

**Ventura College Academic Senate
Minutes
Thursday, January 22, 2015
2:00-3:30pm
Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) - 312**

I. Call to Order at 2:01pm. The following senators were present:

Senator	Division Represented	Initials	Present	Absent
Algiers, Kammy	Mathematics & Sciences	KA	X	
Beatty, Donna	Mathematics & Sciences	DB	X	
Carrasco-Nungaray, Marian	Student Services	MCN	X	
Coffey, Colleen M.	Senate Secretary	CMC	X	
Forde, Richard	Career & Technical Education	RF		X
Hendricks, Bill	Social Sciences & Humanities	BH		X
Lange, Cari	Senate Vice-President	CL	X	
Kim, Henny	English & Learning Resources	HK		X
Kolesnik, Alex	Senate President	AK	X	
Martin, Amanda	English & Learning Resources	AM	X	
McCain, Mike	Mathematics & Sciences	MM	X	
Morris, Terry or Anglin, Gary	Athletics, Kinesiology & Health	TM / GA		X
Mules, Ron	Social Sciences & Humanities	RM		X
Joannamarie Kraus	ASVC	JMK	X	
Sha, Saliha	Mathematics & Sciences	SS	X	
Wendt, Patty or Paula Munoz	Student Services	PW / PM	PW X	
Zacharias, Mary	Career & Technical Education	MZ	X	

Guests Present: Dr. Greg Gillespie, Bea Herrera, Gloria Arevalo, Angelica Gonzales.

II. Public Comments

--Bea Herrera: Here to discuss information received by some faculty re: the student Equity Committee. Would like direction from the senate re: whether equity is an advisory committee. The concern that has arisen is that if this is a participatory committee, there is a process, and a decision making process. If it is advisory, what is the role? She references the practice of putting the committee charge at the bottom of the agendas. This is the first she has heard that this is advisory only. What is the charge of the Equity Committee? This needs to be clarified. Some of the decisions being made involve money and campus-wide initiatives, this issue must be clarified. AK replies that this committee was not included in the "Making Decisions" document and it needs to be; process in place to establish a new committee also needs to be established. KA adds that re: the final decisions being made, because the plan that goes out comes from upper admin (Dr. Gillespie and Dr. Jefferson), the final product must be approved and be consistent with Administration goals. From her understanding the committee's purpose is to offer guidance but Administration ultimately makes the decision. She notes that right now the participation of instructional faculty is actually quite low—if this is advisory only, it is less distressing that the committee is not wholly representative. Gloria Arevalo says that since Student Equity is really an umbrella

across the entire campus, many campuses have moved to make it a participatory governance committee. She recommends looking at other colleges to see what their models are. MCN says that it is really important that we look at the membership and how this committee was selected; particular concern re: Transfer Center representation. KA replies that calls for membership were made at senate meetings. CMC confirms. MCN reiterates that representation should be revisited.

Dr. Gillespie offers to add to this discussion. He says that at this point he would look at the Equity Committee was actually an Equity workgroup that was pulled together for the specific purpose of preparing an Equity Plan. Now we need to look at the formation of a permanent committee, and the opportunity to define it as advisory, participatory, etc. He says that the Equity funding are categorical funds to be distributed across campus so the committee will not have discretion with this spending.

III. Acknowledgment of Guests

--Dr. Gillespie is here to talk about another work group forming which is to review and revise the "Making Decisions" document and to look at our overall committee structure. He distributes two handouts which depict the existing campus committees and their membership & charge. He says this work group has membership from across campus (i.e. faculty, staff and student representation). He says the ultimate goal is to make sure that committee meetings are efficient and transparent.

Gloria Arevalo raises a concern re: the action team membership and specifically that there is no student services faculty representation. With the new requirements in student equity and student success services and programs, and other student services committees on campus, how will the action team equally represent the needs of those committees?

MCN thinks we need to look at what is required by Title V. Dr. Gillespie answers that the action team looking at this issue did receive the Title V requirements. And he says they certainly can add to the committee chart (i.e. the handout) a designation of which are required by Title V. Dr. Gillespie clarifies that the intent is to make sure we do not delete any committees required by law; the action team will make sure that everything matches.

KA adds that (currently) there is not a good way for members on committees to communicate with their divisions, departments, etc. She asks whether there are any ideas of how to better facilitate communication from committee back to constituencies? Dr. Gillespie replies that this was discussed at a meeting this morning so it is something that will be addressed.

AK agrees that we need to at least inform membership of their responsibility to their constituencies.

Bea thanks Dr. Gillespie for this very helpful chart. She asks about where the category came from; he clarifies that that came from the "Making Decision" document. She further asks if in the document, the actual decision-making process within the committee will be spelled out. He responds that they want to make it as clear as possible—not just the org structure. Lastly, she asks how a minority perspective within a committee can express their opinion. She gives the example of a prior Program Review and how deftly Kathy Scott (as the

facilitator) handled that within Student Services. She says it was very helpful to validate those minority perspectives. Dr. Gillespie answers that he thinks that it can as the group works with it. He sees this more as in the realm of committee members' responsibilities. The hope is that committees reach consensus, which is not to say unanimity. This is particularly important in terms of accreditation, that we document a productive, collaborative, and collegial process. He sees this as an opportune moment to revisit decision-making. Goes over the objectives & timeline (from the handout "Committees and Decision Making Review Action Team). He says a key component of this process will also be establishing the deliverables of each committee. Next "Making Decisions" document will carry us from 2015- through out next accreditation visit. Gloria Arevalo asks (in the timeline) when the opportunity to provide feedback on this document will be? Will this group also be looking at District-wide committees and the aligning of campus with those? Dr. Gillespie says yes, that is part of the charge. Dr. Gillespie says he will send an all-campus email alerting everyone to who is serving on this action team.

Dr. Gillespie reiterates that it helps for us to have a process; internally we have an understanding of the process, we can explain it and understand it, and move forward with decisions in the most supportive way possible (recognizing that these decisions will not always align with individuals' perspectives). Goal is always to reach the best decision for students in the long run.

Senators briefly discuss some potential challenges with the proposed timeline re: "Making Decisions." AK will bring these concerns forward to the committee.

IV. Approval of Minutes 1/22/15—Motion by KA; 2nd by AM. Discussion: MCN raises concern that Senate minutes give out too much dialogue; they read "like a soap opera." CL answers that this has come up several times and that the answer was that the process by which the Senate (and other committees) reach their decisions was to be included. AK says that this can be agendized as a discussion item for another meeting re: what is/is not captured in Senate meeting minutes. Vote: 9-0-3 (MZ, MM, JMK).

V. Information Items

A. Dean of Equity: AK tells the Senators that this position was approved at the BOT meeting on Jan 20th. But the hiring committee was formed in advance of that. He expressed to Dr. Gillespie that he was very uncomfortable with this process and wanted to go back. He sent out an email asking for faculty to serve and 8 faculty expressed interest. As it turned out, AK had just enough names to send forward. He wanted Senators to know the process. KA asks if the Senate President alone gathers and forwards names or does the Senate have to approve? AK clarifies and says that he merely forwards the names; but if there had been many more faculty interested, he would have asked Senate's input/vote for names. As it turned out, there were just enough and this was unnecessary. Gloria Arevalo asks what the next step is after those names are forwarded? AK answers re: process that will be followed by HR and that he will have to sign off on the composition of the committee.

B. International Students: All the College and Academic Senate Presidents were called to a district meeting recently to receive a presentation re: international students. There is an effort being made to attract many more international students. 100 international students = \$750,000 to the college. MCN would like the minutes to reflect that we need to build the infrastructure to support these students if we are going to grow this

program. At a minimum, these students will need a dedicated counselor. MCN would like to see the Senate take a position on this; says it would be very unfortunate to not have the necessary supports in place for this very vulnerable population of students. Senators concur.

VI. Discussion Items

A. Enrollment management/waitlist faculty survey; formulation of survey questions: AK explains the background of this issue re: what occurred at the last Department Chairs meeting. This will be a future agenda item—asks senators to begin to think about this.

B. Making Decisions at VC: The former “Making Decisions” document from the website was included in the senators’ packet. Gloria Arevalo says that it is very clear that governance committees governed by the Brown Act need to follow Roberts Rules of Order. There are issues re: the obligation to provide information to all constituent groups in terms of those committees governed by the Brown Act. AK says that on the Academic Senate website we have the Senate By-Laws. One of the things that we may have to do is look at these again as we look at the committee structure since some are spelled out in the By-Laws. He encourages Senators to look again at these By-Laws since we are already going to have to make changes (i.e. to change committee structure).

VII. Action Items

A. AP 5300—Student Equity (Second Reading): Motion by MCN; 2nd by CL. Discussion: none. Vote: unanimous.

B. Formation of study group re: scheduling college hour (spring 2016 start): AK says the Senate must lead the charge on this. MCN asks about the charge is of this group? AK says they would look at do we want to break the schedule blocks to accommodate a college hour (or something less than an hour) at all? When would it be? What would be the effect on scheduling for different programs? EVP’s office has said that if we create such a break, there is no mandate that every single program on campus comply with it. There can be exceptions. KA wants to be on the group. Bea asks what the college hour actually is? AK responds. KA suggests asking Patrick about FTES numbers as it relates to the new block schedule at the next meeting he is guest at. DB says that we could make some observations—particularly about the parking/traffic gridlock at specific times & at the bus schedule. Gloria Arevalo asks about District-wide classes: are our classes lining up with OC & MC start times? AK says that these issues can be part of the enrollment management survey that will be sent to faculty. Joannamarie says that from student perspective, the bus schedule is a concern. Study group for college hour: KA, CMC, CL.

VIII. Consent Items—None.

IX. President’s Report—None.

X. Senate Subcommittees Reports

Curriculum: Angelica Gonzales says that they are reviewing rules & responsibilities and looking at processes. Looking at being more efficient. Gloria Arevalo asks whether Senate wants to know about what programs and courses Curriculum is looking at? PW responds that we are receiving the Minutes already, and then Senators or faculty can go in on days that topics relevant to their work are being discussed.

XI. Campus Committee Reports

A. Equity Report (Kammy)—Distributes a handout “Equity Committee Update” and reviews recent developments. MCN asks about the disciplines represented in the new faculty academy for this semester. KA responds.

B. BRC & CPC reports (Alex)—None not already covered. More information re: FTES will be forthcoming. CL brings up a faculty concern that re: 4-week summer session, required/core classes are being dropped in favor of classes that will enroll at 45 or more. Senators discuss this. This will be agendaized as a discussion item for a future meeting.

XII. Announcements for the Good of the Order—Gloria Arevalo extends an invitation re: two deans of curriculum and instruction that oversees BS, ESL, employability & short-term vocational areas. This will be on 2/24 from 3:30-5. Curriculum committee members will participate. A notice will go out. Location TBD based on interest expressed. Bea asks about non-credit course funding. AK clarifies funding of non-credit courses (i.e. same FTES for credit or non-credit as long as in one of these four areas).

Adjourned at 3:38pm.

DRAFT