Ventura College Academic Senate Minutes Thursday, November 2th, 2017 3:30-5:00pm Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) – 312

I. Call to Order at 3:36pm. The following senators were present:

Division: Visual Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences and Languages

Andrea Horigan (AH)

Bill Hendricks (BH)--absent

Division: Health, Kinesiology, Athletics and Performing Arts

Brent Wilson (BW)

Terry Morris (TM)--absent

Division: Sciences

Kammy Algiers (KA)--absent

Malia Rose-Seisa (MRS)--absent

Cari Lange (CL)

Erin Brocker (EB)

Division: English, Math & Learning Resources

Gabe Arquilevich (GA)

Chris Frederick (CF)

Jaclyn Walker (JW)

Donna Beatty (DB)--absent

Division: Career Education

Joanna Capazzi (JC)

Laura Woyach (LW)

Heidi Dalton (HD)--absent

Deanna Hall (DH)--absent

Division: Student Services

Paula Munoz (PM)

Angelica Gonzales (AG)

Curriculum Committee Liaison

Michael Bowen (MB)

Senate Executive Team

Lydia Morales (President) (LM)--*at plenary* Philip Clinton (Vice-President) (PC) Colleen Coffey (Secretary) (CC) Stephanie Branca (Treasurer) (SB)

II. Public Comments (3 mins)

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 Lydia Morales/Philip Clinton, 4667 Telegraph Road, Ventura CA, 93003.

AH: We need to rethink the dissemination of announcements. No one will search for announcements (i.e. Canvas page) and some faculty do not use Canvas at all. We need to explore other options. CF: Now you're getting an email to go look at Canvas; might as well get an email with the announcement. **Senators would like to be a future agenda item. Someone needs to address how we communicate campus-wide.**

III. Acknowledgement of Guests: none.

Motion by PM to reorder the agenda; 2nd by Cari. This will move approval of minutes to now. Vote: unanimous.

a. Approval minutes (10/5/2017) & (10/19/2017) (2 min.)--Motion to approve as to both sets by AG; second by MB. Discussion: correction made to 10/19 minutes. Approved with two abstentions.

IV. President's Report: LM is at plenary. PC makes the suggestion that perhaps going forward the President's report be included as a written document to senators (i.e. in the senate package) so that this item will take up less time in meetings and so senators can better prepare questions about it. Senators like this idea very much.

V. Informational Items

a. AFT Update (Peter Sezzi, Chief Negotiator) (5 min.): PHS cannot be here today so PM gives a report instead.

b. Response to budget questions raised at October 5th meeting. (Stephanie Branca, Treasurer) (5 min.): SB replies re: questions previously raised. About \$5K does it have to be spent on Great Teachers'

Seminar. The reply was "yes" but she has not yet found out "why." Stay tuned. Another question about travel pool funds—she needs clarification re: what specifically the senators want to see. Reply: how much was unfunded by travel pool? Number of requests and dollar amounts? And number of requests and dollar amounts fulfilled? Stay tuned—she will circle back on this.

c. Report out re: new initiatives in the Department Chair council (Philip) (5 min.)--PC: Last meeting this group received a presentation from Tim Harrison re: dual enrollment. PC spoke out against this in that meeting. He said (in that meeting) that we (faculty) should not entertain any new initiatives until we get a contract. Response he got was overwhelmingly positive (from chairs). AH: Is this something we want to take a stand on? PC clarifies that he brought this up as a department chair (not in his senate capacity). AH would like to see senate take a position on refuting any new initiatives until we have a contract. Further discussion: GA is in favor of this but what if the initiative is in students' favor? What is the dark side of doing something like this? How can we word it to parry the allegation that the teachers are against something that is for students? AH: Students are already being hurt. "Impacts faculty workload to the point that it interferes with student success" is language being entertained. PC suggests adding the word "fair" before "contract." This will go on next agenda as an action item.

d. Draft ACCJC accreditation response to our fall 2016 compliance recommendation for Standard III.A.6--PC reviews this with the senators. Addressing our accreditation response focusing on SLOs. Kim will be coming to the next meeting to discuss this. Senators questioning whether this is being dropped by ACCJC? PC clarifies that this is not the issue of tying SLOs/SUOs to evaluation; this is about our response and the division of responsibilities. Kim can/will hopefully clarify this further.

V. Action Items

b. District Strategic Goals and Objective (3 min.)--PC reviews these with senators (blue indicates what has been added). AG asks if these (blue items) were based on feedback or ?? PM Is asking what they're looking for? Input? Our blessing? PM when you look at who's accountable, it is all administrators. Looking at that we could turn this around at a BOT meeting because there is no accountability. They are not doing a lot of this -it's just lip service. AH: In their additions they did not designate responsible parties. AG: Where is the line about "not cancelling and making available classes that students need." Where is that on here? SB: re: increase DE course offerings to "meet demand" and yet we don't have too much demand; we have too little. Overall, far too little attention given to college marketing. MB: Going back to the first item. A lot of that has an impact on the CC (faculty that have to rewrite CORs). Some of the requests coming through the CC are faculty-generated and others seem to be coming from management. They (the CC) have trouble distinguishing between the two. CL: With DE it seems like they are looking for a way to institutionalize fewer classes, higher caps. All of this is against what we're trying to negotiate. She would like to see us either vote this down or at least abstain. PC: Point of order. AG Motion to approve. 2nd by GA. Discussion: AH would like to amend the motion to say that we are sending this back asking for clarification as to where this information came from. She wants to know how this was put together, who was a part of it and what was the timeline for it? Further discussion of this proposed amendment. CL suggests adding "to clarify who the responsible parties are?" PM: Why are we just not rejecting this? We want to see sources (data) on this. MB: Additional item of clarification. Does expansion of DE mean more (new) sections or fewer F2F? CMC asks for clarification re: what the motion is. Reply: it is a motion to approve. The discussion surrounding AH's proposed amendment is really the justification for why this is not being approved. Vote: none in favor; all opposed; no abstentions. Report will go back to district with these comments as to what senators want to see/why this was not approved.

c. Campus Accommodation of Reservists Military Students' Service Obligations (5 min.) d. Integrated Student Success Plan (2nd reading) (5 min.)--Motion by JW; 2nd by AH. Discussion: we would make accommodations within reason. These will have to be course specific. AG: Not sure if this should go in an AP (i.e. procedure)--in the AP you can put in that instructors will work with students but there can be limitations based on the class. It is not 100% a given but we have a procedure. The concerns of the senate should be communicated back to DTRWSS (they are taking this up). Motion is to move forward and pursue our own policy. 2 abstentions; all else in favor.

d. Integrated Student Success Plan: CMC attended SSC meeting. Damien asked about the senate's position on this. She informed him that the senate had not approved it and why. He acknowledged this and then the meeting moved on. CMC: it would appear that SSC is completely unconcerned with our views on this plan. AH: Motion to reject the Integrated Plan and that the senate president if directed not to sign; 2nd by LW. Vote: unanimous with one abstention.

VI. Discussion Items

a. Revised Resolution Re: Productivity and Course Archiving/Deletion (10 min.): PC reviews the background on this issue with the senators. Puts the revised resolution on the screen for senators to further discuss. Senators discuss this further. **One revision: this needs to have the "whereas" paragraphs added so that we have the justification.** Open question as to whether this is one resolution or two/three. Senate executive council will take this discussion and rework this resolution(s).

VIII. Senate Subcommittees/Task Forces/Work Groups Reports

a. Curriculum Committee updates (5 min)--MB updates senate re: CC and asks them to read his last update (sent to LM).

IX. Campus Committees Reports –AH updates senators re: SLO Committee. MB says that some of the SLO changes/revisions are already arriving at CC (this was supposed to occur in spring). SB reports out re: BRC: Two items: likely budget shortfall –BRC began a discussion on this and specifically about how to fill this shortfall. Some suggestions: non-credit courses; money from sale of fire house building. Could this money(ies) be allocated to colleges instead of going to district coffers? Bookstore is experiencing a shortfall b/c of push for OER. CL: asks if there was any discussion about going back to an in-house bookstore? Reply: no. Last, Pirates Walk area is going forward finally. Senators discuss the cost of this project and the source of these monies. Discussion drifts to the poor quality of HVAC campus-wide. CMC shares from FOG meeting last week. Significant money initially set aside for LRC HVAC upgrades (because it was not enough to accomplish that purpose) was put towards the Pirates' Walk instead. Senators further discuss this briefly.

X. Announcements for the Good of the Order –None.

XI. Requests for Future Agenda Items –Please send these to LM.

XII. Adjournment: PM motion to adjourn at 4:48pm. AH 2nds. Unanimous.