|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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. | **Ventura College Academic Senate**    **Lydia Morales ( *President*) Dan Clark (*Vice* *President*)**  Email: [lmatthews@vcccd.edu](about:blank) Email: [dclark@vcccd.edu](about:blank)  Phone:805 289 6296 Phone: 805 289 6368  **Colleen Coffey (*Secretary*) Andrea Horigan (*Treasurer*)**  Email: [ccoffey@vcccd.edu](about:blank) Email: [ahorigan@vcccd.edu](about:blank)  Phone: (805) 289**-6194** Phone: (805) 289-6196 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **Ventura College Academic Senate**  **Minutes**  **Thursday, December 5th, 2019**  **3:30-5:00**  **Multidiscipline Center West (MCW – 312)**   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **VENTURA COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERS** | | | | | | | **Constituency** | **Representative** | **Attended** | **Constituency** | **Representative** | **Attended** | | PRESIDENT | Lydia Morales (Acting) | **X** | SECRETARY | Colleen Coffey | **Absent** | | VICE PRESIDENT | Dan Clark (Acting) | **X** | TREASURER | Andrea Horigan | **X** | | CURRICULUM REP | Michael Bowen | **X** |  |  |  | | MATH & ENGLISH  (4 FACULTY REPS) | (NAME) |  | STUDENT SERVICES  (4 FACULTY REPS) | (NAME) |  | | Jaclyn Walker | **X** | Paula Munoz | **X** | | Chris Frederick | **X** | Gema Espinoza Sanchez | **X** | | Gabe Arquilevich | **X** | Yia Vang | **X** | | HEALTH, KINESIOLOGY, ATHLETICS, & PERFORMING ARTS  (3 FACULTY REPS) | Nathan Cole | **X** | BEHAVIORAL & SOC. SCI, LEARNING RESOURCES  (3 FACULTY REPS) | Ron Mules | **X** | | Mary McDonough | **?** | Michael Ward | **X** | | Bill Hendricks | **X** |  |  | | (NAME) |  | | SCIENCE  (3 FACULTY REPS) | Erin Brocker | **X** | CAREER EDUCATION II  (1 FACULTY REPS) | (NAME) |  | | Cari Lange/Marta De Jesus | **X** | | Preston Pipal |  | | CAREER EDUCATION I  (3 FACULTY REPS) | Rachel Johnson | **X** | SELF-NOMINATED AT-LARGE PART-TIME FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE | Greg Cooper | **X** | | Lazaro Salinas | **X** | | Deanna Hall | **X** | | | | |
| **Agenda Item** | **Discussion Notes** | **Action?** |
| 1. Call to Order |  |  |
| 1. Public Comments |  |  |
| 1. Acknowledgement of Guests: | Rhonda Mohr, Kim Hoffmans, Damien Pena, Jennifer Kalfsbeek, Lisa Putnam, Lauri Moore, Lucy Capuano, Tania De Clerck, Joe Selzler, Sumita Lall, |  |
| 1. Action Items:    1. Approval of 11/21/19 minutes    2. Guided Pathways SOAA    3. New Senate VP    4. New GP leadership team member | 1. Motion to approve by PM; 2nd by MW. Discussion: Add Chloe Branciforte as a guest and to note that LM asked her to write up her points on effects of new proposed FTEF model on small programs. Unanimous with above changes and with two abstentions. 2. Will be brought back in January 3. Motion to approve Preston as New Senate VP by PM 2nd by BH Discussion: None. Unanimous 4. Hope to have a name by Thursday for new GP leadership team member |  |
| 1. Informational Items: 2. Welcome New Senate President 3. AFT Update (Michael Ward) 4. Faculty Staffing Priorities   Committee rankings   1. New Dual Enrollment Agricultural (Dorothy Farias) 2. Protocol for responding to ICE | 1. Thank you Dan Clark will replace Lydia Morales as Academic Senate President per senate By Laws 2. Motion to move the remaining informational items to the end of the agenda by AH 2nd by PM Discussion: None. Unanimous 3. AFT update – Moved to January meeting 4. Attached are the rankings submitted to Kim on 11/25. Moved to January meeting 5. Moved to January meeting 6. Moved to January meeting |  |
| 1. Discussion Items: 2. Equity Plan (State Vice-Chancellor Rhonda Mohr)-time certain at 3:45pm. 3. DRAFT Ventura College SEA Annual Report (Damien Pena) 4. Program Viability | The discussion began with Academic Senate president, Lydia Morales welcoming VC Rhonda Mohr and thanking her for coming on such short notice. ASP Morales acknowledged everyone in the room: senate council members, Additional faculty, Administrators, one student and trustee Chancer. She then referred to the timeline that was handed out which outlined how we got to this point with the equity plan and added that this wasn’t the first time for Ventura College. The Academic Senate was also the 114th college to sign off on Guided Pathways in 2016/2017. We had challenges with how the Integrated Plan was developed and most recently with the new proposed FTEF model. These are all a result of a systematic issue with campus-wide plans and initiatives that have skirted the participatory governance process. The senate’s fear is that top-down initiatives masked as participatory governance are becoming a new normal. Our hope was to get answers to our clarifying questions about the state’s intentions and process with respect to colleges’ equity plans, in the presence of our college’s administrators, that will help us all move forward on the same page.    ASP Morales invited VC Mohr to give us an overview and history of the SEA funds. VC Mohr explained thatlegislation passed in 2012 was codified so that all students’ services were then available for all students.  AY 14-15 Matriculation was funded (Student success), AY 15-16 SSSP funding reached $285 million (matriculation), based on number of counseling sessions, ED plans, referrals, etc. Student Equity funding was $140 million and the 3rd program: Basic Skills Initiative $55 million. In AY 18-19 these three programs were combined into the Student Equity and Achievement Program (SEAP) which now has $475 million based on the same funding formula and this stayed the same for AY 19-20. The Chancellor wants to keep stability in funding formula for SEAP, especially since the Student Success Funding Formula is underway, with lots of changes. Colleges were last required to submit an Equity Plan in 2016. We learned that VC senate did not sign off on that either, but the Chancellor’s office didn’t notice since they didn’t have the capacity to check. The SEAP funds are tied to a signed Equity Plan. She also informed faculty that each college/district was required to submit local goals that maps to the vision for success.    **Questions/answers**    Q1.     Perhaps you can start by explaining what does the signature of the academic senate president on the Equity plan indicate? Why did the State Chancellors Office include this?   State academic senate insisted the Chancellors Office make the signature a requirement to ensure that faculty would be involved in the process.  Our response -That didn’t happen at Ventura College.   Q2.     Our BOT approved a plan (that academic senate did not sign off on), that was different than the plan that was entered into NOVA, that was also different from the plan that we were given on 6/11 to be widely shared with our senates.  Bottom line: we have a BOT approved document that does not match what the state was sent and that no campus committee has signed off on.  How do we reconcile this? Does the state have a mechanism to prevent this disparity, or to identify when it has occurred?  The chancellor’s office does not have a mechanism for checking this and VC Mohr, expressed surprise that the Board of Trustees approved the plan without the senate’s approval. She appeared to imply that the Governance process and the BOT should be the mechanism for checking. She also said that the plan was a living document that our college should be revisiting, discussing and fine tuning on an ongoing basis.   This prompted one of the senators to ask the trustee why the BOT approved the plan without the senate’s signature.   Vice President of Student Services, Damien Pena, responded that the version shared with the BOT was what he shared with me via email. But he took no steps to make the corresponding revisions between June when it was submitted in NOVA and September when the revised plan was presented to the board. This, of course, meant that none of the changes made to the plan after it was submitted in June were ever recorded in NOVA, so the plan that the BOT approved was not what the state saw.  Q3.     When did all local districts get the instructions on completing the Equity Plan?  How have you seen other districts meet this timeline?  (As you can see from our timeline, the VC process did not get under way until April 17th.) When was the complete data available to all the colleges?   The chancellor’s office had a word document about equity plan in September 2018 and they sent instructions out in the fall. They offered webinars and held meetings in Fresno which were mostly nuts and bolts on how to complete the form; but would have been helpful in planning activities. VP Pena attended with Brenda Griego, a Senior Accounting Technician at Ventura. Although when VC Mohr asked who she was, he responded that she was a budget manager.  Faculty asked how many people went from each district. VC Mohr explained that there was no limit of how many could attend and added that she thought there were about 50% faculty in attendance. VP Pena waited until March to start a conversation about information relevant to the Equity plan that was learned at the Student Equity and Achievement (SEA) Program Training. The task force was not formed from the Student Success committee but instead with a seemingly random group that included only one faculty. Then he repeatedly postponed the initial meeting and we didn’t meet for the first meet until April 17th.  This gave faculty the impression that perhaps with better leadership there would have been time to get the plan through the governance process like the other 113 colleges. VP Pena interjected that the first template was available on January 11th and first draft of data wasn’t available until April 2nd. VC Mohr added that it was disappointing that the first time VC met about the new equity plan was April, but she guessed that it was common across other colleges. She also reminded us that the Equity Plan should have been a living document that our college is continuously updating/adjusting throughout the school year.     Q4.     How have you seen other colleges use their SEA funding?  What did they spend this on?  Are there any guidelines or restrictions on how SEA funds can be spent?  Who is overseeing the appropriate use of these funds (at the state level) --who is making sure the plan matches the appropriate use of resources for the SEA funding?  VC Mohr responded that she has seen the SEA program funds used in a variety of ways including to make up the FTES difference in non-credit concurrent classes. Some colleges are using it to go heavy on guided pathways. Since the original $150 million over 5 years is not adequate funding for most colleges, some used SEA to support guided pathways. Some colleges are doing student services redesign--such as case management design. Or other SS redesign/release time for faculty to get on committees. Some colleges had siloes SS deans who chopped up the funds. She offered that the best way to spend money is focusing on student success practices that reduce the inequity of achievement**.**    Q5.     We understand that we now have 3 more months to sign off on the plan.  What happens if VC does not meet this (extended) deadline? It is the position of the academic senate executive team that this whole process needs to begin again.  Based on these timelines, that is not realistic to occur within 90 days.    VC Mohr responded that if we think we’ll need more time, we should let her know right away. And added that if we waited until March 31st and came to her saying that we are at an impasse and we just can’t get it done, she would have to consult with Chancellor Oakley and Deputy Chancellor Dr. Daisy Gonzales. Her guess is that they would withhold the funds at that time. When asked if somehow we managed to get the plan approved through the governance process if we still need to get it through the board of trustees, she said that she would recommend that because it is a best practice. VC Mohr also assured us that we can resubmit changes through NOVA. The first opportunity to stop our apportionment would be January. But the CO has made a commitment not to do that. The Annual Chancellor’s Office Report due to legislature in April 2020.This inspired VC Mohr’s extended deadline of March 31st that was given to Ventura College.   Note: For us to meet that March 31st extended deadline the completed plan would need to go to the BOT on March 10th which means it needs to be turned into the district office by February 26th and have a first reading at academic senate on February 2nd and second reading on February 20th. It seems highly unlikely that we would meet that deadline.    Q6.     Ed code does not specify who should sign the plan before the board of trustee’s approval. Why does the CCCCO have the signatures as they do? Can we get the loss of funding threat in writing--or request a legal opinion about this?   VC Mohr responded that they have engaged in conversations with their legal department about this and they believe that they most likely can withhold the funds and agreed to send us a definite legal opinion on that.  Q7.     Do you know if other schools have had issues with faculty voice not being heard, and just being done by student services?    VC Mohr responded that there are a wide range of practices across the 114 colleges. But there is no requirement for the funds to be used exclusively for student services. They expect that some of the funds will be used to help support adjustments needed for AB 705 and the expect the participatory governance process is used  Q8.     Our administration created an Equity Plan taskforce which consisted mostly of administrators and had only one faculty (the Academic Senate President) to write the Equity plan/document. We already have a standing Student Success Committee that is a participatory governance committee and includes representation of faculty, staff and students. What is the recommendation of the States Chancellor’s Office for practices that ensured that SEA plans were developed with effective participation of constituents from across the institution?       VC Mohr asked questions about who served on our Student Success Committee and added that she read that there were 9 faculty. A discussion ensued. Someone expressed concerns about how well that committee functions. One faculty shared that she has been on student success committee since it was formed in 2015, and the appointed faculty on the committee are not being listened to. In the past, administrators have overlooked the work of the committee through an RFP process and funded other initiatives, or their own ideas. ASP Morales added student success committee has gotten worse, the RFP process is gone and the committee was actually disbanded or rumored to have been disbanded by VP Pina, leading to faculty confusion about serving. VC Mohr expressed that RFP boutique projects supporting a limited number of students will not get the results the state needs, and added that this is a vanilla plan--with lots of flexibility.  ASP Morales followed up with “if there is a lot of flexibility, does this mean there’s very little accountability?” to which VC Mohr responded “Yes”. But CO can send technical assistants to work with local schools.” We interpret that to mean that the accountability needs to come through the participatory process and the BOT ensuring that the process was followed.      Q9.     It’s outlined in EC 78220 Student equity plans shall be developed with the active involvement of all groups on campus as required by law, including, but not limited to, the academic senate, academic faculty and staff, student services, and students, and with the involvement of appropriate people from the community. What is the recommendation of the States Chancellor’s Office on who should be reviewing the SEA budget to ensure that it aligns with the goals and objectives set forth in the SEA plan?  VC Mohr thought that the SEA budget should be included in the SEA planning process.    Trustee Chancer added that he thought it was a good practice to share budgets and whatever information is requested at a committee.    Q10.   I know there is no specific law, but is there anything specifically saying the academic senate must sign off on the equity plan?   In the fall instructions, there was the instruction of requiring academic senate signature.    Q11. Trustee Chancer was asked again why the board signed when there was no senate signature.    He responded that as part of participatory governance process, a signature from academic senate was required. This was a red flag for me, and that was the main reason I voted not to approve the plan.  We ran out of time. At 5:00 ASP Morales asked VC Mohr if she could email the questions that she didn’t get to. VC Mohr replied that she would be happy to respond to any additional questions. We thanked her for her time and for responding to our questions.   1. DRAFT Ventura College SEA Annual Report (Damien Pena) Moved to January meeting 2. Program Viability   Moved to January meeting |  |
| 1. President’s Report: |  |  |
| 1. Senate Subcommittees/Task Forces/Work Groups Reports:    1. Curriculum Committee (Michael)    2. Guided Pathways    3. CTE liaison report (Deanna Hall)    4. Treasurer’s Report (Andrea)    5. OER Report(Andrea)    6. DE (Dan)    7. Faculty PD Committee (Colleen) |  |  |
| Announcements for the Good of the Order:   1. Upcoming ASCCC Events:  * **OERI Early Childhood Education Summit December 13th 10:00am - December 14th 2:00pm** * **2020 Part-Time Faculty Institute January 24-25, 2020 – Pre-session January 23: 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm**   Details can be found at [https://asccc.org/calendar/list/events](about:blank) |  |  |
| 1. Requests for Future Agenda Items: |  |  |
| 1. Adjournment |  |  |