

Oxnard College Academic Senate
MINUTES

Date: September 23, 2013

Members present and absent:

Academic Senate Executive Board	
Linda Kamaila, President	Absent
Robert Cabral, Vice President	Present
Diane Eberhardy, Treasurer	Present
Amy Edwards, Secretary	Present
Department	Senators
ADS/Paralegal	1. Becca Porter, Present
CAOT/Office Technology	1. Diane Eberhardy, Present
Child Development	1. Vacant
Counseling	1. Graciela Tortorelli, Proxy, Gloria Lopez, Present
Dental Programs	1. Armine Derdarian, Present
Fine Arts and Performing Arts	1. Vacant
Fire Programs	1. Vacant
Letters	1. Teresa Bonham, Present 2. Gaylene Croker, Present ----- 1 PT Vacant 2. PT Vacant
Library	1. Tom Stough, Present
Management	1. Robert Cabral, Present
Math	1. Cat Yang, Present 2. Mark Bates, Present ----- 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, Present

	----- 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	1. Vacant
AFT Vice-President	1. Jenny Redding, Present

Non-Voting Faculty: Kevin Hughes, Chris Mainzer, and Ishita Edwards

Guests: Ken Sherwood, Cesar Flores, Marnie Melendez, Josue Joshua Ruiz, Alan Hayashi, Lynn Fauth

- I. **Vice President Robert Cabral** called the meeting at 2:10
Agenda Approval 1st **Diane Eberhardy** 2nd **Teresa Bonham** Motion Carried
- II. Public Comments: None
- III. Announcements:
 - A. **Secretary Amy Edwards** announced:
 1. Literature, Arts and Lecture Series: 12:45 September 25th Deaf Community Cultural Wealth
 2. Get Moovin' 5K October 12th
 3. Next exhibit at the McNish Gallery
 4. Health Fair September 30 10:00-1:00
 5. All College Forums regarding Educational Master Plan will take place on:
 - a. 10-11 a.m. on Wed. Sept 25 PAB Auditorium
 - b. 2-5 pm on Thurs. Sept. 26 PAB Auditorium
 6. The Board will have a Subcommittee Meeting (open to all) on our Campus to discuss *Current Legislation*. 1-5 pm, Wednesday September 26, PAB Black Box (not the auditorium!).
 7. Regarding the Summer Biotech Institute:
 - a. Dr. James Harber and his Biotech Institute students made considerable progress this last summer defining conditions for differentiation of mouse P19 cells to elongated neurons, differentiating CHO cells to parallel bundles of muscle and DNA sequencing to define a population of unusual bacteria from ocean water.

- IV. Approval of the Minutes: Tabled (skipped by mistake; not because there was an issue with the minutes)
- V. Treasurer Report: **Diane Eberhardy** reports that we have \$2, 123.40 in our account
- VI. Action Items
- A. Resolution to pass EMP:
1. **VP Robert Cabral** called for discussion to start this item.
 2. Senator **Jenny Redding** still sees some problems and distributed a handout. See attached “Document #1” at the end of these minutes. She highlighted a few of the points on the handout. :
 3. Other comments from Senators include:
 - a. page 6...the choice of the word *remedial* was objected to and then discussed in connection to the BOT discussions of two levels below transfer. Senators think *remedial* should be changed to *developmental*.
 - b. *Motion to pass the EMP with the consideration of written commentary from the Senate and with the refinement of *remedial* to *developmental* on page 6 of the document.
1st Jenny Redding 2nd Cat Yang
All approved. Motion carried with no abstentions.

B. Seating of Senators

1. **DTRW**—Motion to approve **Graciela Tortorelli** as Senate rep to DTRW
1st Jenny Redding 2nd Gloria Lopez
All Approved with no abstentions
2. **PEPC**: recommendation to seat **Kevin Hughes** and **Cesar Flores** as Senate reps to PEPC
1st Gloria Lopez 2nd Diane Eberhardy
 - a. Discussion took place beginning with Senators asking “how this was decided?”
 - i. **Secretary Amy Edwards** distributed the Exec evaluation rubric for PBC which she claimed was also used for PEPC decisions. She also commented that this is second reading and all of the names were provided to the Senate at the last meeting and there were no objections.
 - ii. Issues of Experience covered
 - iii. **VP Robert Cabral** clarified the goal of PEPC and the key responsibilities before moving forward.
 - iv. **Senator Redding** asked: If anyone here serves on PEPC, how contentious has it been? She is concerned with non-tenured faculty being in high powered committees. Is this a committee

we should worry about? **Kevin Hughes** said it was transparent, open, and honest last semester. He felt very comfortable.

- v. **Senator Guevara** asked: Why is this suddenly an issue? It seems unfair to set aside PEPC and PBC to be tenure only? Are we writing new laws here? Comments were made such as faculty could decide for themselves. **Senator Bates** agreed **Senator Guevara** and asks what becomes a “non-important” committee?
 - vi. Discussion continued
 - vii. **VP Cabral** recognized Past Academic Senate President **Lynn Fauth** as a guest speaker who expressed his experience with tenure affecting committee assignments. He claims, it seems dangerous for the non-tenured faculty to serve on contentious committees.
 - viii. **Cesar Flores**, a non-tenured faculty, spoke about his concern with this decision and discussed the impact it would have on student services.
 - ix. Guest **Alan Hayashi** commented: If a vote comes up with the Dean on a committee, whatever the decision of that person, is it being influenced by that Dean’s presence?
- b. *Motion called to accept **Kevin Hughes** and **Cesar Flores** as representatives from the Senate to PEPC:
 - c. *Then motion called to postpone this PEPC representation situation until the next meeting
1st Mark Bates 2nd Gloria Guevara
4 voted yes to postpone; 9 voted not to postpone
Thus, Senate did NOT postpone:
 - d. *Motion called again to accept **Kevin Hughes** and **Cesar Flores** as representatives from the Senate to PEPC:
Motion was carried with more YES votes than NO votes.
3. **PBC** recommendation to seat the 8 faculty listed on the agenda as Senate reps to PBC
 - a. Motion to open this up for discussion
1st Mark Bates 2nd Tom Stough

- b. **Senator Redding** stated she wanted to clarify the process which typically begins with departments submitting names. She claims that the by-laws (not updated since 2002) state the Senate President does this in consultation with the Senate. The PG manual is updated more often so it reflects our actual practice. She asked: were these people nominated by their departments? **Amy Edwards** answered “not necessarily.”
- c. ***Senator Mark Bates** put forth a motion to amend the agenda to add **Brett Enge** to the list on the agenda
1st Mark Bates 2nd Amy Edwards
- d. **Mark Bates** then discussed why Math encourages **Brett Enge** to sit on this committee.
- e. *Motion to approve a revision to the agenda’s list of names to add name **Brett Enge** called:
8 yes; 7 opposed; 3 abstentions; **Brett Enge** is now on the list for this discussion.
- f. More discussion took place.
- g. *Motion to accept the 9 faculty on the list as Senate reps to PBC (including **Brett Enge**)
Motion carried with the majority in favor and 2 Senators opposed.

VII. Senate Subcommittee Reports

- A. Curriculum: There was no live report; however, there were notes included the agenda packet distributed at the meeting. See notes for details.
- B. CUDS: **Senator Tom Stough** reports:
 - i. The Dental Hygiene build has been approved and will open Fall 2015.
 - ii. Plans for Condor Hall have not been approved yet expected for 2014.
 - iii. ASG will renovate the Student Lounge.
 - iv. They watched a disturbing video about an active shooter on a college campus and then discussed retrofitting door locks.
 - v. The new college marquee sign placement was covered. Administration decided it will stay where it is planned even after a presentation by **Kevin Hughes**.
 - vi. An ongoing discussion about a technology subcommittee is happening. No one was seated on this sub-committee.
- C. AFT: **Jenny Redding** reports

- i. A tentative agreement has been met. It's been a long, hard road. It goes to the BOT tomorrow night. One Senator asked about DE and Senator Redding reported that DE has been taken off the table.
- ii. Two irregularities of the tenure process have been reported.

D. Sabbatical: **Amy Edwards** (not a member of the committee) announced:

- i. the Sabbatical Committee meets on 2nd Monday at 12:30 pm in the Admin Services building and the committee needs more members.
- ii. Also, the call for sabbatical proposals begins now and ends November 1st.

VIII: A brief comment by **Senator Newlow** about *College Hour* took place here for the Good of the Order:

1. She says, that the subcommittee decided that the 12:30-1:50pm time slot would work best because the majority of classes are not offered at this time.
2. She also commented that this is most likely going to become a voluntary college hour.
3. A calendar/handout was distributed, but not discussed at this time.

IX Adjournment at 3:15

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary Amy Edwards

Supporting Document #1: Written and Distributed by Jenny Redding
COMMENTS ON LATEST DRAFT OF MASTER EDUCATIONAL PLAN 2013-2019
IN LIGHT OF 10+1 ISSUES

p. 6:

Under “**Our Mission**,” I would point out that the Mission of the California Community Colleges at the State level does not qualify the legal obligation to provide services/courses based on “need and available resources.” Rather, the State Mission states that the community **shall** provide these programs, etc. Thus, I object to the second paragraph under “Our Mission” wherein the District Educational Master Plan states, “Effective, efficient student services are offered to assist in the accomplishment of the District’s primary mission based on need and available resources.” Further, I object to paragraph 3 wherein the Draft states, “Additionally, workforce and economic development activities and services are offered based on need and available resources.” I also object to language in paragraph 4 wherein the Draft states, “English as a Second Language instruction, remedial, adult education, and supplemental learning services that contribute to student success are offered and operated based on need and available resources.” The language in the Mission Statement does not align with the Mission as stated at the State level. The language should be changed.

p. 11:

Under Objective number 2 of Goal 1, “**Establish greater uniformity from the student perspective: seamless registration that enables students to enroll in multiple colleges; common course numbers, etc. . . .**,” is a direct threat to 10+1, curriculum. Uniform course numbers means that the District is aiming

to usurp the current campus Curriculum Committees' rights to purview over curriculum at each campus. Under Title 5, Ed. Code, each campus' Curriculum Committee is currently the only *legal entity* that can process curriculum at each campus. There is no district curriculum committee. The District Technical Review Workgroup – Instruction is **not** a district curriculum committee as defined under the law. Therefore, DTRW-I does not have the right to change unit values in an official course outline of record. Unless all three Academic Senates vote to create a District Curriculum Committee, this responsibility of developing curriculum cannot be removed from the campus curriculum committee. Under Title 5 and Ed Code, each campus curriculum committee with a preponderance of faculty on each of these committees, has the right and responsibility for developing curriculum most appropriate for its student population. Therefore, this objective under Goal 1 cannot be achieved unless a District Curriculum Committee is formed and each Senate agrees to **give away** its current rights under the *mutually agree or primarily rely upon* as defined under Title 5. I would argue that the three campuses serve disparate community needs and that the current structure best serves the ability of each campus faculty to create curriculum that most properly serves the needs of its particular student population. Unless there is agreement among the three campus curriculum committees **and** the three Academic Senates, this objective cannot be achieved.

Objective 4 under Goal 2, “**Increase and widely promote services, support systems, and activities designed to facilitate success, including the early alert system, study skills instruction across the curriculum, peer mentoring, etc.**” is an assault on the 10+1 and curriculum purview of faculty. Only faculty and the campus curriculum committees can determine what goes into each course outline of record; thus, study skills across the curriculum can only be determined in conjunction with faculty and each campus curriculum committee.

p. 12:

Under Objective 7 of Goal 4, “**Develop a system-wide program of outreach and recruitment, giving consideration to the development and expansion of bridge programs and the offering of introductory mini-courses,**” is a 10+1 curriculum issue as curriculum can only come through the campus curriculum committees and faculty.

p. 13:

Under Goal 5, “**Maintain organizational vitality,**” Objective 1, “**Develop a shared vision statement and a unifying mission statement,**” places an undue emphasis on the District mission thereby minimizing the campus mission in serving disparate communities within the County. This is an accreditation issue.

The general question is what relationship do the Appendices have to the actual Master Plan on pp. 4-10? It is unclear, as the material in both Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 has previously been objected to by the Senate through Linda Kamaila as Oxnard's Academic Senate President and representative at Consultation Council.

These are my thoughts on the draft Goals and Objectives contained in the current draft of the Educational Master Plan, 2013-2019, and distributed by District personnel on Tuesday, September 10th, 2013.

Yours, Jenny Redding