Action plan 4.6). Answer: Agreed that this can be elaborated upon. Suggestions can be emailed to LP. Question: (Re: p. 7) What has happened in the hiring of a more diversified faculty? Answer: LP wasn't on the work group that discussed this so that information isn't right at hand. Looking for hard numbers to show some movement? Clarifying: Hope is that with a midterm report we would be able to include in this report hard	

	numbers about whether this was effective. LP: Can probably find this information on the dashboard. Link needs to be corrected so that it goes to faculty data (right now it's connecting to classified). Concern: the EEO committee has seen very little progress on this. Does not think this here is very accurate. It should be showing more "in progress".	

Question: Re: Action #2 (p. 42) and SEP. We had a meeting with state rep Rhonda Moore at last senate meeting of fall semester. Why aren't issues of SEP included in this report? Answer: We can either add a section in QFA and use those meeting minutes as evidence. Or we can have it in the next self-evaluation. Probably we should put it in this document. Clarifying: Whole reason this is brought up is that we've made progress by putting together a committee to accomplish this. Answer: She just needs help with the narrative since she has not been privy to these conversations. DC says he can help with this.

Motion withdrawn.

MB: Motion to postpone current action item and move it into a new (second) reading next meeting on 5/7. 2nd by RM. Vote: unanimous.

To do's for revised document are:

1) Modifying workgroup list
2) Survey results and _____
3) Correcting link to EEOC and if possible add a table of data.

c. Motion to approve by MB; 2nd by KA.

Discussion: DC updates senators re: this document. Comment: This will be more readable next time senators see it because there will be language under "activities" so that we'll see what's at the bottom—all that matched up with the metrics.

Comment from chat: We should include any efforts we did special for this semester (Chromebooks for lending, ?) and maybe some ideas for the near future?

	Great idea. And DH says some of that was included. And the group did discuss that as COVID was evolving. Should be something written in there re: wanting smaller class sizes in order to address equity (esp. right now with remote learning). All of the pedagogical research is that we should not be having these overinflated class sizes. And yet at VC, we're talking about exploding these class sizes. Senators want to see class sizes addressed in this. Comment: Some of the activities were aspirational. Question: Is there a way to distinguish between what we're doing and what is aspirational? Answer: Yes, "Inquiry" means the aspirational. Comment re: #4: ESL/ELL has been annialated at VC. This has been true for years. We have never created an infrastructure to support those students. This is a big problem our lack of support for ESL/ELL and who is being excluded—this should be addressed. DC: Yes, addressing all the groups that would benefit from ESL/ELL support. Vote: unanimous with 2 abstentions. d. Motion to approve by PP; 2nd by EB. Discussion: Couple of typos: 1st page: stray opening quotation mark at second paragraph. Sentence p. 4 (all pages labeled p. 7) practical points for employees—sentence that was really confusing. Very end of document it says California's general and probably it should be attorney general. DC will send Jesus Vega these grammatical corrections. Vote: unanimous. e. Motion to postpone resolution re: priority registration by PP; 2nd by RM. Vote: unanimous. f. Motion to postpone resolution re: quality online instruction by AH; 2nd by PP. Discussion: Quality of online education that VC has worked hard to maintain via DE training requirement; we need backing of the admin, deans, dept. chairs, and faculty themselves to adhere to these best	

	practices in order to maintain that quality. Comment: Is this document in our packet? Answer: No, we are writing in process. Clarifying point: the issue for resolution is by-passing the training requirement here at VC and making our voice heard that this should not happen. Question: Is this not involving COVID emergency? Answer: No one should be teaching online that hasn't been trained to teach online. We have to be vigilant that courses presented to our students are up to standard. Response: Concern about faculty who are just not ready to teach online. Response to the response: We have the tools to keep it as close to face-to-face as possible. Comment: State chancellor requiring that everyone teaching a summer or fall course must be trained according to local DE training. Do senators want to have a resolution? Senators want to come back to this. Vote on postponing until next senate meeting: unanimous.	
VI. Discussion Items *(These agenda items are a chance for the body to discuss and debate any matter related to the business of the Senate, often leading to action at a future meeting or providing the President or Chair with direction for discussions with the Administration, State Academic Senate, or other bodies.)* a. +/- grading system b. CCCCO's emergency remote instruction blanket addendum	a. Several senators speak up and do not support +/-. Question: What are arguments for/against this? Against: very few 4.0 students as opposed to how many there are now. Proponents: say the reverse. Effects on GPA are primary concern. Comment: CSU uses +/- and it just gives greater range. When students are borderline at VC we tend to bump up; sees +/- as a little more honest, giving faculty a little more flexibility and honesty in terms of evaluating student performance. Comment from chat: It requires all 3 Senates agreeing for it to happen. It sometimes helps with I wish could give better than a but I don't have to give them a full letter grade better. Answer: Yes. Comment: Thinks that lack of +/- leads students to over-inflate their own ideas	

	about the work they're doing, and then their grades sink at 4-year schools. b. MB for summer and fall we are expected to adhere to all ACCJC and Title 5 standards for everything we're offering. All faculty teaching DE must be trained. Curriculum Committee is going to have to approve every course we offer for DE by December. This may delay some of the other curriculum that should be happening. Question: Does all courses mean those recommended by faculty to be switched to DE or over faculty objections? Answer: Faculty needs to submit and CC can distinguish between temporary approval and permanent DE approval (for something that is not suitable for DE). Question: If we were to go through this process, can we distinguish hybrid from fully online? Answer: You can classify courses however faculty see fit (i.e. as faculty already do) but if course is only submitted for hybrid and virus prevents face-to-face learning, that course could not be offered. Question: Can we have a greater chunk of time at our next meeting to discuss this? Answer: Yes, and at the state this still has moving parts. Curriculum Committee will also be discussing this on Tuesday at 3pm. Comment: Let's not forget that we're all working to rule. Here is something with a bunch of work and we don't even have a contract.	
VII. President's Report		
VIII. Reports from Senate Subcommittees, Task Forces, and/or Work Groups a. Curriculum Committee (Michael) b. Guided Pathways c. CTE liaison report (Deanna Hall) d. Treasurer's Report (Andrea) e. OER Report (Andrea) f. DE (Preston) g. Faculty PD Committee (Colleen)	BRC: Likelihood that there will be less $ from state. Wait and see. Next meeting after semester ends to go over May revise. She will share at that time.	

IX. Announcements for the Good of the Order
        a. AFT Update (Michael Ward)
        b. Upcoming ASCCC Events:
 	
Details can be found
        at https://asccc.org/calendar/list/events
	AFT: Tomorrow AFT at 9:00am.	

X. Requests for Future Agenda Items	For our last meeting can we discuss appropriate tools, computers, webcam availability for teaching online.	
XI. Adjournment	Adjournment at 5:02pm.	

Academic Senate's primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters specifically the following policy development and implementation matters:

1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites
2. Degree & Certificate Requirements
3. Grading Policies
4. Educational Program Development
5. Standards & Policies regarding Student Preparation and Success
6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation process
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
9. Processes for program review
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
+ Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon.