

**Ventura College Academic Senate
Minutes
Thursday, September 3rd, 2015
2:00-3:30pm
Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) - 312**

I. Call to order 2:02pm. The following senators were present:

Senator	Division Represented	Initials	Present	Absent
Algiers, Kammy	Mathematics & Sciences	KA	X	
Beatty, Donna	Mathematics & Sciences	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	
Hendricks, Bill	Social Sciences & Humanities	BH		X
Horigan, Andrea		AH	X	
Kim, Henny	English & Learning Resources	HK	X	
Kolesnik, Alex	Senate President	AK	X	
Lange, Cari	Mathematics & Sciences	CL		X
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	
Joannamarie Kraus	ASVC	JMK		X
Sezzi, Peter	Senate Vice-President	PHS	X	

Guests Present: Michael Bowen (Math/Curriculum Committee); Phillip Brigs (Dean, Inst. Equity & Effectiveness); Gloria De La Rocha; Michael De La Rocha; Karen Engelsen (Student Services); Rubisela Gamboa (History); Daniel Gonzalez (Political Science); Juan *no last name given* (student/MECHA); Mario *no last name given* (student/MECHA).

II. Public Comments—None.

III. Acknowledgement of Guests

- a. Dean Phillip Brigs—Here to talk about program review and to show the senators what the changes to the process & documents are this year. One major change is to the data provided to everyone; individuals will not have to mine data for themselves—there are 5 pages of data provided in the documents and he reviews what that data will be. RF asks about the integrity of the data. Phillip answers that the data should be accurate and that it is pulled from Banner. KA asks about co-listed courses. He answers this and shows senators the document “Disciplines and Courses used to calculate Program-Level Data.” Further discussion ensues and senators offer a few corrections to this program-level data. He also shows senators the program review template. All of the initiatives that programs had in

prior year will be populated in this year's form. He also distributes a document "Program Review Timeline for FY 2015-2016" to senators.

- b. Dan Gonzalez, Michael de la Rocha, Gloria de la Rocha—here in support of resolution (see Action Item "b" herein below).
- c. Karen Engelsen—Here to speak re: 3SP. We now have an opportunity to rewrite the revisions of the 3SP plan for this school year. She says she wants to honor the roll of everyone to provide input—this is the primary reason she is here. She says the timeframe is very short—due to the state at the end of October. This will be on board agenda at the October meeting. She wants everyone to conceptually agree as to what we are doing with 3SP. Within SS we need to coordinate very well and get consistency; even larger than that there are campus and district-wide initiatives that connect to this as well. She distributes to the senators an outline. PS asks about dollars to support "Achieving the Dream" and KA answers that it is from Equity funds. He asks if 3SP dollars will be directed to this in future. KE answers that some 3SP funds may because "Achieving the Dream" really begins at the recruitment stage. She walks senators through her outline "VC 3SP Plan: A Process, Task and Resource Overview." Senators ask questions about this outline. PM asks about make-up of Student Success Committee. KE answers that she doesn't know yet. AK says this committee's structure is TBD. KE says that the red items in the outline she passed out were worked up in counseling work groups. PS says he would rather not spend money foolishly and is concerned that we are rushing throwing something together (just like last year)—don't ask why; we just want the money. MCN replies that everything in red is coming from a 5-year old document and that KE finally read through all these documents and listened to the counselors. MCN says that the red is the voice of counseling faculty. KE says she hears what PS is saying loud and clear. Her intention is to write the plan as broadly as possible so that there is flexibility. She says we do need the money; we cannot just eschew 3SP funding this next year. Senators discuss how 3SP dollars can be spent and about the efficacy of spending this money specifically on hiring counselors.

IV. Action Items

- a. Program Review (1st Reading): AH raises the concern that this might be the best program review document in the world but once again the senate is pushed into a corner as to approving this or else we are in the position of potentially messing up the PR timeline for the whole college. AK responds that Phillip only just began in summer so he is working on a short time line. He says the 12/1 date set by the district is driving this—he acknowledges this is short—but says that if we want hiring, etc., we will have to meet that timeline. PM agrees with AH that we are being pushed/pressured again and that everyone must take this back to their department. AK says his intention was not to rush anyone, if there is no motion to approve the document, it will not be. KA asks if it would be possible to work in the document and simultaneously suggest minor revisions. AK says best not to go down that road—i.e. don't start working on something that might be changed later. SB asks if we can approve as to data population but not the narrative parts. Senators discuss the pros/cons of moving forward quickly and meeting timeline versus the alternative. RM says this document was brought up at the Department

Chairs meeting but only in a cursory fashion. He says looking at the 10+1, this process is the senate's yet we had no input into the process or the document's design. He says the time for this was last spring. PS says we do have an option: continue to use the established program review process we already have. He says this is a "done deal" only if we proceed and use the new document. RM clarifies the difference between objection to the process and objection to the document itself. Senators further discuss what the process is/should be. KA says we need to give timelines rather than receive them. SB brings up the curriculum committee—they set the timelines. AH says we (the senate) are not being an effective body—if we were a senate to be contended with, everyone on campus would be deferring to us, making sure we had things on time. MCN says best we can do is adjust timeline by two weeks (to next senate meeting). PM asks about when are we going to discuss the instructional program review document.

PS moves that we move program review document to a second reading at the next senate on 9/17; and adjust the timelines accordingly knowing that the hard and fast deadline is 12/1. Senators to go back to their divisions for input. KA seconds motion. Discussion: PM asks about the productivity number. PS says the productivity number is not going away any time soon, but the best place for programs to describe why they are or are not meeting the productivity number is at the program level. He says the opportunity to describe at the program level why your productivity is what it is, is a benefit. KA offers a revision to Section C "Productivity"—AK captures this in his notes to pass on to Phillip. Senators discuss productivity and program mix. PM asks about enrollment demand. PS responds that enrollment demand is a way of quantifying student demand (and it originated in the senate—7 metrics for program discontinuance) for purposes of program discontinuance. Senators discuss this. Rubisella Gamboa brings up the issue of whether classes of any particular size are efficacious for students or if it is just a random, "you have 60 chairs so teach 60 students." Vote: 9-1-2 (PM votes no and HK and AM abstain).

- b. Resolution re: Mayo de la Rocha—Motion by PS; 2nd by RM. Dan Gonzalez, Michael de la Rocha, Gloria de la Rocha, Rubisela Gamboa, and students/MECHA members Juan and Mario are all here in support of this resolution. AK suggests a vote by acclamation but PM objects saying that some senators may want to abstain. Accordingly, a roll call vote is taken instead. Vote is 11-0-1 (PM abstains).
- c. Committee Appointments—Time ran out and this was not discussed.
- d. 3SPS Plan (1st Reading): No motion on 3SP. Senators will take it back to the divisions for feedback.

XIII. Adjournment at 3:37pm