**Ventura College Academic Senate**

**Agenda**

**Thursday, December 3rd, 2015**

**2:00-3:30pm**

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

I. Call to Order at 2:05pm

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Senator** | **Division Represented** | **Initials** | **Present** | **Absent** |
| Algiers, Kammy | Mathematics & Sciences | KA | X |  |
| *Michael Bowen for* Beatty, Donna | Mathematics & Sciences | *MB for* DB | X |  |
| Branca, Stephanie | Career & Technical Education | SB | X |  |
| Carrasco-Nungaray, Marian | Student Services | MCN | X |  |
| Coffey, Colleen M. | Senate Secretary | CMC | X |  |
| Dalton, Heidi | Career & Technical Education | HD | X |  |
| Forde, Richard | Career & Technical Education | RF | X |  |
| Ghenov, Natalia | ASVC  | NG |  | X |
| Hendricks, Bill | Social Sciences & Humanities | BH | X |  |
| Horigan, Andrea | Social Sciences & Humanities | AH | X  |  |
| Kim, Henny | English & Learning Resources | HK | X |  |
| Kolesnik, Alex | Senate President | AK | X |  |
| *Ty Gardner for* Cari Lange | Mathematics & Sciences | *TG for* CL |  |  |
| Martin, Amanda | English & Learning Resources | AM | X |  |
| Morris, Terry | Athletics, Kinesiology & Health | TM  | X |  |
| Mules, Ron | Social Sciences & Humanities | RM | X |  |
| Munoz, Paula | Student Services | PM | X |  |
| Sezzi, Peter H. | Senate Vice-President | PHS | X |  |

II. Public Comments

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 Alex Kolesnik/Peter H. Sezzi, 4667 Telegraph Road, Ventura CA, 93003.

Marcelino Di Cierdo is here to request that senators do not just rubber stamp the student equity plan. He provides his background working on this issue and informs senators re: his concern that this report does not go far enough; that evidence was largely anecdotal; he urges senators to talk to him about concerns and he is very glad to talk to them in more depth—he authored the last two equity reports.

Michael Bowen—reminds everyone re: Connie Baker’s retirement party.

III. Acknowledgement of Guests—Marcelino Di Cierdo.

IV. Action Items

1. Approval of minutes (11/19/15) – 3 minutes

Motion by PHS; 2nd by HD. Discussion: PM makes correction re: professional development discussion. TM & TG abstain, otherwise unanimous.

1. Equity Report (2nd Reading”) –

Motion by PM not to approve Equity Report. Motion fails for lack of a 2nd. Motion by TG to approve; 2nd by KA. Discussion: RM says he sees the plan as unorganized in terms of where $ is going. Trying to understand money values and why money is going where it is. And also, isn’t this going forward regardless of whether we approve it? The answer is yes, the BOT can still approve it. AK clarifies that he would make clear at the BOT meeting that he will not be signing off on this plan (if that is what occurs). TG asks a procedural question. If we vote to approve, can we make recommendations to the BOT asking questions or suggesting changes? Can we make an approval with a caveat? AK answers that we can direct him as to the content of his statement to the BOT. KA says regardless of whether we approve, issue is that faculty are not involved, only a small number have worked on it. If we want legitimacy, and we want faculty to value this and get involved, we do need to approve this. PM says that the caveat can go to the Equity Committee because they can still make changes. She says the BOT cannot make changes. The problem with Equity is that it did not go out to all the faculty for them to provide feedback and proposals. The problem is that the administration did not follow a good process; only a select few were invited to suggest proposals.

RM says when he was reading over this, this is a revolving document, still waiting for information, still studying. Does approving this mean that faculty can still give input? KA answers that we can still make modifications and slight adjustments to funds it is still ok. The interventions suggested by sub-committees, we can still make modifications. AK says to BOT on 12/8 and to the state on 12/18. RF says it looks like if we don’t approve it we (as faculty) have no say on how this money gets spent. KA says yes. AM asks what it looks like if faculty has more input? AK says we need greater interaction between categorical plans. BSI plan, 3SP, plan, etc. Moving forward we would like to have a faculty driven committee and have large faculty representation so that it is not just administration creating those plans and telling faculty to have involvement. CMC asks Marcelino if he can elaborate on his misgivings. He objects to this idea that if faculty don’t approve, then they have no voice. He points up that he was not consulted and he wrote the last two equity reports. He says you either agree with the data and the process used, or you do not. He says the last two reports were not attached to money, thus nobody participated. Now there is money and everyone is grabbing at it. AH says last night he looked at other college’s equity plans and they are very similar to this one. She says the basic structure and the target groups are the same, almost 60% going to staffing people. She looked at other plans across the state and they had even more money thrown toward staffing. RM says he sees this as interesting issue but if the categories are designed by the state we don’t have much control over it and if that’s the case, we pass the document, you call faculty to serve on the committee, and reallocate the money a bit as you go. He sees this as the heart of the senate’s concerns: where the money goes. We may not be able to change the categories but we can change how the money is allocated. PHS says we can’t change the populations served but we can change the interventions. What are we going to do with $800K? He says you can move things a little; but dramatic re-allocations cannot be made. We need to vote on the plan as it is in front of us. AK says that also in all this the evaluation of all these interventions is built into this.

Marcelino says he authored the first HSI grant on campus. We can’t move money around that way—the line items matter. PM says that the concern of student services is that if this is approved then the plan will stay the same. If this goes forward then it will stay as it is. PHS asks who’s on student equity: PM, AK, and KA. PM says there has been dissention on the committee. PM says that some voting was online, no discussion. There is no agreement between PM and KA and AK as to what occurred.

AH asks if the individual components were unanimously supported. KA answers that there was a majority for each thing that was in there. RM says we are voting on a document that the committee itself clearly doesn’t agree on. RM says his question is that they voted on pieces of the document—did they ever vote on the document in total? PM says no they did not. RM says this is the problem: even if they don’t have to, he wants to approve a document that the whole committee could agree on. TG replies that you might never get that. RM answers that this is the challenge of serving on a committee. He has no way to know how the votes break down. AK answers that in order for interventions to move forward a majority had to agree. KA reiterates that we need more faculty involvement; the money has everyone clamoring.

Equity 8-3-5 (Yes—WH, KA, TG, TM, AH, SB, AK, RF; No—MCN, PM, HD; Abstain—RM, HK, AM, PHS, CMC). Motion passes.

Motion to reorder agenda to item D (i.e. Approval of faculty to serve on VP hiring committees) next: Question from MCN as to why. AK answers that there is a board policy and he explains that policy to the senators. AK conferred with PHS and he recommended that he solicit volunteers by email, which he did. If there were more than 6 he would ask individuals to submit statements (they did and he has distributed those to senators). MCN wants the senate to follow-up and find out how can we allow HR to decide who serves on the committees? AK replies that one of the concerns might be about diversity. PHS says just like a faculty hiring committee we can send out top three, if you do not select that, please provide a written explanation as to why the top 3 were not chosen.

1. Proposed Senate By-Law Changes (1st Reading) – Motion by PHS, 2nd by RF.

Discussion: KA asks about when divisions vote on members. Asks if we can specify? AK says the plan campus-wide is to set committee hires in the spring. KA asks if we should have this specified. Senators discuss setting forth a “prior to the last day of finals during the spring semester” date for choosing membership. This will be under section 2(b) in article 1.

Added duties (page 95) to the office of the Vice President: to collect all senate dues and to deposit funds as necessary. This was previously assigned to a treasurer but we have not had a treasurer in some time. AH says that if we move these two treasurer duties to the office of the VP, then the VP has to do all of the treasurer duties. RM asks for clarification: if the VP is going to take over the treasurer’s duties, then at least once per year we need a budget report, foundation report, etc. PHS says that we had a good balance carried forward of general funds and this was deposited with the foundation. PHS says it was never brought to the senate because we have a couple hundred bucks for supplies (i.e. awards), and a travel fund of a couple thousand for the president to attend the plenary. AK says last year there was money left over so he went to the faculty leadership institute run by the state academic senate. Senators want an annual budget report. PHS says previously there was no interest in hearing this level of detail and the dollars are so little but if senators want to hear this information, he can bring it forward and this will be part of proposed change to vice president’s duties.

Last change: instead of having a treasurer as a member of the senate executive committee, to have the curriculum co-chair. Senators are not sure about this because senate exec is elected and committee co-chair is not. CMC asks what the value in having the co-curriculum chair on the senate executive. PM seconds this. AK answers that there is a much closer marriage between curriculum co-chair; other colleges do this. MB says that there are a lot of academic senates that do this. At this campus the Curriculum Committee is totally independent of the senate even though it is a sub-committee. Also, the CC co-chair is elected just not by the senate or by faculty at large. CMC voices her concern that we are mixing apples and oranges here.

AH ask if curriculum co chair can just be added as a voting member on senate. PHS takes a straw poll on this. Should the curriculum co-chair attend senate meetings? Senators concur. Should that person be allowed to vote? Senators concur. Can that person also serve as a division representative? Senators say no to this idea. Senators discuss the composition of the executive and release time associated with various positions. KA says she hears that people want more people on exec. Problem is that no one has even put their name down to be treasurer in at least the last 4 election cycles. Senators do not want curriculum co-chair on the executive. AH says there were changes in the spring that were not addressed/made.

KA asks if the Curriculum Co-Chair should go under 2B? PHS says we’ll probably have to create a new article. He is capturing all the comments on this and he’ll bring back a revised version for a 2nd reading. Senators discuss further changes. PM brings up professional Development. She has sent this to senators. Senators agree unanimously. And this should be separate from travel fund pool (and quit calling it professional development). More discussion of changes and PHS captures these in his hard copy notes. RM Motions to add the amendments discussed and for the document to be reexamined in Jan. RF seconds. Unanimous.

1. Approval of faculty to serve on VP hiring committees (2)—5 minutes

VP Student Development: Munoz, Carasco Nungarary, Jones, Wendt, Gardner, Kolesnik

VP Academic Affairs: Forde, De Clerck, Kim, Sloan Graham, Moskowitz, Gardner. In vote order: Forde, Kim, 3-way tie for third between Sloan Graham, Moskowitz, Gardner. Senators need to break tie: they do. Sloan Graham will be third.

1. Resolution re: college hour—Time ran out.
2. Resolution re: teaching and learning center—Time ran out.

V. Study Session – Instructional Calendar—Time ran out.

VI. Consent Items – None

VII. President’s Report—Time ran out.

VIII. Senate Subcommittees/Task Forces/Work Groups Reports

1. Enrollment Management Work Group Report—Time ran out.

IX. Campus Committees Reports –Time ran out.

X. Announcements for the Good of the Order –Time ran out.

XI. Requests for Future Agenda Items –Time ran out.

XII. Adjournment  at 3:40pm

\* \* \*

Academic Senate means an organization whose primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters.

Academic and Professional matters means the following policy development matters:

1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites.
2. Degree and certificate requirements.

3. Grading policies.

4. Educational program development.

5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success.

6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles.

7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes.

8. Policies for faculty professional development activities.

9. Processes for program review.

10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development.

11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon.