**Ventura College Academic Senate**

**Minutes**

**Thursday, March 19, 2015**

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

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

I. Call to Order at 2:06pm. 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 |
| Horigan, Andrea |  | AH | 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 | PM X |  |
| Zacharias, Mary | Career & Technical Education | MZ | X |  |

Guests Present: Dr. Gillespie (enters shortly after the start of the meeting)

II. Public Comments—None.

III. Approval of Minutes a. March 5, 2015—Postponed to 4/16.

IV. Discussion Items

a. College hour: the following questions were proposed for a faculty survey on this issue:

 --Are you full time/part time faculty?

 --Are you in favor of the idea of a college “hour” (it may be less than 60 min long)?

--Why or why not comment section to be added after first question (to clarify objections).

 --What break in the schedule makes the most sense? (offer choices)

 --Ask about length of break (45 min; 60 min; or 75 min).

Initial survey to go to ASVC to gauge student interest? Senators discuss pros and cons of this; feedback received from faculty about this. CC will type up this survey and bring back to next meeting as first / second reading. Next meeting is 4/16.

b. Waitlists: Today’s discussion limited to what was impact of waitlist/cancelled classes. AH put together some possible questions for Senators to consider for a faculty survey on this issue. We seem to have inconsistencies in what we have actually seen and what we have heard about it. CL shows Senators message from Patrick Jefferson addressing this issue (dated 3/17). She shows chart of classes cancelled and number of students enrolled at time of cancellation. Senators discuss this data and the inconsistencies across in terms of what was cancelled and when and with how many students. PM says her understanding from AFT is that 15 enrolled students has been the historic practice in terms of the minimum number of students to keep a class going. KA and MCN say they have always understood that 9 students essentially “broke even” financially. Senators discuss the draft questions that AH prepared. MM asks if it is possible that one section might have been cancelled to roll those students into another? Further discussion of this. AM suggests that we might want to have another open-ended question about how the individual faculty member was affected. Further discussion of this. Also: should add “When was faculty informed that class was cancelled and by whom it was reported.” KA says it is important to ask faculty “Which class of theirs specifically was cancelled” so that we can connect it to the CRN. RM says that we actually have two surveys here: a campus climate survey (how do you feel about what happened?) and a fact survey (was your class cancelled?). He suggests perhaps putting fact questions at the start and then an open-ended response re: feelings about it. Senators discuss pros/cons of getting this information from individuals vs. department chairs. CL asks about possibly sending a factual survey to chairs only; and climate survey to all users. PM asks which questions would go with which. A bit more discussion ensues.

Dr. Gillespie says that he sees some merit in the two survey idea. He says we could take the specific classes cancelled and send survey just to affected faculty; and then a more general climate survey to all. So he is suggesting a targeted survey (rather than to all users). The general survey to get general impressions/feedback. KA says she is concerned about asking faculty about data we already have. AH says this proposed survey was made before this data became available. She says what we are trying to get to the bottom of is faculty perspective. CL says her concern if we do it targeted and non-anonymously, part-timers particularly might be reluctant to be forthcoming. RM says he is skeptical—so many effected faculty filed AFT grievances, so why would they be reluctant now? Senators question what purpose of this survey is? KA asks if we are interested to know how waitlist might have impacted this or are we just looking at cancellations? CL replies that right now we are trying to keep these two separate. Senators further discuss this and attempt to clarify what will be in what survey.

Dr. Gillespie adds that doing a survey is potentially beneficial because it offers a way of getting at what is the expectation and what would people like this process to be? With the goal being to conduct this unfortunate process in a way that is the least disruptive to faculty and students.

RM adds that part of the climate survey may need to be “was your class cancelled?” But as department chair he was not told any of this—faculty informed by the dean and he only found out after the fact.

CL advocates for a single survey with filters, just in order to see what bubbles up. AH and RM will work on this revised [single] survey for the next meeting.

Dr. Gillespie asks if it would be helpful to get the data on the classes? AH replies that we just received this from Alex.

MCN states that what the senate needs is to understand and hear from faculty; also senate needs to communicate with the Administrative team about the process itself so we can work towards a greater collaboration. This may entail asking hard questions: what is the criteria for effective enrollment management? Biggest picture is how does this enrollment management affect our curriculum availability (for timely degree completion)? CL says we need to take this first step first, but then move this conversation on to that next logical step. MCN says she would like us to develop something that we can give our counselors because their perspective is so unique—seeing how class cancellations intersect with degree completion. KA asks about obtaining even more robust data about trends in enrollment. CL tells senators that District has new software supplement “ARGOS” to tag onto Banner to hopefully get us the information we need to make informed decisions.

Dr. Gillespie says that the data KA is asking about is available now. He says we have a real need to train the department chairs on how to use this.

On 4/16 agenda, this revised survey will be brought back on that date for first and second reading. Also, discussion item re: counseling perspective that MCN will provide to CL.

c. Brown Act –CL clarifies for the senators re: the discussion that took place re: this issue at the 3/5/15 meeting. Specifically, no legal action taken; there was no “whistleblower” complaint with respect to VC’s senate—it was merely an inquiry to the District and the District chose to take this very seriously. She tells Senators that calling it whistleblower action mischaracterizes what occurred.

d. Diversity: PM had an announcement regarding diversity hiring. (Hand out was passed out). Departments will be looking at diversity hiring. As faculty and departments, when work on hiring, we need to have discussions regarding diversity on our committees. HK asked about when the diversity trainings were and it was clarified. CL asked if there is something we should put forward. PM said this was just an information item and no action needs to be taken. PM said we need to decide as faculty/college if we value for diversity. How much does the diversity non-voting member on hiring committees influence if diversity is a focus in hiring committees? We need to be aware of it and have conversations about it. She asked faculty to ensure the conversations take place.

V. Action Items

a. District “Making Decisions” document Academic Senate Subcommittees (possible By-Law changes)—This can’t be an action item because we don’t have the complete document. CL informed us that per AK, there was an update made but we did not know the extent of the update. CL asked if anyone know anything about the update. Dr. Greg Gillespie stated that though he was not at all the meetings, he does periodically check to see what the timeline is. Once the workgroup has their first draft (before or after spring) the draft will go to faculty/classified senate for comments so everyone will have a chance to look at it and revise it. Then there will be a campus forum to share the document and get campus input. The timeline is this semester and before spring semester is over, committee slots will be filled.

Forums: Late April there will be a decision making document forum.

Looking at the timeline, CL showed concern that if we have our first and second reading in April 16th of the document, it will not give the senate enough time to take the information back to faculty and get input. Dr. Gillespie said if the senate does not feel it will give them enough time, they can do a first reading this semester and do a second reading in the fall as this document is not time sensitive like other documents have been in the past. He added we are looking at the committee structures in place now and making sure it works well and how it can work better. The main goal is to make something that the campus can understand. We don’t have to complete it this semester if time does not permit. Dr. Gillespie added that co-chairs of all the committees have seen the changes and have had input already.

MCN expressed concern in regards to the charges and asked if she should send the committee charges to faculty to compare and contrast to ensure we are not violating Title V and Ed Code. Dr. Gillespie stated the committee has not made any changes to the committee charges or memberships listed. Dr. Gillespie said we are just looking for confirmation of the decision making process. But have not touched anything in terms of charge or membership on the committees. What is being looked at is how to categorize the committees (governance, workgroup, advisory, etc.) to better understand the committee structures.

CL said that it is not ready to be shared yet as the process has not been completed by the workgroup that is working on this. MCN asked about the distance ed. Committee. She said that she is on DTRWSS. She said we have not defined what is teaching effectiveness but APBP4105 has defined it. MCN said a faculty asked where is this in the process as we have not defined it yet at senate. We usually review such things and it goes to senates and they take the input from faculty. Then it goes to the committee (DTRWSS). CL said that on Jan 22nd we discussed APBP4105. We had some revisions that Angelica was going to take the item back as it needed to be reviewed by counseling and she had some items to add. It never came back on our agenda after that so we never did a second reading. So APBP4105 was just approved, with all three senate presidents approving it. However, as a group the senate never did a second reading or approved it.

CL asked the senate to be more diligent at looking at the minutes because it is our responsibility to ensure it is correct. She said we need to check and if we don’t see an item on the agenda that needs follow up we need to make sure to bring it up so it is not accidentally dropped. These types of things can affect our curriculum and our teaching and need to be taken seriously.

CL said that minutes from senate are not up on the website yet and we need to make sure they are. The reason they are not is because AK has not had training to get access to the website and asked Dr. Gillespie if he could help ensure training is made available. KA said she has been through training and would be happy to post minutes until AK can get trained.

Dr. Gillespie said he does not go to the DTRWSS but that it is important to have senate rep there (currently senate president). Dr. Gillespie said he would be glad to talk to AK about posting the minutes because it is important for our senate to be acting on things on a timely manner and getting information out in a timely manner. Also, if the other senates are approving items and it comes to us but we haven’t done a second reading yet, it is problematic. If they all vote yes but Ventura cannot vote yes because we are not ready, it is a problem.

Proposed By-law changes: Senate has proposed changes to the document.

1. Remove committee charge and meeting times. The reason for the changes is that currently, if a committee needs to change the time for the meetings, it needs go through a ballet vote as it is in the by-laws. However, if we take the charge and meeting times off the by-law, it will be easier to make such changes. We would still vote on such changes as a senate, but it would not need to go to a ballet vote for the campus.

Action Item: Suggested changes: Andrea, MCN.

Discussion: MCN was concerned about how our subcommittee meetings are held and how minutes are taken. She said since we are governed by the Brown Act, we need to follow proper orders which the by-laws help ensure. If there are proposed changes to the by-laws we need to have in context of why such changes need to be made in order to understand the rationale behind the change. We need to know why we are keeping something or changing it. CL explained the process again (ballet votes) and that currently there have not been any changes to the document text itself. We are just discussing removing some of the items from the by-law for convenience. CL said that it was proposed by AK to also remove membership charge but she suggested to him not removing charge because membership determines what district wide committees faculty can speak at and where faculty can have input. If it is not in the by-laws, it can easily change and could negatively affect faculty. Discussion suggested not removing membership. RM said if we decouple the charge from the by-laws, the purpose of the committee could change in a way that would make its role less than what it was intended to be. AH agreed the charge should stay. Other members agreed. The senate wants explanation from the workgroup on why the charge was to be removed.

2. Quorum requirements were asked to be moved to a different section to align it better. Committee seemed to have no problems with this change.

3: Learning committees change: Rational for the change is needed for this request as it was unclear for some on why the change would need to be made. AK can clarify at next senate meeting.

4. College professional development committee instead of faculty professional development committee: There was much discussion regarding this change. Faculty would rather have professional development stay as a faculty committee to ensure faculty voice on the committee. DB said this committee was combined in the past and she was on the committee and it always felt like the concentration was in two different orders and she like the idea of having two separate committees that can meet together to discuss ideas and work together when needed, rather than combining the committees to one only. More discussion is needed for this.

5. Distance education: we need clarification on what the second one is.

6. Senate was tentatively ok with this change.

We will need to wait to get clarification at the next meeting on some of these items. KA asked if we can look at the mark ups (track change) on the by-law so we can see what the changes will look like. It will be easier to follow that way. MCN: if you look at pg 8 basic skills committee, I would oppose that membership. They are only including deans, etc. where is the counselor? I don’t like this change. CL said this is not a change. This is what we have had, so if you want changes you can suggest the change. MCN said she was reading our by-laws for senate and since we want communication, under campus community report we need a list of the items under it so we can hear each report. AH said if we go over the reports in the beginning it would better. RM thinks that would be more effective. CL will check the brown act/Roberts rule of order to make sure it is ok.

CL asked if everyone ok with doing another reading next time on this item. Committee agreed.

b. Full-time and part-time faculty handbooks

CL: this is an information item since it is already released. However, feedback can still be given. Senate wanted clarification on this.

VI. Consent Items—None.

VII. President’s Report—CL: From Alex’s board report: The board of trustees has said that we are ‘on target’ to maintain Medium College status. This is because we are counting the FTEFs yet to be earned in the four week summer session towards this academic year’s FTEFs. However, this means we are going to start next year at an FTES deficit. Ron: we are sending half a million dollars to Moorpark college. We are also going to make our college medium by using summer to barely make it for next year. I am very worried about this. CL said our college president agreed to this change, and CL spoke out on it as an individual. However, the state is using 525 WSCH number, and since Ventura doesn’t meet this as much as Moorpark, we are sending them money. Dr. Gillespie thinks we will be ok. PM thanked CL for making the board presentation. She suggested AK should tell the board and emphasize that faculty were not responsible for this decision and it was an admin decision. CL: We need to have some conversations about what we want to be as a college and as individual programs. Many valuable programs, like CTE and nursing, can’t fit that goal. This 525 model does not favor such programs. RM said if we start using the new larger lecture halls into those large classes, it would help. Discussion suggested we can be creative in increasing size in some departments to adjust for some of this. PM said it is important for senate to have formal statements at these forums. It can’t just be the same 1-2 people speaking up. CL said we will put this as a discussion item for a future senate meeting. Forum regarding WSCH/FTES can help share some of these points. MCN said we need weekly FTES emailed to us. Dr. Gillespie has been working on a plan to discuss how to spend the international student funds, and as part of the plan there would be a FT counselor and coordinator needed.

CL asked senators to talk to department and come up with a statement on what you want your program and Ventura College to be as far as who we serving and how many students we can accommodate with these numbers.

VIII. Senate Subcommittees Reports—None.

IX. Campus Committees Reports: CL: Registration for fall is going to move back up to prior to the end of the spring term.

Equity update: KA said that the Equity inquiry team will be meeting next week to review and compile information collected at all the focus groups that have met this semester. KA will compile the information and present it to the Equity Committee on April 16th. All are welcome to attend the presentation. The Equity committee will make recommendations in regards to interventions and the information can be presented in a campus forum if the campus is interested.

X. Announcements for the Good of the Order—None.

XII. Requests for Future Agenda Items—None.

XIII. Adjournment—at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_p.m.