

Oxnard College Academic Senate

MINUTES

Date: November 14, 2011

Members present and absent:

Academic Senate Executive Board	
Robert Cabral, President	Absent
Linda Kamaila, Vice President	Present
Diane Eberhardy, Treasurer	Present
Amy Edwards, Secretary	Present
Department	Senators
Addictive Disorders Studies	1. Vacant
Business/CIS/Legal Assisting	1. Diane Eberhardy, Present
Child Development	1. Vacant
Counseling	1. Ralph Smith, Present
Dental Programs	1. Vacant
Fine Arts	1. Vacant
Fire Programs/T.V.	1. Vacant
Letters	1. Teresa Bonham, Present 2. Lynn Fauth, Present 3. Cecilia Milan, Present ----- 1 Pt Vacant 2. Pt Vacant
Library	1. Tom Stough, Jenny Redding as Proxy
Math	1. Cat Yang, Present 2. Maria Parker, Cat Yang as Proxy ----- 1 Bill Greason, Absent
Part-Time Faculty Rep. at-Large	1. Vacant
Performing Arts	1. Vacant
Physical Education/Health	1. L. Ron McClurkin, Present
Natural Sciences	1. Shannon Newby, Present 2. James Harber, Absent ----- 1 Pt Vacant 2. Pt Vacant

Student Support Services (EAC, Health Center)	1. Della Newlow, Absent
Student Support Services (EOPS)	1. Ana Maria Valle, Gloria Lopez as Proxy
Social Sciences	1. Marie Butler, Present 2. Gloria Guevara, Present ----- 1. Pt. Vacant
Technology/CRM	1. Andrew Cawelti, Absent
AFT Vice-President	1. Jenny Redding, Present

Non-Voting Faculty: Jonas Crawford, Alan Hayashi, Ishita Edwards, Carolyn Dorrance

Guests: Erika Endrijonas, Juan Smith, Oscar Machuca, Carlos Gonzalez

I. Call to Order

Academic Senate (AS) Vice President **L. Kamaila** called meeting to order at 2:39pm

II. Public Comments/Announcements

- Treasurer's Report: \$1,455.37
- **President Richard Duran**
 - He provided an update on Accreditation.
 - The recent visit went well. The team was very pleased with our progress at the campus level. The team felt we met the standard, but they do not make the final ruling.
 - The next step is that Dr. Duran will receive a Draft Report (before Thanksgiving) so he can review for errors of fact. It will then be sent to the commission to be reviewed in January and then we will receive a letter (late January) about our status.
 - We might not meet the assessment of student learning, but we are hoping to be taken off warning, although Dr. Duran does not think that will happen.
 - He announced the ASG forum that will take place Thursday, November 17 from 6:00-8:00pm. It is open to the community and community council members and Board members will be present. The focus will be the program cuts to Oxnard College.
 - He announced the Fire Tech graduation that will take place in December. He said more details will be coming soon.
- **Trustee Bernardo Perez**
 - He began with his background. Then explained that he wants to get to know us better and he spoke to his approach to situations. With over 20 years of service, he claims that "process is important to me" and "the timely flow of information is important to me as a decision maker."
 - He wanted the Senate to know that "the Board is listening and the Board is not ignoring the public comments."

- He asked that the Senate provide more background and historical facts in order to show a broader picture.
- Senator **Lynn Fauth** questioned **Trustee Perez** asking, “Is there a stopping point in sight [in regard to our campus cuts]? When will the Board say enough?” **L. Fauth** brought his attention to the data on the Summary of Recalculation Apportionment FTES and Apprentice Hours and commented that the cuts are disproportional and he highlighted several sections. **L. Fauth** continued that there is a lack of planning and he asked, “Where is the Board?”
- **Trustee Perez** responded with an appreciation for Lynn’s comments and asked for the analyzed numbers to be emailed to him directly. Lynn agreed to email them to the Board.
- **L. Kamaila** commented that our campus is feeling it even worse than the others because we do great outreach and get the high school students in and then we turn them away because we aren’t offering enough sections. She asked **Trustee Perez**, “aren’t there other solutions because we won’t get our programs back?”
- **Trustee Perez** responded saying, “why can’t alternative action plans come to us for us [The Board] to consider? Any idea deserves to be considered and we will weigh and discuss what comes to us.”
- **L. Fauth** explained a bit about OC history and hierarchy.
- A discussion about “dialogue” began. The main focus was that dialogue seems to have stopped at the Board level and that’s filtering down and the Senate hopes the Board will get back to a dialogue mode to help students which is the point of our education system.
- **Trustee Perez** remarked, “Communication and the flow of communication is important.”
- **Chris Horrock** asked the Board to come to our campus and commented on the small venue and arrangement of seating for the Board meetings. He claimed that the meetings leave people feeling powerless because everything is too tailored and managed.
- **Trustee Perez** again commented how he will look at alternative proposals and agreed that “the Board should go on the road into the community because they are for the people.” When he first started in this position he thought that there was such small public presence, but that has changed.
- A bit of college history was then reported to **Trustee Perez**. The Senate explained that OC has some special needs and in order for a small college to survive, it needs and deserves a holistic approach.
- **Trustee Perez** was happy to hear some more historical perspective and commented that there must have been a need for three colleges because of growth. He also commented that the State’s budget is terrible so this is unprecedented, but “those with the greatest need deserve the greatest response.” He added, “I know the decisions I make do have a broader result.”
- The Senate then went back to the numbers and the allocation model and discussed how our campus is in a downward death spiral and it is time for the other campuses to take more of the cuts now since our portion is at 51.3% of the entire district cuts.
- **Trustee Perez** asked for the Senate to put it down on paper and **Lynn Fauth** did and emailed a PowerPoint to Trustee Perez and Trustee Hernandez. He added, “I don’t know very much about this yet, but we [The Board] need to look at all of this information because we are serving more than one campus.” He asked for the Senate to help him identify what he doesn’t know.

- The Senate also discussed that there is a 4th campus (the District) and they need to be part of the cut discussion.
 - A discussion about the reserves then started and the Senate asked **Trustee Perez** to look into using the reserves. He commented, “you build reserves with sacrifice; when is it time to use that?”
 - The discussion ended with **Amy Edwards** agreeing to forward these minutes to the Board at **Trustee Perez’s** request.
- **Juan Smith**, OC Student, spoke on behalf of all OC students. He asked the Senate to come to the next Board meeting.

III. Senate Action Items

- October 24, 2011 Meeting Minutes
 - One change of “in” to “it”
 - 1st **Shannon Newby**; 2nd **Teresa Bonham**; Motion Carried; no abstentions

IV. Impact of Budget Cuts

- DCAS: No Report
- Planning and Budgeting Council
 - **Ishita Edwards**, one PBC rep, reported that the committee asked for data and said there were some problems with the data and John al-Amin told her he is working on it. She added that they haven’t come to any solution, but we will have some recommendations on Wednesday at the PBC meeting.
 - **Jenny Redding** wrote a commentary on Dr. Duran’s analysis responding to questions from PBC, both of which are attached below.
 - Several Senators commented that they wanted more of a report from PBC reps at the Senate meetings.
 - PBC reps asked for a plan for them to take to the Wednesday meeting.
 - A discussion about alternate cut proposals began.
 - There was discussion of a proposal written by **Jim Merrill** and one by **Alan Hayashi**.
- Program Effectiveness and Planning Committee: tabled

V. Participatory Governance Committee Reports: ALL REPORTS TABLED

- Campus Use, Development, and Safety Committee
- Curriculum Committee
- Learning Outcomes Team Committee
- Professional Development Committee
- Technology Committee

VI. Standing Committee Reports

- Accreditation Committee: Tabled
- AFT Report: Tabled
- Distance Education: Tabled

- Sabbatical Committee:
 - **Ishita Edwards** reported that four people have been awarded sabbaticals. They are:
 - Cecelia Milan
 - Shannon Newby
 - Teresa Bonham
 - Alan Hayashi
 - And Jose Vega is the alternate
- Student Success Committee: Tabled
- Transitional Studies: Tabled

(District Committees)

- Report on DCHR: Tabled
- Report on DCSL: Tabled
- Report on DTRW: Tabled

VII. Old Business:

***See PBC report above**

VIII. New Business

- Across-Campus Reading Project: Tabled
- FSA Procedures: Tabled
- Academic Senate discussion on confidence:
 - The Senate had a discussion on their lack of confidence for the local campus administration. The Senate agreed that they are fundamentally losing confidence in their leaders and the Senate feels they are not doing their duty to the college. They asked that if PBC is ignored, they would like a written rationale why he's not taking the Senate's advice.
 - **Andres Orozo** commented that one of his students has been discouraged from speaking out in public comments, which he sees as a lack of leadership. He comments that if anyone has a question about the TV program, ask him, not his students. Senate agreed that this is an example of what it means when it says the Senate is losing confidence in the leadership of our Local Administration.
 - A discussion also began about the fact that OC did not get to hire any new faculty when the other 2 campuses did.
 - The meeting ended on the statement that "we are spiraling down under the leadership of **Dr. Duran**."

IX. Adjournment

Adjourned by **VP Linda Kamaila** at 4:25pm

- Next Meeting November 28, 2011

October 20, 2011 (*Revised 10/25/11*)

To: President Duran

From: Robert Cabral, Co-chair of PBC (acting chair of the October 19, 2011 meeting)
CC: John al-Amin, Co-chair of PBC

RE: PBC Meeting Outcomes: Request for additional clarification and information relating to the President's memo on proposed program discontinuation.

President Duran,

The following items were agreed on and requested by the PBC committee at its October 19th meeting. Additionally, in order for the committee to proceed with providing a timely recommendation on program discontinuation to the President's office, the committee is requesting the information to be delivered to the PBC co-chairs by October 28th.

1. A narrative and explanation on how you identify the 8 programs considered for discontinuation among all programs. Please also include your rationale for using the 4 criteria points for discontinuation. Why do CTE programs represent 88% of the proposed program discontinuations?

Given the anticipated budget shortfall as identified by the Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services and presented to the Board of Trustees for FY 2012-13 and in the absence of a District approved Administrative Procedure (AP) for Program Discontinuance, the guidelines to identifying possible programs for discountenance was determined by Chancellor's Cabinet and applicable to all campuses. **The guidelines included:**

- Consolidation of programs across the District
- Duplication of programs available in the community
- Productivity / efficiency
- Disciplines are available on other campuses to meet degree or certificate requirements

The Chancellor requested that each campus identify possible programs for discontinuance using the guidelines. Senior management at OC identified possible programs with input from the Deans utilizing the guidelines which resulted in the number of CTE programs identified. It just so happened that a greater number of CTE programs met one or more of the criteria than non-CTE programs. The number of programs identified for possible discontinuance also reflects the proportional instructional share of the campus budget in relation the targeted assigned campus budget reduction.

The Co-chairs were presented the list in the memo dated August 31st requesting input from the PBC in accordance with the Planning / Budget process which would not normally have begun until January after the Governor submits his proposed budget. This is unusual given the exigency facing the District. The President subsequently addressed the PBC and recommended the use of several of the data elements in the emerging

proposed AP for Program Discontinuance for further analysis. The PBC agreed to the use of the data elements recommended which was subsequently provided at the next meeting of the PBC on September 20th with additional information regarding the rationale for each program.

As the dialogue continues within the PBC, I am and have been concerned about the net impact on the total FTES loss the programs represent in the list I presented to the committee. As such I am evaluating what FTES target we need to achieve for 2012-13 so that we do not spiral in downward enrollment which will affect the percentage total of the allocation to OC in relation to the other campuses. This target may materially affect the final decision on how many programs may need to be discontinued. Of course, since this is a zero-sum game and if any program is removed from the list, I will have to find additional cuts from the rest of campus resources. While I continue to evaluate other possibilities, I request that the PBC continue analysis of the programs as requested.

2. Please provide the general fund dollar cost per FTES (GF\$/FTES) of all campus programs.

Dr. al-Amin will be able to provide you with this information after he returns from his accreditation visit. He returns to campus on October 31st. Please be advised that on October 31st and November 1st we will be hosting the accreditation site team.

3. What are the mandated district cuts that are currently being planned?

The District's range of cuts based on the anticipated \$11-13 M budget reduction is between \$ 731,000 and \$863,000. It is proportional to the District wide reduction the same as each campus target reduction.

4. Please clarify the Program Summary report;

- Auto Body indicates an "other fund" category of approximately \$65,000. The CTE dean reported to the committee the actual amount is closer to \$1,000. What constitutes "other fund" dollars?
- The Program Summary sheet does not clearly delineate general fund dollars versus other non-general fund dollars. Please include a column that identifies non-general fund dollars.
- The Program Summary does not accurately match the program dollars as reported in banner. Please provide accurate and consistent program information that aligns what is being provided to PBC versus what the division managers are managed by.
- Please provide separately a row in the Program Summary for TV and for OCTV.

See response to question #2.

5. What is the amount of Perkins funding for future fiscal academic years after the proposed programs have been discontinued?

Based on the plan submitted each year, the amount of funding is adjusted. Until that occurs, we won't know what the effects of program discontinuance will be on Perkins funding.

6. What are the student gender and ethnicity of those programs identified for discontinuation?

This information has already been provided in the data submitted to the PBC. However, the attachment on demographics provides updated information.

7. How many EOPS, Financial Aid, and EAC students are represented in those programs considered for discontinuation?

Please see the attachment on demographics with the requested data addressing this question.

8. If all programs in the memo are discontinued what is the actual net change to the general fund for OC using the district allocation model?

See response #1 and #2.

9. The committee had a discussion on “zero-sum” budget reductions, in order for PBC to offer a qualified recommendation to the President, what other instructional programs, business services, student services or other areas of the college are being considered to account for the \$2.5 million reduction?

The balance of the cuts, depending on the final decision of which programs are approved for discontinuance, under consideration will necessarily come from athletics, operations, classified staff and management as has been the case in the past three years. In the end we must reach our targeted budget reduction number to present to the Chancellor and ultimately the Board.

**COMMENTS ON PRESIDENT DURAN'S "ANALYSIS" ON DATA
EXPLAINING HIS RATIONALE FOR SELECTING THE EIGHT PROGRAMS
TARGETED FOR DISCONTINUANCE**

*Written by Jenny Redding
Nov. 4, 2011*

1. First off, note that under number 1, Dr. Duran states that “The guidelines included.” This means that there were *other* guidelines. PBC members have consistently asked what those other guidelines were and have been rebuffed at every turn on this issue.

2. Second, these four criteria that we hear about over and over again, are meaningless. It would be like saying to a council which had 100 people standing before them that the council had to decide upon 10 of those people to send to the gas chamber. The criteria to be used would be: (1) choose someone who breathes air; (2) choose someone who has a heart; (3) choose someone who is a human being; and (4) choose someone with lungs. That would include all 100 people standing before the council! At that point, if 10 people were indeed selected, either some other criteria would have had to have been utilized OR the council simply didn't like those 10 people and thus targeted them!

3. Notice on page 2, paragraph 2 of Dr. Duran's "analysis" that he states the following: "As the dialogue continues within PBC, I am and have been concerned about the net impact on the total FTES loss the programs represent in the list I presented to the committee. As such I am evaluating what FTES target we need to achieve for 2012-13 so that we do not spiral in downward enrollment which will affect the percentage total of the allocation to OC in relation to the other campuses. This target may materially affect the final decision on how many programs may need to be discontinued." My comment on these few sentences is that they expose Dr. Duran's lack of forethought as to the consequences of discontinuing the very programs he has recommended be discontinued. This proposal would not even have come forward if such forethought and analysis of the data had been done. Not only that, but Dr. Duran is supposed to be our LEADER, yet he, himself, is having second thoughts about what he, himself recommended the Planning and Budgeting Committee approve! How can the PBC members endorse the President's list of proposed programs when *he, himself* does not endorse his own recommendation!

4. Finally, note on page 3 under number 5 wherein Dr. Duran states, "Based on the plan submitted each year, the amount of funding is adjusted. Until that occurs, we won't know what the effects of program discontinuance will be on Perkins funding." My only comment here is this: Is this planning? How can people make decisions unless they have run the numbers by *hypothetically* discontinuing the programs and analyzing what the possible funding repercussions might be? When John al-Amin

was asked if he could run the allocation model *if these eight programs were discontinued*, he said he could not. It was too *complex*. How can anyone or any group of people *plan* in such an environment? You can only tell what the consequences of a decision are after you actually cut the programs and only then have to deal with the consequences? This is not *planning*; this is ridiculous!

5. Lastly, can one really call this 3 ¼ page “analysis” an “analysis”? Is this the best the administration has to offer on its rationale for targeting these specific programs based on *data*? This response is pathetic, as is the decision to cut programs without adequately assessing the potential negative impacts to the campus’ FTES, funding from the allocation model, and many other possible negative impacts to our students and our campus’ Mission, to name a few.