**Ventura College Academic Senate**

**Minutes**

**Thursday, March 7th, 2019**

**3:30-5:00pm**

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

I. Call to Order at 3:32pm. The following senators were present:

**Division: Visual Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences and Languages**

Bill Hendricks (BH)--absent

Andrea Horrigan (AH)--absent

**Division: Health, Kinesiology, Athletics and Performing Arts**

Brent Wilson (BW)--absent

Mary McDonough-Giles (MMG)

**Division: Sciences**
**Kammy** Algiers (KA)--absent
Cari Lange--absent
Erin Brocker (EB)--absent

Hugh O’Neill (HON)--absent

Division: English, Math & Learning Resources
**Gabe**Arquilevich (GA)
Chris Frederick (CF)

John Guelcher (JG)
Donna Beatty (DB)

Division: Career Education

Roxanne Forde (RF)
Deanna Hall (DH)

Laura Woyach (LW)

Division: Student Services
Paula Munoz (PM)

Gema Sanchez (GS)

Yia Vang (YV)--absent

Curriculum Committee Liaison

Michael Bowen (MB)

Senate Executive Team
Lydia Morales (President) (LM)

Philip Clinton (Vice-President) (PC)

Colleen Coffey (Secretary) (CC)

Stephanie Branca (Treasurer) (SB)

II. Public Comments—not recorded.

III. Acknowledgement of Guests: Joshua Chancer (Trustee), Gabriela Torres (Trustee), Kim Hoffmans (VP), Adrian Ponce (ASVC Student Representative), Bea Hererra (Student Services)

IV. Informational Items:

1. Board Trustee Joshua Chancer (moved to first item): Mr. Chancer introduces himself and describes his vision: without making assumptions about the district organization, he feels there is always room for growth. He would like to highlight relationships specifically—and believes the health of the organization is built upon this. When there is a strong sense of trust and that relationship really works, it benefits students. He would like to project maintaining and even improving relationships. Re: budget: he wants to see the budget serve the individuals who serve students. He takes questions from the senators:

LW: She speaks to the trustee about the difficulty of recruiting quality individuals to staff this college because it is among the lowest paid in the state. She thanks him for being here—the first trustee to visit in her two-year tenure on the senate. Reply: MC expressed a concern about losing tenured faculty exactly because of the issue that Laura has raised. He expresses that he hears this loud and clear.

DH: One of the things with the new funding formula is about completion. They (CTE) do not have assurances that the new monies potentially coming in (on account of completions) will be coming back into the colleges to support those very programs.

RF: Every year the government delivers various monies to the college, but she is concerned that no monies are making their ways back to the classroom (ex: equipment not updated, repairs not made). Concern is that there is so much money on the table, but it seems like it does not “trickle down” to the end users. Reply: Has noted that we have an enormous number of committees. In that, we want to make sure that there is communication and coordination. He has pushed for a reserve policy in order to ensure that we are fiscally sound and consistent. Change should come through policy.

DH: Wants to pick up on the idea of relationships—how does he see his role in terms of helping all of us (3 colleges and the district office) work together? Reply: Number one would be transparency; that builds trust. He does not assume that is not happening here, but he believes that relationships work better when it is there. Also: efficiency—everyone should be able to be heard and get to an end-result. He has advocated—and had to push hard--for televising the board meetings. This is on the agenda of the next board meeting—a proposal for how to accomplish this and also a plan for how to archive these.

RF: Question about the efficiency of the DAC (given its size and the new DAC building). Reply: Yes, we are asking questions.

SB: Concern about the isolated decision-making taking place at the DAC. She has been faculty in this district for 15+ years and sees this as an increasing problem. Decisions being made are not being vetted; there is not collaboration. When our accreditation was seriously on the line a few years back, it was exactly because of the dysfunction of the DAC. Reply: He sees this again going back to that theme of trust and the value of transparency and communication. He expresses that he is listening and he hears what she’s saying.

PC: Piggy-backing on SB’s comment he brings up the WED not-for-credit classes and how the development of that—with no input from the stakeholders –decisions isolated at the chancellor level and his direct report—is actively harming our college and our industry partners. Reply: Yes, he hears this concern and shares it.

Board Trustee Gabriela Torres joins the group

LW: Clarifies for Trustee Torres’ benefit that the WED issue is particularly affecting our campus so they may not hear about this issue from the other two academic senates.

PC: Met last Friday with Dr. Alexandria Wright along with faculty from Diesel Mechanics re: Agricultural Mechanics. They expressed that they were perhaps 10 years out from rolling out such a program. Thereafter, Alexandra sent a message to Dr. Hoffmans announcing that she was rolling out an Ag Mech program because she had asked faculty for input and hadn’t received any feedback.

SB: Describes her experience developing Business student internships. The entire project floundered over the DAC being unable/unwilling to provide a straight and concrete answer re: the liability insurance for these students. The DAC was completely unresponsive until she finally got a VP from VC involved who cut through this roadblock. Reply from Trustee Chancer: encourages all senators to reach out to him personally. He cannot guarantee resolution of course, but he can at least ask the right questions and help overcome road blocks.

DH: One of the things that there is a difference in our perspective is about the roles of the college and the DAC. We think the DAC supports the colleges—or at least it should. They have a different perspective. She brings up the example of the IEPI and that the meetings were all set at a time when all of the CTE faculty would be out at a mandatory conference. They refused to reschedule. There was no option for a call-in, or Skype, until finally they pushed for it. When the report came back about what was said, 95% of it was what the people at the DAC (I.e. who had face-to-face time with the IEPI partners). Even through a process that is meant to help the organization, it is often set in such a way that it is exclusionary.

RF: Brings up the very architecture of the DAC and how everyone is kept out in the foyer and not even allowed back into the office. So different from when the office was here (I.e. in Ventura).

DB: There has been a time when—in the past—when faculty were instructed not to contact the Trustees. “They don’t represent you, they represent the community.” She appreciates the Trustees being here. Reply from Trustee Torres: Their constituents are the community, but that is the students and when the students are taught by faculty who are valued, they are teaching at their best. When morale is down and communication is broken down, students suffer.

**Discussion Items:**

1. **AP/BP 3721 Information Security Standard (Time certain @ 4:15-Grant): Informs senators re: this new AP/BP re: Information Security. He presented this to the Classified Senate this morning. They have requested (in line 4) a change to the “faculty and staff” to “district employees.”**

**Question about what is meant by “regular training” (in the last line). We need to be mindful that if this becomes a mandatory training, faculty need to be compensated. She makes clear that this question is as much for the benefit of our guest, Dr. Hoffmans, rather than a question she expects Grant to answer/solve. Reply: This is primarily re: anyone who deals with FERPA data. PM: Question about the language “in consultation” language and whether that is specifically pointing to the 10+1. This is briefly discussed. "Faculty, staff, and other district employees” is suggested as an alternative. Protocols of this new AP are reviewed. Any proposed changes from this body can be sent directly to Grant. Then it will go to the College Planning Council, and then to the BOT agenda.**

1. **Quick review of the Brown Act: LM reviews this with the senators.**
2. Guided Pathways update (Colleen): In the interest of time (it is 4:35), this update is not given.
3. SEA budget report (Lydia): By motion (PC) and second (RF) this is postponed until the next meeting. Unanimous vote.
4. Update re: New Faculty Experience/release (Lydia): This came up at our last meeting who were attending our last senate meeting and they expressed that the NFE was not meeting this semester. Lydia asked Dr. Hoffmans about this and she confirmed that the faculty facilitators are still getting their release time. Dr. Hoffmans is here and she tells the senators that she has asked Dan to please report back re: what the facilitators are doing this semester. This will be on our agenda for next time.
5. AB19 updates (CA College Promise) (Lydia) --Asks the senators if they have any questions. PM: Who oversees this? Reply: By Financial Aid and Damien’s office.
6. Impact of increase in COUN V02 offering: Lydia shows the senators (they have already received this ahead of time) what she received from Raeanne about this new offerings. She asks if there are any comments about this from Counseling. From GS: She did provide this information to the senate on 2/7 re: the expansion of these offerings. She clarifies that this is a joint offering of Counseling VO1/VO2. She clarifies re: what the offerings are—F2F, hybrid, online, and East Campus. Any of these Counseling courses can be applicable to Area E but the other classes (ex: Health) that have been raised as a concern, they can all be applied to other areas of the CSU GE. The purpose of these expanded Counseling offerings is to better serve our students; specifically, VO1 teaches how to prepare students for the new culture of college (since many come unprepared); VO2 guides students who are not sure what they want to study. Senators ask questions about scope and purpose of these classes. PC: His concern is that we have hired a good number of new counselors to the department. They were hired to help meet student needs. Now we have a situation where numerous counselors are being pulled back to teach, rather than meeting students. He would like to see this moved into a discipline. GS replies: Damien has committed to back-filling for counselors who are in the classroom. Also notable: many of the things that students would otherwise come into counseling to ask in appointments, they are able to do for themselves in these classes.

PC clarifies: He wants to see more the development of the skill set of successful students. GS: Yes, the intent of VO1 is to build the skills of successful students.

MB: Asks whether students have the option to choose 1 of these classes in order to qualify for priority registration. Reply: Yes, students have the choice of VO1/VO2.

1. Forum for Presidential Interviews: Senators will email LM their input for this.

V. Action Items

a. Minutes 2/21/19. Motion (PC) and second (RF) to approve. Discussion: PM wants minutes “corrected” to more fully convey her commentary at that meeting. Specifically, she *stated* at that meeting her belief that the senate was in violation of the Brown Act and one person in the room that day (MB) agreed with her. MB: “Minutes are a record of actions taken.” SB: To clarify: “Does that mean that the minutes do not have to capture all points of discussion?” Answer: “Yes.” PM insists that her allegations be added to the minutes anyway. Not clear what happened to the motion by PC. RF abruptly puts forth an amended motion to include this additional information in the 2/21 minutes; PM seconds this amended motion. Vote: 9 yes-1 no-3 abstain.

 Meeting adjourned at 5:01pm.