Ventura College Academic Senate

Agenda

Thursday, February 15th, 2018

3:30-5:00pm

Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) – 312

I. Call to Order at 3:30pm. 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)

Malia Rose-Seisa (MRS)

Hugh O'Neill (HO'N)--absent

Cari Lange (CL)

Erin Brocker (EB)

Division: English, Math & Learning Resources

Gabe Arquilevich (GA)--Kelly Peinado is here for Gabe

Chris Frederick (CF)

Jaclyn Walker (JW)--Eric Martinsen is here for Jaclyn Donna Beatty (DB)--absent **Division: Career Education** Roxanne Forde (RF) 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 Council** Lydia Morales (President) (LM) 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.

SB: In light of another school shooting (yesterday), expresses concern about VCCCD's unpreparedness for safety/disaster/public information gaps. Admin should prioritize safety on our campus. Senators concur.

Robert Rodriguez: He is a returning student. Has noticed a huge difference in curriculum at VC since he has returned. Finds himself unchallenged in this current system. He believes Guided Pathways would be counter-productive to the purposes of preparation and transfer.

KA: Speaking on behalf of herself and several other Biology faculty who teach in Canvas and want to be able to roll separate lab sections into one course shell (by way of explanation: students enroll through their labs but are all in one lecture). Emphasizes that this is a 10+1 issue and she would like the senate to take this up. **This needs to be put on a future agenda.**

AH: (Further comment on the problem raised by KA): State Chancellor has approved a charter for a district distance ed committee. This is the perfect venue to address this kind of issue district-wide.

III. Acknowledgement of Guests: Robert Rodriguez (student)

IV. Informational Items

- a. AFT Update (Peter Sezzi, Chief Negotiator) (5 min.): Peter is not here today.
- b. OER presentation (Gwendolyn Lewis-Huddleston) (10 mins): Gwendolyn is out sick and cannot be here today.
- c. Rolling two-year schedule: To guarantee that students will have access to the classes they need. Chancellor wants to be sure that we are moving forward on this in all departments on all campuses. Senators briefly discuss the pros/cons of this kind of template. Question raised about whether students who enrolled (for example) a year in advance would also then have to pay in advance? This would need to be addressed. Also, the Equity Committee should

be part of this developing/on-going conversation/committee. Enrolling far in advance could favor students who are able to pay up front over those who are not.

d. Update on Faculty Representation on SSC: AH volunteered from her division. Ralph Fernandez will represent CTE. Recruitment is continuing.

V. Action Items

- a. Approval minutes (2/1/2018)--Motion to approve KA; 2^{nd} by AH. Discussion: none. Vote: 3 abstain, all others in favor.
- b. Guided Pathways: Motion to not approve by PM; 2nd by RF. Senators share their various discussions with their constituents. There does not appear to be consensus on this issue in any division. Some faculty see the potential of this model more positively, while others still have many misgivings. Specific concerns raised: that senators should be speaking to constituents not about the money (CA Promise) but about the meaning of this for our institution and our students; will it be easy or difficult for students to deviate from their "chosen" pathway?; that the state would send VC the money and our administration would take it and spend it how they wish without inviting the faculty authentically involved into the planning process; that this new model is destroying the very mission and intent of the CA CC system; this new model is taking away student choices and student autonomy; concern about the governor's proposed budget which moves funding away from FTES and to "student success" and graduation rates instead. On the other hand: we are signing up for only a year to explore this—we can opt out at the end of the exploration year and not have to give the funding back.

Another suggestion: if we go forward, an important component would be a written commitment from the administration that each program would be allowed to run the full complement of their classes (in their two-year rotation) without regard to enrollment. We cannot allow our "electives," to be sidelined/archived (we are a community college after all, not a voc-ed school). Further concern raised about the "Starfish" early-alert/e-advising software that some campuses have/are adopting—this is owned/operated by Achieving the Dream. Senators briefly discuss this.

Discussion turns to Monday's GP forum. One faculty spoke at their table re: "Don't we already have GP?"--aren't our ADTs GPs? Kim Hoffmans replied that yes, those are pathways, but students are confused by how to complete them. This suggests that perhaps we don't need GP so much as we need to better communicate with our students. Isn't part of the problem that we keep cancelling classes that students need and then they can't graduate? How is this big initiative different from what we already have? Another senator adds that they were at the table with President Keebler. He agreed that we do have many pathways already and there would be more added and with an umbrella structure over the top. For financial aid purposes, students already have to declare a major (i.e. we are already asking them to pick a pathway).

One senator offers a clarification: the definition of "pathway"--it's not the transfer degree. It's a cluster of degrees put together and then as faculty we would decide what the preferred GEs that students in these majors would take. Part of what it would open-up might be: here's a Social Science pathway and they could teach English sections themed by Social Sciences (ex: instead of teaching MLA formats, they might teach APA instead and it's themed to topics in the Social Sciences). Math could create statistics classes that have problems focused on Social Sciences instead of just generic statistical problems. Believes that there is the potential for value added here too. This might also be a chance to build a cohort model into the college. Another suggests that this an opportunity to get the faculty more involved in student advising to better inform students about the sequencing of classes, which classes complement one another, etc.

Another senator expresses the concern that this is corporate influence on the state chancellor's office, and on our local district. As far as the CA Promise, we have our own already, and there is financial aid. We don't want to go back to a system whereby classes were designated as "tier one," "tier two," etc.

Another concern: In the grouping of these courses and tapping into particular GE classes at the expense of others, we might lose the ancillary courses (ex: Chicano studies, African studies, etc.) that are part and parcel of a well-rounded GE/Liberal Arts education, as well as remedial courses that remain vital to many, many students. We already have the tools to guide students, we don't need this.

Discussion turns to the "Teaching Men of Color" event last Friday--the emphasis on communicating consciously with our students, that is really important. Some senators express skepticism that GP would really "move the needle" on that issue at all. This appears to many faculty to be primarily about getting state money & getting our numbers up. While many agree with *aspects* of the GP model, it is the whole package that starts to raise the questions and concerns. Senators note that 3SP and Equity, etc., already exist and our college/district is not deploying these monies as effectively as they could/should be.

Vote on motion to not support Guided Pathways: 4-12-2.

Motion to accept a one-year exploration of Guided Pathways by KA; 2nd by LW. Senators discuss the pros/cons of an initial one-year-only commitment to this. Amendment suggested by EM: College administration must remain true to their promise of an unprecedented level of collaboration around this process; 2) Immediately appoint additional teaching faculty to the lead team (i.e. team should be made-up primarily of faculty). Amendment accepted.

LM offers this clarification: What we are voting on today is signing off on the self-assessment. In order to get funding, we also have to do the plan which is due at the end of March. Even if we approve of this (a one-year exploration) today, she still must sign again at the end of March in order to receive the funds. If the faculty leadership in this process is not respected by the administration, the senate will not sign off on this again. Vote: 14-2-0.

LM: Only reason that faculty had not been invited to the lead team, was because we had not signed off on this. Now that faculty has agreed, she will send out the call for more faculty involvement. Senators remark that the lead team should've had more teaching faculty on it from the start.

Motion to table rest of agenda by PM; 2nd by RF. Vote: unanimous.

Adjournment at 4:50pm.

c. AP/BP 7211(2nd Reading)

VI. Discussion Items

- a. AP 4100: Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates
- b. Compressed Calendar

VII. President's Report

VIII. Senate Subcommittees/Task Forces/Work Groups Reports

- a. BRC (Stephanie)
- b. DE (Colleen)
- c. SSC (Philip)
- d. Curriculum Committee updates (5 mins)
- IX. Announcements for the Good of the Order
- X. Requests for Future Agenda Items
- XI. Adjournment