

Oxnard College Academic Senate

MINUTES

Date: October 8, 2012

Members present and absent:

Academic Senate Executive Board	
Linda Kamaila, President	Present
Robert Cabral, Vice President	Absent
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. Kim Karkos, Present
Counseling	1. Graciela Tortorelli, Present
Dental Programs	1. Vacant
Fine Arts and Performing Arts	1. Vacant
Fire Programs/T.V.	1. Vacant
Letters	1. Teresa Bonham, Present 2. Gaylene Croker, Present ----- 1 PT Vacant 2. PT Vacant
Library	1. Tom Stough, Present
Math	1. Cat Yang, Present 2. Vacant ----- 1 PT Vacant
Part-Time Faculty Rep. at-Large	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, Present
Student Support Services (EOPS)	1. Gloria Lopez, Present

Social Sciences	1. Marie Butler, Present 2. Gloria Guevara, Present ----- 1. PT Vacant
Technology/CRM	1. Vacant
AFT Vice-President	1. Jenny Redding, Present

Non-Voting Faculty:

Jim Merrill, Chris Horrock, Christina Tafoya, Chris Mainzer, Ishita Edwards

Guests:

Richard Duran, Carolyn Inouye, Karen Engelsen, Carmen Guerrero, Cynthia Herrera

Called to Order by President L. Kamaila at 2:33pm

Public Comment:

I. Dr. Duran

- A. There is a Board Meeting here at OC tomorrow in the Black Box at 3:00 pm with a Citizens Advisory Committee following at 6:00 pm. The main item of discussion will be the Accreditation Report approval.
- B. The campus newsletter went out at end of September. If you have something to add, email your Dean the information.
- C. The Budget Forums are October 9th from 9:00-11:00 am and October 11th from 2:00-4:00 pm. Also, pension reforms will be discussed by Patricia Parham.
- D. Friday 10-10-12 is the annual Youth Conference. Approximately 700 high school students will attend to experience the activities of Oxnard College life.
- E. An Integrated Planning Model is being drafted for the Accreditation Team Visit for November.
- F. He thanked faculty for their participation with the Tarjeada and Ralph Smith's memorial. To further donate to Ralph's campus memorial, make checks payable to The OC Foundation.
- G. We are searching for a permanent Dean for Liberal Studies. The goal is to have a Dean here to start in January 2013.
- H. We are also in the process of hiring a counselor to replace Ralph Smith. Dr. Duran said, he "does not anticipate the canceling of this position. It is [his] commitment to fill this position."

II. **Christina Tafoya** produced a document of key points about the OC Dental Assisting and Dental Hygiene Programs. She says "give us a year to repair our problems and then, if necessary, we will put ourselves up for elimination." See Document # 1 at the end of these minutes for her complete written statement.

III. **Marta Erazo** (Dental Assisting student) gave a passionate plea to save the Dental Assisting program. She wanted to let faculty know that we need this program to provide students better career opportunities. She says, "Please think twice." Her complete statement can be found as Document #2 at the end of these minutes.

IV. **Christina Campos** (Dental Assisting student) explained the importance of keeping Dental Assisting. She reviewed the OC mission from the catalogue and connected the program directly to it. She says, "Please reconsider your decision."

- V. **Jim Merrill** made a comment stating he is disappointed in PBC and EVP's decisions to discontinue the Television instructional program. He provided some historical context of the program and argued that it never had the consistency to grow. He also adds that TV R100 is part of the Communication Studies AA-T.
- VI. **President Kamaila** welcomed **Graciela Tortorelli** as the Full-Time Senate representative for Counseling.

Changes to the Agenda: There were no changes to the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

- Minutes from September 24, 2012 written by AS Vice President R. Cabral:
- 1st Diane Eberhardy 2nd Jenny Redding
- Corrections made: Motion Carried

Treasurer's Report \$1,665.74

Reports

CUDS report by Diane Eberhardy

- The committee will meet tomorrow 10-9-12
- The Parking Lot B issue concerning STAFF labels is resolved.
- Some other concerns about Parking Lot A were mentioned. Diane will take it back to the committee.

PBC report by Linda Kamaila

- She reviewed the PBC decision about Program Discontinuance. Programs slated for discontinuance by PBC are Dental Hygiene, Dental Assisting, Television, and Engineering Technology.
- She then reviewed the EVP's proposal which is to cut: Engineering Technology (\$45,000), Television (\$155,000), Dental Assisting (\$270,000) regardless of Prop 30 passing or not. She then adds an additional \$330, 000 of cuts to G.E.

PEPC: No Report

DCAA/DCHR: No Report

Ongoing Business

A. PBC: AP 4021 Program discontinuance and reduction.

- President Kamaila led a discussion about Program Discontinuance. She reviewed that the Senate is charged with reacting to PBC's response and the EVP's response. (see above PBC report for clarification) She reminded Senators that they are only a recommending body; the Senate is not the final decision making body.
- Senators were very concerned that EVP's decisions were cuts regardless of prop 30 passing or not. PBC only voted for these program cuts *if* Prop 30 does NOT pass.
- Senators discussed the need for Administration to make some cuts.
- Senators made some comments about the OC Foundation contributing more money rather than keeping swap meet monies in their reserves. Although they are already committed to \$200,000 per year (one million total over five years), in this time of crisis, it seems this is yet another avenue for exploration. Senators mentioned that R. Cabral sits on the OC Foundation Board and he might be the resource to bring this idea to their agenda.

- Senators were very concerned with the EVP's additional cuts to GE monies. Senators asked, what specifically is she slating for cuts?
- Discussion about the cost of courses taught by part-timers verse full-timers took place. Further, Senators noted that we down to very low numbers of part-time faculty so these next cuts will also touch the full-time faculty without a doubt.
- Concerns were raised about the EVP's cuts of 67% of ESL without discussion. Senators noted that this is very high for a Spanish speaking serving institution.
- Motion to affirm the PBC decision of slated programs to be discontinued *only* if Prop. 30 does not pass AND to demur the EVP's proposal was called. (In other words, voting yes on this motion supported the PBC recommendation and rejected the EVP recommendation; the EVP recommendation was whether or not Prop. 30 passed or not)

1st Diane Eberhardy 2nd Jenny Redding

YES votes: 6

NO votes: 2

Abstentions: 8

Motion carries.

B. Responses to District Participatory Governance Handbook

- J. Redding spoke to different issues that are listed in her document titled "Observations Pertaining to the Districts Participatory Governance Handbook" [See Document #3 at the end of the minutes.] The Senate agreed that these observations should be presented at Consultation Council by President Kamaila. President Kamaila agreed.
- Discussion about Board decision making processes and transparency took place.

C. Communication

- J. Redding briefly mentioned the AFT meeting. She distributed minutes from their last meeting. See Document #4 at the end of these minutes.
- A brief discussion about the importance of keeping Athletics took place.
- The remaining Senators offered Linda some guidance for her speech at the Board Meeting on 10-9-12. Senators asked her to defend the "community" in community college. They asked her to demand that the Board show some vision and use reserves if necessary. We want to see more vision and planning. We also need to know the Board is using their institutional memory when they make decisions.

D. Memorial for Ralph Smith

- Discussion about what to do to honor Ralph on campus took place. Senators discussed whether or not to have a scholarship in Ralph's name or something more permanent on campus. The Senate agreed that they would like something more permanent since a scholarship will not be sustainable long term. Diane Eberhardy is researching our options.

New Business

A. Prop 30 Forum Planning:

- The Senate agreed this is a good idea in association with the ASG. L. Kamaila will contact them.

B. Upcoming Educational Master Plan: Tabled

C. District-wide Curriculum Mapping: Tabled

Adjourned @ 4: 32

Supporting Documents

Document #1: Public Comment made by Christina Tayofa

Academic Senate

Please consider these key points about the
Oxnard College Dental Assisting and Dental Hygiene Programs.

Dental Assisting:

1. A radical program revision has already been submitted to Curriculum Committee
 - a. one-semester program with no part-time faculty
 - a. only costs to college would be the existing full-time faculty (\$4000-6000 is estimated cost above full-time faculty →the *Dental Care Foundation has already provided a check for \$3030*; it is expected that the Santa Barbara-Ventura County Dental Society will vote tomorrow to cover the additional cost)
 - b. new *FTES would be approximately 29*
2. Even though there are other advertised DA programs, they are not the same
 - a. ROP is “high school” level
 - b. proprietary schools charge in the range of \$35K/yr (*our new program will be less \$1000K + would also fill other courses for Cert of Achievement and GE for degree pattern*)
3. Not trying to “save” Dental Assisting Program at all costs; trying to revise it into a program that is of minimal cost to the college, but will still meet student (and employer) needs; program faculty agree that if revisions do not work, then we will recommend the DA Program for elimination the following year (2014-15)
4. DA has pretty good success, retention, and completion rates (these vary, of course, but I believe have been between about 75% -98%). It is also a program that completes 100% of its SLO assessments, enters eLumen data, does its mapping, completes its PEPRs, etc. → OC needs programs that help boost these statistics for whole college.
5. Demand still exists for DAs
 - a. Calls come in year round from employers looking to hire our DA grads
 - b. DAs make \$12-20/hr, which is significant earnings for someone with one-year or less of college

Dental Hygiene:

1. Has already been reduced in half from two cohorts each year to one, accreditation prohibits radical changes
2. Hygienists make \$60-90K/yr—life changing for most graduates; hygienists have always traditionally worked part-time
3. Nationally renowned program; has consistent 100% pass rates on board exams
4. Draws students from all over → priority entrance is given to OC students, which helps fill other courses at OC, even if student never applies for DH
5. Serves an estimated 1000 adults and children each year, many other whom would otherwise not receive care

Document #2: Public Comment made by Marta Erazo (OC student)

To who concern:

My name is Marta Erazo Palacios. I was born in Mexico City and I came to The United States when I was 23 years old. Coming to the United States I did not know any English. I came to Oxnard College to take ESL classes in 2003. After that I took general classes and then I got my AA

in 2007. I come from a low income family and I do not have insurance. The reason that I chose to attend DH department is because I have no dental insurance and I am grateful that I did because that was my incentive to pursue a Dental Hygiene career. Following my graduation, I took all my prerequisites for DH program for two and a half years here in Oxnard College. I had been accepted into the DH program in 2010, however due to financial challenges I was not able to do the program at that time. So I decided to do Dental Assisting for the meantime while I saved money in order to follow my dream. I also decided to stay in this college because I cannot afford to go to another college. I am the first one to graduate from college in my family. Without Dental Hygiene Program I would not be able to provide stability to myself and my family.

Document #3: Written by Jenny Redding

OBSERVATIONS PERTAINING TO THE DISTRICT'S *PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE HANDBOOK*

On page 8:

Under **Implementation of the Law in VCCCD**, the *Handbook* states, “Ventura County Community College District and its Colleges’ governance groups strive to put into practice the spirit and principles of participatory governance.” Under this specified language, the Brown Act should be liberally applied to the following groups because the group is legally obligated to be such by legal precedent (case law and/or legal opinions issued by the State Attorney General, or because a board should not be able to create some structure and substructure by which it can do business outside of Brown Act compliance. If the Board is influenced by such structure or substructure then, under the spirit of the Brown Act if not in fact, the District should operate the business of these structures and substructures under the Brown Act. Although never specified in the *Handbook*, the Colleges’ Academic Senates are obliged to function under The Brown Act per Attorney General Opinion (LO 83-304) and by virtue of case law in which Academic Senate have been sued for not complying with The Brown Act. In order to avoid undue legal exposure the following recommendations are being made.

On page 9:

At the top of page 9, furthermore, the *Handbook* states, “An inclusive governance structure enables members of the VCCCD community to participate in developing recommendations for consideration by the Board of Trustees”; in other words, these structures and substructures inform and influence the Board. This is further evidence that the *Handbook* should specify that such structures and substructures should be under the Brown Act in their functioning.

On page 11:

Under subpoint 4 wherein the *Handbook* states, “These District groups are not subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act and therefore are not public meetings” should be eliminated by virtue of the aforementioned sections of pages 8 and 9.

On page 12:

At the bottom of page 12, the final paragraph should apply to all appropriate structures and substructures that inform and influence the Board of Trustees, and the language cited on this page should be repeated (albeit modified to pertain to the particular structure and/or substructures) where appropriate throughout the *Handbook*, e.g., “As a legislative body, the VCCCD Board of Trustees conducts deliberations and actions openly within the real of public scrutiny consistent with Government Code Section 54953, also known as the Ralph M. Brown Act. Minutes are prepared for all actions taken by the VCCCD Board of Trustees to serve as the District’s public record.”

On page 16:

Under “District Consultation Council” following the bulleted items, the *Handbook* states, “Constituent agreement/disagreement on Board items discussed in Consultation Council are noted as Board informational items in the Chancellor’s summary statement ‘Chancellor’s Recommendations of Board of Trustees Agenda.’” Further, at the bottom of p. 16, the *Handbook* states, “The authority of the District Consultation Council is limited by the scope of delegated Board authority to the Chancellor, . . .” Both of these instances reveal that this substructure (e.g., District Consultation Council) both influences and informs the Board as well as has its authority circumscribed by the Board and, therefore, should be subject to the Brown Act.

On page 17:

The constitution of the Consultation Council is the following: 7 administrative members, 7 faculty members, 4 staff members, and 3 student members, thereby denying faculty primacy if areas of the 10+1 under Title 5 will be dealt with by this substructure. Council membership should be reexamined.

On page 18:

Pertaining to the Administrative Technology Advisory Committee, the membership includes 11 administrative members and members of no other constituency group. The question is whether or not this substructure deals in any way with the 10+1 areas under Title 5. If so, the makeup of this substructure is inappropriate.

On page 19:

The “District Council on Human Resources” charge includes, according to the *Handbook*, “Develop the first draft of Board policies on human resources” and “Develop the first draft of District procedures to implement the related Board policies on human resources.” Clearly this language overtly claims to influence the Board and, therefore, this substructure should be under The Brown Act. Also, the composition of this substructure is as follows: 6 administrative members, 4 faculty members, and 3 staff members. If any items of the 10+1 under Title 5 are dealt with by this substructure, then the substructure membership should be revisited.

On page 20:

The composition of the “Institutional Research Advisory Committee” is as follows: 1 administrative member, 6 staff members, and no faculty members. If this substructure deals with any of the 10+1 items under Title 5, then the substructure membership should be reexamined.

On page 21:

Under the “District Council on Academic Affairs,” the *Handbook* states, “The District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA) advises the Chancellor through Cabinet and the District Consultation Council regarding instructional program development and related Board policies . . .” thereby overtly stating that this substructure influences the Board. Therefore, this substructure should be under The Brown Act. Further, the membership of this substructure is as follows: 7 administrative members, 7 faculty members, and 1 student member. As this substructure clearly deals with 10+1 items under Title 5, the membership of this substructure needs to be reexamined as guarantee of faculty primacy in the 10+1 areas cannot be guaranteed by its current membership.

On pages 22, 24:

Under the description of the “District Technical Review Workgroup – Instructional” the *Handbook* states, “The DTRW-I is responsible for reviewing new and substantively revised courses and programs prior to submission through DCAA to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees,” thereby overtly referencing its influence on the Board of Trustees. As a result, this substructure should be under The Brown Act.

Further, membership on this substructure as related on p. 24 is as follows: 4 administrative members, and 6 faculty members. As this substructure clearly deals in 10+1 items under Title 5, the membership in this substructure needs to be reexamined in order to guarantee faculty primacy in the 10+1 areas.

On page 24:

In describing the “District Technical Review Workgroup – Student Services” the *Handbook* states, “It [DTRW-SS] is responsible for the review and development of Board policies,” and as such influences the Board and should function under The Brown Act.

On page 25:

As a substructure of the District Consultation Council, the “District Council on Administrative Services” should function under the Brown Act. Further, the membership in this substructure is as follows: 5 administrative members, 5 faculty members, 3 staff members, and 3 student members. Because this substructure deals with 10+1 items under Title 5, the substructure membership needs to be revisited as the current membership cannot guarantee faculty primacy over the 10+1 areas.

On page 26:

The membership in the Instructional Technology Advisory Committee is as follows: 4 administrative members, 2 faculty members, and 3+ staff members. If this group deals with the 10+1 areas of faculty primacy under Title 5, then the membership in this substructure should be reexamined as its current makeup is inappropriate to guarantee such primacy.

On page 28:

In describing the “District Council on Academic Affairs,” the *Handbook* states, “The District Council on Academic Affairs (DCAA): advises the Chancellor and administration through Cabinet and the District Consultation Council regarding instructional program development and related board policies . . .” This language overtly states that this substructure thereby influences the Board and should thus function under The Brown Act.

Document #4: Written by Jenny Redding: AFT Minutes

HIGHLIGHTS FROM AFT EXEC COUNCIL MEETING: 10/5/12

1. Approval of Annual Financial Audit: A review of our Local’s financial position is required by law (or an official audit). The Treasurer and President opted for an official review of our financial position by an independent auditor. Only one item was highlighted, namely, reconciling the Local’s checkbook against the accounting records on computer as opposed to reconciling against the bank statement. Other minor items mentioned were possibly investing in a Money Market account and keeping more documentation on capital expenditures. The auditor presented no major exceptions on the internal controls presently in place. R. Gregg stated that this report was a good one.
2. Labor Organizer Report: Rudy distributed numerous Yes on Prop 30, No on Prop. 32 campaign flyers, stickers, etc. He requested campus VPs to email Steward commitments to vote as such in upcoming election. A discussion ensued about the details in reviewing argumentation documents. Rudy raised the question as to whether we should send people to Sacramento to lobby in favor of Prop. 30. S. Hall explained that a newsletter with an article clarifying the issues will be sent out soon. A Yes on 30, No on 32 Phone Bank will occur Monday, Oct. 8th through Thursday, Oct. 11th at the Union Office from 2 p.m. to 8 p.m. Phones will be provided and food will be offered. This effort is directed to our Local’s members. Rudy also noted that a precinct walk will occur tomorrow, Sat., Oct. 6th, as well as Sat., Nov. 3rd.

- 3.S. Hall noted that a F/T member of the Negotiations Team has dropped off the Team (from MC) as well as a P/T member (from OC). After much discussion, it was decided that S. Hall should send an ALLUSERS email to pertinent faculty at the respective colleges (MC and OC) to seek replacement Team members. If, after one week, insufficient response occurs, the current Team will continue in place.
- 4.M. Hittleman spoke regarding issues at statewide level, namely, accreditation issues and the fact that the ACCJC is a private entity with no real accountability to anyone. Administrators around the State are watching what is happening with CCSF. Some are feeling ready to take action against the ACCJC. A lawyer is investigating at present regarding issues such as due process. Cuesta College and College of the Redwoods are also on Show Cause. Some of the issues at CCSF which is also on Show Cause involve supposedly too few administrators, shared governance issues, and P/T being so expensive, there is no advantage to hiring P/T over F/T. One group is working to use the example of CCSF (California Competes) to get rid of shared governance.
- 5.P. Munoz reported that the Symposium sponsored by AFT involving representation on a panel from the State Academic Senate, FACCC, and CFT, was a success with 64 faculty in attendance. Cost for the event was under \$2,000. She suggested sponsoring it every year as it was well received.