I. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. The following were present:

Voting Senators: Michael Abram; Bret Black; Mark Bates; Elissa Caruth; Gloria Guevara; Greg Kaapuni; Christine Mainzer; Gary W. Morgan; John Norbutas; Leo Orange; Jim Petersen; Anthony Rodriguez; Winston Sarafian; and Ralph Smith.

Guests: Carolyn Dorrance; Carmen Guerrero; Alan Hayashi; Amy London; Alex Lynch; Maria Parker; Everardo Riveras; and Shant Shahoian.

Academic Senate President Fauth welcomed everyone to the Senate. He noted the closure of Rose Avenue next week and the fact that water would be shut off for a period of time. There was a correction noted to the Agenda that was sent out, i.e., on the Calendar of Senate Meetings April 22 should have been April 11.

II. Additions to the Agenda – President Fauth noted that he would be presenting a student support services grant letter for Senate information.

III. Announcements

A. Carmen Guerrero: C. Guerrero began with her announcement of the final Self-Study Report being available at the Accreditation Workplace (i.e., accredoc0304) in about one week to anyone with an off-site Lotus Notes password. C. Guerrero elaborated on her Mandatory Flex Day presentation. She stressed that College President Ledesma-Reese needs to be recognized for her refusal to change the Self-Study Report in the face of Board opposition in August. C. Guerrero also stressed that the Perceptions Survey had indicated dissatisfaction with the Board among OC employees. There was one meeting at which one board member participated in creating OC’s Self-Study Report. Alan Hayashi and Mary Jones both agreed that this would be a place in the Self-Study to emphasize positive Board participation. However, this action was misinterpreted as a criticism. It was a miscommunication. Second of all, with regard to Board participation involving the meeting in Sacramento regarding our Performing Arts Building, a Board member asked that this section be corrected. President Ledesma-Reese refused to do so, as she believed the section was correct as written. C. Guerrero stressed that these incidents reflect a 29-year history during which dissatisfaction with the Board’s performance has ultimately been removed from the final Self-Study accreditation documentation, and that this Self-Study Report
represents the first instance in which we have a College President who is willing to let the Report stand and to defend it if necessary. Ralph Smith queried C. Guerrero about the writing process of the Self-Study and whether there was adequate participation. C. Guerrero stated that there was more participation with this Report than in the past. She reiterated that this Report represents “reality” and that one current resounding theme is the perception that the allocation model does not serve Oxnard College well. C. Guerrero suggested that faculty read the Abstracts if they do not have time to read the entire 397-page Self-Study Report. C. Guerrero also mentioned that the Report contains a critique of the College President and that President Ledesma-Reese’s response has been to be proactive, in contrast with the Board’s reactive stance.

B. David Magallanes: David Magallanes presented Mary Jones with an engraved stationary set highlighting the following: (1) Jones’ leadership during a difficult period with administrative change; (2) Jones’ leadership with regard to “smoothing over” relationships with the Board; (3) Jones’ devotion and dedication; (4) Jones’ strong Toastmaster’s background which guided meetings and raised the level of professional presentations during the meetings; (5) the fact that Jones breathed new life into the annual scholarships and awards banquet; (6) that Jones served as a full-time faculty member who also served as harassment claims intake officer and student grievance intake officer; (7) that Jones handled media inquiries during the spending scandal with former Chancellor Westin; (8) that when faculty or classified staff were ill, Jones ensured proper recognition for same; (9) that Jones dealt successfully with the aftermath of September 11, 2001 in her leadership role; (10) that Jones helped with overall frustration during the budget crisis; (11) that Jones served on hiring committees for 24 permanent faculty positions (28% of the overall faculty); (12) that Jones successfully dealt with 3 different College Presidents, 3 Executive Vice Presidents, 4 Vice Presidents, 3 Chancellors, and 4 Deans; (13) that Jones secured appropriate gifts for colleagues for times of recognition; and (14) last but not least, Jones provided brownies and sodas at all Academic Senate meetings, for which the Senate is eternally grateful. Jones accepted the gift for her service, dedication, and devotion to faculty/colleagues and students with “great aplomb.” Jones stressed the need for continued faculty participation in the Academic Senate and the need to be visible and vocal, especially with the upcoming accreditation visit.

IV. Public Comments – None.

V. Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the meeting of April 26, 2004, were approved (moved by R. Smith, seconded by M. Jones).
VI. Treasurer’s Report – D. Magallanes reported that the Senate has $1,135.93 after consideration of encumbrances. D. Magallanes went on to state that the dues period normally ends at the close of the academic year. He stated that he is still receiving dues and suggested that perhaps we should continue accepting dues and sending out reminders about dues without “closing” the time for dues acceptance. When M. Jones asked D. Magallanes to clarify dues amounts, he stated that $20 per year for full-time faculty and $5 per year for part-time faculty is the status quo. Maria Parker also reminded the Senate that automatic deductions are available for dues-paying purposes. C. Guerrero also reminded the body that in order to be a Senator or an Officer of the Academic Senate, a candidate had to be in good standing, i.e., with dues paid. In response to a query by B. Black, D. Magallanes mentioned that the current Academic budget as well as historic records are available on an Excel spreadsheet which he would be happy to provide to any interested party. President Fauth also reminded the Senate that funds are used for scholarships or flowers for the bereaved, etc., not on any frivolous purchases.

VII. New Business

A. Seating of Senators – There followed the introduction of Senators as well as the introduction of above-listed guests.

B. Sabbatical Leave Committee Chair – The Sabbatical Leave Committee Chair has been vacant since Tom Barth removed his name from consideration last year. T. Barth agreed to place his name back on the list. A motion was made and seconded approving T. Barth as Sabbatical Leave Committee Chair (moved by W. Sarafian, seconded by L. Orange). The motion passed unopposed.

C. Professional Development/Flex Chair – Liesel Toles-Rigsby’s name was put forth as a candidate for the Chair of the Professional Development/Flex Committee. A motion was made and seconded approving L. Toles-Rigsby as Professional Development/Flex Chair (moved by E. Caruth, seconded by G. W. Morgan). The motion passed unopposed.

D. Senate Representatives to Committees – President Fauth opened discussion as to the functions/purposes of each of the institution’s governance committees so that by September 9th, nominees’ names can be forwarded to President Fauth in time for action at the next Academic Senate meeting. The committees were discussed as follows:

1. Planning and Consultation Council – C. Guerrero defined the Council as the primary recommending body to the College President. Each individual committee has a representative serving on PCC (which, by the way, served as the Accreditation Steering Committee last year).

2. Campus Use, Development and Safety – M. Jones defined this as a productive and positive committee responsible for campus safety concerns, as an
example the recent smoking area designations. CUDS is also responsible for updating the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS).

3. Financial Resources – M. Jones also spoke regarding this Committee stating that a quorum is difficult to gain, especially when the budget crisis impinges on the committee’s functioning. She further stated that she is optimistic this year since Ken Bailey, the new VP of Business Services, is in place. She stressed the need for every department to be represented. President Fauth added that he had had a successful meeting with Bailey last week. Bailey had commented on his surprise at the lack of funding and “how far we’ve managed to make these funds go.”

4. Program Review – C. Guerrero stressed that participating on Program Review Committee is one way to learn about new programs on campus. The Committee is charged with the review of Program Review Reports, questioning of faculty for clarification on those Reports, and ultimately making recommendations to departments, which then address such recommendations three years later in a follow-up review. PRC’s charge in the near future will be to encourage Programs to incorporate these recommendations into Unit Plans. The budgetary allocation process will also ultimately be tied to this process, making PRC a very powerful committee. President Fauth also added that after a meeting with College President Ledesma-Reese, he feels that the institutionalization of such committee work will occur shortly, particularly with regard to prioritization for new hires, etc.

5. Student Services – R. Smith announced that this committee meets every Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. The charge of this committee is to recruit members to help ensure that student service operations run smoothly, everything from the bookstore to raising enrollment in low-enrolled courses.

6. Technology – J. Norbutas stated that this committee has not yet achieved its goal of creating a Technology Plan. This is an obvious charge for the committee this year. C. Dorrance stated that the focus of the committee must move from administrative/law enforcement to instructional issues. C. Guerrero further stated that the Self-Study Report indicates that a lack of faculty input has occurred in this committee and that the Technology Committee needs to be a place where faculty needs are well articulated. The Planning Agenda in the Self-Study indicated that the committee will work with Darla Cooper, the Dean of Institutional Research, to create an appropriate survey instrument to gauge instructional technology needs. President Fauth further elaborated explaining that there was no procedure for allocating new computer equipment to take into consideration how long faculty have been here working on “older” equipment. He also stressed the need for departmental representation on this committee.

7. Sabbaticals – President Fauth explained that this committee approves sabbatical applications by faculty members. A. Hayashi clarified that the Committee does not decide whose proposal gets funded; rather, it ranks proposals and forwards the ranking list to the District Office.
8. **Professional Development/Flex** – President Fauth explained that although there is little PD money at present, departmental representation is needed to set priorities for flex activities within available resources.

9. **Curriculum Committee** – C. Guerrero explained that the function of the Curriculum Committee is to consider all new curricula, whether or not a course transfers to universities. Curriculum originates at the department level, but this committee is where new curriculum is discussed “as a campus.” The process for fully implementing a transfer-level course can be up to two years long. J. Redding reported briefly on the Curriculum Institute she attended in July stressing the importance of developing high-quality solid curriculum. C. Guerrero further stressed that “boilerplate” outlines are not generally acceptable for transfer purposes. She further emphasized that building relationships with articulation officers on CSU and UC campuses is the key to successful articulation. President Fauth explained that articulation is vital and is the currency by which Oxnard College instruction is judged in other academic venues.

**VIII. State of the Senate Report** – President Fauth presented his “State of the Senate” report for August 2004 (one of four required such reports) (attached as a handout to this meeting).

**IX. Letter in Support of Student Support Services Grant** – Finally, President Fauth reviewed the proposed letter in support of student support services grants for the Senate’s information.

There being no further business to come before the Senate, the meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeannette Redding, Vice President (substituting for Tom Stough, Secretary)
Edited by Tom Stough September 3, 2004
State of the Senate, August 2004 from President Lynn Fauth

This missive complies with the stipulation in the Senate’s Constitution for four written President’s reports to the Senate each year.

In my two months as your President (plus a month or so acting “Presidential”-- by attending meetings!) I can say that the state of the Senate is pretty good. While I have spent more time than I wanted dispelling rumors and half truths that abound (this is Oxnard College, after all!), overall in relationships with the Board, the college’s administration, and you my colleagues, I think the Senate is doing fine.

First, I would like to say that Mary Jones’ administration accomplished lots in her 3 ½ years as President. The Shared Decision Making document from May 2003, noted in multiple places in the Accreditation Self Study, with its hub/spoke model of governance looks like a great way to govern this institution. Likewise, the Accreditation Self Study, reported to you by Carmen Guerrero is a noteworthy achievement. I signed off on it last week. Mary’s administration also enabled us to add sixteen, soon to be eighteen new colleagues to our number, about 20% of the faculty. My meetings with them in the Senate/AFT sponsored Flex Day on the 10th of August was a wonderful time and we are fortunate to have them join us; the future with their influence should be bright, and their presence here is in no small part due to Mary’s effective leadership. And, all Senate members (that’s the whole faculty) will be enjoying a 2.8% salary increase, so with new colleagues, more money, and a new Chancellor, 2004-05 can be pretty good, save for the testing we’re undergoing with enrollment—perhaps we should come up with some creative faculty suggestions to find more students. Any takers?

As far as the administration goes, relationships with the new chancellor are unknown. He just started today. Jenny Redding represented the Senate at a meeting with him in July; she reports she liked him. Ask her about the meeting in more detail later. I’m setting up my own time with him. With Lydia, so far, things have been good. No major blow ups/blowouts. In conversations I’ve had with her she’s asserted her position that she’s an advocate for the college. Her trip to Sacramento (reported upon by Alan Hayashi at the 26 April meeting, and attached to the minutes), and in at least two instances at Board meetings, she has followed through. She stuck up for the faculty when a Board member questioned the tone and substance of a passage in the Self Study, and she has run quite a few things by me. She reports she’s taken to heart the negative stuff about her the various surveys have turned up and she says she’ll be working on removing these bad perceptions—she met with the new faculty to get to know them and has established a process by which she will be meeting with many of us over the course of the year So far, as your Senate President, I can report she’s been very consultative; I expect the relationship to flourish.

When it comes to Board members, I’ve been busy. I’ve had two meetings with Cheryl Heitman, with a third scheduled on September 3. She voiced concerns over our college’s status, and we have had fruitful discussions—always useful when one talks to the Board President. I’ve had two meetings with Mary Anne Rooney, plus a long phone call. The
last meeting with Mary Anne lasted over three hours! I was accompanied by Ana Maria Valle at that meeting, and there are many issues we need to address with this trustee who is also a graduate of our college; her heart’s for the college, but some of our “advocates” have not helped the relationship between trustee Mary Anne and us. Ana Maria and I have met once with Art Hernandez, with a second meeting scheduled for this Wednesday. The meeting went well, and Art is quite vocal in his support for the college. I haven’t met with Bob Gonzalez or Al Jacobs, but may schedule one with Jacobs. I’ll stay out of the election fray for Gonzalez’ seat given that the two Larrys are colleagues.

Building Projects are under way. You’ll be inconvenienced by the closure of streets for construction—next the parking lot. The water will be turned off one weekend, with numerous “Dempsy Dumpsters” manifesting themselves on Rose Avenue, so a new main can be laid. The FPP for the Performing Arts center went into Sacramento on July 30, as did the IPP for the Library renovations. Lydia sent out a call for members of the design committee for the new Classroom Building and five faculty members have already volunteered to serve. More should be involved. So, let me know if you’re interested in serving and I’ll forward your name onward.

I’ll be presenting some other ideas to you at future meetings, but I think that’s enough for today.

Lest I be accused of auditioning for the Board and getting even more long winded, let me say that I look forward to serving you, my colleagues, as your Academic Senate President for the next nine or ten months. Thank you for your support.