Academic Senate Meeting  
Thursday, February 16th, 2005 (1:30)  
Minutes

Present:
Members of the Executive Committee:  
Kathryn Schoenrock, Becky Hull, Luke Hall, Robert Porter

Members of the Council:
Nancy Mitchell, Mayo de la Rocha, Judy Garey, Peter Sezzi, Terry Morris, Lauri Moore, Paula Munoz, Donna Beatty, Ollie Powers, Maryann Carrasco Nungaray, David Oliver

Senator Emeritus:
Edith Conn

Guests:
Harry Korn, Mark Cryer, Aurora de la Selva

I. Meeting Called to Order at 1:30
II. Introductions
III. Mark Cryer, the new AFT Executive Director, was introduced by Harry Korn, our current AFT president. He asked if any Senators had questions and a discussion followed about various negotiation issues. He gave out his email: mcryer@aft1828.com if any faculty had follow up questions or concerns.

IV. Aurora de la Selva, the Matriculation Coordinator and a full-time counselor at VC introduced herself and presented some information about matriculation. She mentioned that ‘matriculation’—the provision of student services—is legally required. She passed out some handouts and went over issues related to matriculation.

V. Minutes approved for Jan 19th (with one abstention) and Feb 2nd meetings.
VI. President’s Report. DCAS Report. Kathryn Schoenrock gave a presentation about the District Council on Information Technology (DCIT). She noted that DCAS discussed whether or not the DCIT should be a participatory (shared) governance committee. A handout about this was passed out.

VII. President’s Report, continued. Kathryn Schoenrock passed out a handout regarding budget assumptions that Sue Johnson handed out at the DCAS meeting.

VIII. President’s Report, continued. President Schoenrock urged more faculty to attend CID meetings, as there were only two faculty at the last meeting. She went over some of the brainstorming that has happened regarding organizational restructuring. A discussion followed about this issue.

IX. President’s Report. Chancellor’s Consultation—Participatory Governance. Kathryn Schoenrock discussed the upcoming technical visit by the State Academic Senate (April 18, 2006). She highlighted some of the key issues that the Senate Exec thought were important and asked if anybody had
comments. She mentioned that she will meet with the other Academic Senate presidents and brainstorm about preparing for the technical visit. Finally, she asked that any senator forward questions or points she would like considered.

X. Marketing Task Force—Becky Hull overviewed some of the issues being discussed in this committee. She passed out two flyers that related to registration deadlines and marketing strategies. April 17th is the date that current students can register for BOTH summer and fall semesters. Discussion about this issue followed.

XI. Treasurer’s Report. Luke Hall reported that the date for the faculty recognition dinner is April 21st.

XII. A motion was made to table Action Items A and B on the agenda and passed unanimously.

XIII. Action Item: Role of DCSL. Kathryn Schoenrock highlighted that the group that is deciding the role of the DCSL is District Committee on Participatory Governance. A discussion followed about some alternatives for how DCSL would operate. A basic issue that came up is whether the campus should have complete autonomy over all over certain issues. A motion was made to conceptually accept one of the options for how DCSL should operate. A motion was made to vote on whether to accept option “C” as a concept for Kathryn to bring forward. The proposal to accept “C” option on how DCSL should operate is conceptual only; ie.—it will be brought back for a final vote once it has been discusses further. The vote was: 7 yes. 4 no. 2 abstentions. Option “C” passed and will be taken forward at the conceptual stage.

XIV. Proposal for Senate Sponsorship of Student in the “Ventura Promise” program. This issue was discussed as new business as well as whether the Academic Senate should get involved in graduation more. Peter Sezzi volunteered to talk with Octavio Sifuentes regarding a mixer for faculty before graduation. There was concern that not enough faculty are involved in the graduation. One question that was posed was: should the Senate be involved in the actual planning of the graduation?

XV. A motion was made to adjourn at 3:46. Approved unanimously.