

**Oxnard College Academic Senate**  
**Monday October 25, 2004**  
**CSSC101-102**

**I. Call to order—2:35 pm**

Officers—Lynn Fauth, Jeannette Redding, David Magallanes, Tom Stough, Mary Jones.

Voting Senators—Michael Abram, Jack Ahrens, Mark Bates, Alan Hayashi for Brett Black, Robert Cabral, Elissa Caruth, Lynn Fauth for Frank Castro, Gloria Guevara, Christiane Mainzer, Gary Morgan, John Norbutas, Leo Orange, Jim Petersen, Anthony Rodriguez, Carolyn Dorrance for Winston Sarafian, Ralph Smith, Ana Maria Valle.

Non-Voting Faculty—Hussein Fahs, Shant Shahoian, Amy London, Lilia Zambrano.

Guests—Mary Anne Rooney, Vice-President, Board of Trustees; Larry Kennedy, Ventura County Career Center Director and candidate for Area 3 Board seat; Jose Cornelio, OC Executive Vice President Ramiro Sanchez; Institutional Researcher Darla Cooper; Deans Jaime Casillas, Delois Flowers, Steve Hall, Joe Ramirez and Cheryl Shearer.

**II. Additions to the Agenda—none.**

**III. Approval of Minutes of October 11, 2004—**moved R. Smith, seconded G. Morgan, approved.

**IV. Public Comments—**Trustee Rooney indicated that she was “just visiting” as part of her desire to meet with the Academic and Classified Senates of all three colleges. Board candidate L. Kennedy stated that he advocates a “stipend for instructors who have many students”. He also noted that he was “glad to see shared governance in action.” He asked his potential constituents to consider a long-term problem: will the public continue to support higher education as it has in the past? Kennedy stated that “the District must rethink what it’s doing.” He noted that 85% of students perceive the College’s instruction to be “excellent”. He also noted that 95% of the College’s budget goes for personnel expenses, partly due to the long tenure of many employees. He then described the geographic boundaries of Area 3 and his endorsements: former trustee Pete Tafoya, outgoing trustee Bob Gonzalez, and current trustee Art Hernandez. Trustee Rooney noted that she and Board President Cheryl Heitmann have taken no position on any of the Area 3 candidates.

**V. Treasurer’s Report—**D. Magallanes reported a balance of \$ 737.90. This includes a \$ 400 gift to the GeoBowl previously approved by the Senate.

## **VI. Continuing Business: Dialogs**

Senate President Fauth thanked the deans for their attendance and noted the format for the two “dialogs”: Fauth and T. Stough to write down questions and answers, J. Redding to be timekeeper, M. Jones to be moderator. Two minutes each were allowed for each questioner and responder.

### Dialog I: Institutional Governance

The administrators handed out copies of the *Oxnard College Student Enrollment Year-to-Year Trends*. The topic under discussion: how will the College respond to its drop in enrollments? (Faculty questions are listed with management answers.)

*Question #1: Were any of the proposed solutions to enrollment problems derived from existing unit plans? If so, how?*

The unit plans for the PACE Program and high school partnerships were consulted. A decision was reached to offer 15 high-demand courses. The Spring 2004 unit plans in general were consulted and a high-priority goal was set: full restoration of high-demand courses.

*Question #2: Has there been an analysis of students lost to the College and why?*

No “official reasons” have been established why continuing students chose not to re-enroll. However, an informal meeting was held with student government leaders last year to ask this question. Two answers: the fee hike and the greatly reduced 2003 and 2004 summer sessions, which presented course-sequencing problems for many. The enrollment drop is District- and County-wide, not limited to Oxnard College.

*Question #3: Why are there so many restrictions on the number of class sections offered?*

The bulk of new funds for 2004-05 had to be used to hire new full-time faculty per State mandates. This question would be better directed to K. Bailey or T. Kimberling.

*Question #4: Why hold to the absolute minimum of 15 students per section offered?*

This policy is District-wide and can't be changed unilaterally by the College.

*Question #5: Many committees have recommended that an outreach coordinator position be created to assure that the College is reaching into all student “markets”. Why hasn't this happened?*

The number one objective is to create the position of Outreach Coordinator. The Senate ranked this position as its sixth priority two years ago, but as 16<sup>th</sup> last year.

*Question #6: Has any effort been made to correlate enrollment growth goals with the resources needed to accomplish them?*

The management seeks to expand partnerships with high schools with the goal of insuring future enrollment growth. Needed supplies will be purchased from contract education funds. Faculty input is needed in the subcommittee work of the ad hoc growth plan group.

Post-dialog discussion: A. Hayashi stated that the “unit plans were ‘looked at’, but not really considered.” A.M. Valle stated that the “real issue” is that the enrollment plan was decided upon unilaterally by management and didn’t go through the shared governance process. Discussion followed. C. Dorrance: the enrollment plan is very bureaucratic and relies too heavily on “cherry-picking”, i.e., lavishing effort on individual academic programs.

#### Dialog II: State Academic Senate

L. Fauth noted that he will vote on October 30 on State Senate resolutions regarding raising English and Mathematics requirements. He noted that the resolution may be tabled once again. Title V currently calls for raising minimum levels to our English 101 and Math 14 courses. There are four resolutions: no change for English, no change for mathematics. Or: increase the English requirement, increase the mathematics requirement. E. Caruth noted that ECCTYC favors raising English standards for all California community college students. M. Bates said that his “unscientific poll” of mathematics faculty indicates “wariness” toward the proposed higher requirement.

C. Dorrance: the Social Science Department is opposed to raising the mathematics requirement and is split regarding English. She suggested that the requirements should be driven by whether the student’s goals are vocationally or transfer-oriented. R. Smith noted concern among counselors regarding the raised requirement. G. Morgan stated the Fire Academy faculty’s position: increase English, status quo on mathematics. A.M. Valle, speaking for the Educational Assistance Center, took the same position as Social Sciences. The Science Department favors raising both requirements (M. Abram). The Letters department leans toward raising English standards but takes no position on mathematics (A. Rodriguez, E. Caruth). The Business Department has taken no position on either issue (R. Cabral). L. Fauth, speaking for the English Department, noted the position: yes on English, status quo on mathematics. Discussion followed along with a straw poll of Senators present. Fauth stated that he would cast his vote accordingly.

**VII. Action Items**—were deferred until the next meeting except for consideration of financial support of Multicultural Day.

C. Dorrance suggested a \$300 Senate donation to the Multicultural Day celebration, along with inviting faculty to make personal donations as well. This motion was

seconded by A. Hayashi. Discussion followed, especially regarding existing scholarship obligations. Dorrance called the question. The motion was carried.

**VIII. Committee Reports**—Fauth noted that sabbatical applications are due soon. He also noted that the next Senate meeting will begin with committee reports. A.M. Valle: get involved with the enrollment decline issue. Fauth: 97 class sections were cut from the 2002-03 academic year and 1100 students were lost. The College also lost 800 more students during 2003-04. R. Smith suggested enrolling students immediately after orientation. Further discussion followed about the practicality of offering continuous enrollment.

There being no further business to come before the Senate, the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Stough, Secretary