FACULTY SENATE
October 22, 2002
3:00pm To 5:00pm, Room 1804

Present: David Balogh, Nancy A. Brown, Steve Hodges, Andre Neu, Lisa Feintech, Dorothy Nunn, Jay Jackson, Topsy Smalley, Kim Belliveau, Laura Thompson-Dickie, Olivia Hand, Marcy Alancraig, Mary Ellen Sullivan, Helene Jara, Celia Rabinovitch, Louis Compoginis, Yelena Krasin (Student Senate representative)

Guests: Claire Biancalana, Nick Roberts, John Steimnitz, Georg Romero, Claudia Close

Staff: Bronze Freeman

I. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 3:05p.m.

II. Minutes
Page 6, second sentence, insert, “cuts” and “areas that involve direct student/faculty contact” to read “Jay would like a resolution to keep the budget cuts away from areas that involve direct student/faculty contact from the students”. On Page 3, Nancy will speak with Jeff and confirm that only $14.00 was contributed to Financial Aid. Andre moved to approve the revised minutes. Jay seconded the motion. The motion to approve was passed unanimously.

III. Reports
A. Technology Committee- Georg Romero reported
Faculty are requested and encouraged to report any computing problems to CR; CR is happy to receive an additional $37,000.00 for faculty computers. 24 laptops with DVD’s have been purchased; there will be one for each Division Office.

Georg noted that Al had remarked that Cabrillo College is part of the C4Net which is an outgrowth of CSUNet; Cabrillo College is upping our bandwidth to 10 megabits per second (DS3 connection) in the near future via CNet. Georg reported that Al had said that this would allow Cabrillo College to have more bandwidth as needed in 1-megabit increments for $260.00 per month.

Georg reported that Datatel would be down for upgrade from October 25 to the 28th to implement the new release; there would be no change to the interface and the Division Assistants have been testing the new release. Web Advisor will be tested in January and will come in modules. The campus web page is being modified; the new Division Web Pages are up; one of the pages is no longer visible, but there is a link to the changes. Salsa is a tool to aid faculty in “putting stuff” on their web pages; the BELA Division is currently testing it. This will ultimately standardize department web pages.

B. Geo-Cluster Meeting- Nancy A. Brown
Nancy remarked that they had met on Friday; the food was excellent and Culinary Arts had been applauded. Rory and Marcy had discussed the new Accreditation Standards. Nancy noted that the Cabrillo resolution had been passed; the language was changed to State Academic Senate and the second whereas had been struck. Nancy noted that the resolution had been unanimously approved.
C. For Profit Institutions- Topsy Smalley
Topsy noted that she had already provided her information to the Senate. David B. remarked that his resolution to have the CEO’s stop paying the Accreditation Commission was passed at the Geo-Cluster meeting and will now go forward.

D. CPC-David Balogh
Facilities had been discussed at CPC. David had complained that there was no access to Santa Cruz from the Sesnon house when exiting onto Soquel. David had asked that the left turn signal and U turns at College Drive be activated. David noted that Joe Nugent deserves “kudos” as his request only took one week to implement.

E. Technology- David Balogh
David reminded the Senate that when AI had presented, David had requested access to more technology. AI’s response had been to discuss this with Francine. David did, and that technology (DVD’s) will be available in the near future.

F. State Academic Senate- David Balogh
The State Academic Senate will be meeting in San Francisco; David encouraged the Senate to attend the roundtable. David noted that this would be an opportunity to learn about other colleges and stated to the Senate.

IV. Action
A. Senate By Laws Revisions- Nancy A. Brown
Nancy would like Article 1 to better conflate with AR1725, and requested authorization from the Senate to “get some people together to do this”. Steve moved to form a subcommittee. Andre seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

On Page 2, Clause 3, Nancy would like to rewrite this. The Senate was in agreement. Marcy moved to allow Nancy to make the changes. Mary Ellen seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously. Andre suggested that the Senate vote at the end of this discussion.

Nancy noted that Clause 4 would also be changed. Please see the changes on Page 4, Clause 6 and Nancy asked regarding if the language in Section 2 should remain or put in language regarding electing 4 and 2. Regarding Page 6, Section 2, Claire suggested drawing four straws to see who gets the shortest. Nancy noted that Page 6, Section 2 is a pending issue for the next Senate meeting.

On Page 7, Nancy noted the bylaws say completed before Monday in November; it would be done this year, but if a large number of people ran the bylaws would be “unworkable”. Steve suggested stating the last round had to be completed before November 1st. Laura asked why the language could not state, “so many days after school starts”. Nancy concurred with Steve’s idea. In response to David’s question, Nancy replied that she knew of four candidates for the At-Large positions and one for the position of President.

V. Old Business
A. Budget Resolution-Jay and Nancy
Jay distributed a draft resolution and remarked that he had approached Nancy to do something concrete to support the Senate position on Contract Faculty and regarding the non-teaching faculty, they are not protected as much under the 50% Law. Jay did not want to address the 50% Law, but would want some supportive language included.
The resolution is a request to CPC to keep the budget cuts away from faculty with direct student contact. Topsy noted that it was inevitable that when there were budget cuts, people came up with resolutions as a protection. Topsy remarked that it was a good idea to clarify what was important, but does not want it to interfere with the, “college talking as a whole”. Jay noted that a whereas could be included to that effect.

Nancy read from the CCCCIO Staffing Report. Cabrillo College’s staffing report comes out November 1st. For 1995 to 2000, the report states that there was a 24% increase in the number of students, a 10.4% increase in Tenure-Track faculty, a 51% increase in Adjunct faculty, a 90.7% increase in educational administrators and a 56.5% increase in Classified Managers. The total combined changes are 73.4 increase in management, 13.8 increase in Classified and the total FTE is 21.2 and a 10.2 increase in faculty. Nancy noted that there was an increase in all but Contract faculty. Nancy noted that if there are cuts, they should be in areas that would not affect students as much. Nancy commented that, “as wonderful as Cabrillo College seems, where the rubber meets the road, Cabrillo College is getting shaky and that is what is dragging her down.”

In the resolution, Andre suggested not saying, “don’t cut us and cut something else”. Nancy remarked that this is what happens. Steve suggested including the 1995 to 2000 numbers as another whereas. Nancy remarked that this issue was about the students, “and not us”. Topsy noted that there is a need for more Librarians to take on the information competency. David made two suggestions for the resolution, “Be it resolved that priority be given to increasing the FTES taught by Tenure-Track Faculty”. Andre suggested using the word “maintain” in the resolution to maintain what we already have. Marcy stated that she would not want Contract versus Adjunct. Claire suggested including maintain minimum number of faculty under AB1725. Steve suggested including FTES generated income. In the first whereas, Claire suggested deleting “instructional component” and replace with “students”, delete “success” and replace with “instruction”. In the resolution, delete “cuts” and replace with “changes”.

Helene extrapolated from a letter written by Stephanie Stainback regarding the budget cuts; it was written in response to an article in The Voice. Stephanie had said that if 4% were restored of the total budget to full-time faculty, the money would have to come from somewhere else. That 4% would equal 2 million dollars, an amount that would pay for 43 classified positions. Stephanie noted that adding full-time instructors would significantly change the percentages (71% Instruction, 17% Business component, 10% Student Services, 2% President’s component) that have traditionally been received. Stephanie had noted that 82% of the budget is tied up in employees.

Nancy stated that she was not saying that the money should be restored, only that faculty takes most of the cuts, “the easy way is to not fill the retirements”. Claire stated that Instruction never gets 71% of the base budget when allocated. Nancy noted that when the round of cuts was done, the Vice President had only the choice of cutting retirements. Claire concurred, “It was either retirement or a program”.

In response to Nancy’s question as to how the students were doing, and could they get into classes, Helene noted that the lines in Financial Aid, etc effect the students. Helene will forward a whereas to Jay regarding this. Nancy noted that she would need direction from the Senate when she goes to CPC. Steve suggested changing the language, as there was a logical disconnect between the first and last paragraph. In response to Jay’s question as to which faculty have no direct student contact Nancy commented that there were five she could think of, including Francine Van Meter and David Warren.
Claire noted that the question of how to make cuts was raised at CPC. The most acceptable way was to make cuts across the board, a percentage from each of the components. Claire remarked that Purchasing and Electronics had been lost in the last round of cuts, but the Purchasing Department has been built back up. Claire agreed that it would be too difficult to make cuts in Tenured faculty and noted that 1) the students need them, 2) the law states that we have to have them and 3) income is generated only through faculty in the classroom. Claire remarked that it gets hard when looking at the bottom line; the only place to get money is from generating FTES. Claire noted that it was just as important to “generate student success (not paid for) and student enrollment (paid for)”. The other concern regarding direct student contact is the faculty and Claire noted that there are places on campus that have too many classes; those with too few students would be the first cut. If the resolution were passed, it would make this difficult. In response to Yelena, Claire clarified that the classes cut would be with students of 15 that would need an increase to 18.

Nancy will bring the draft back to the Senate with the changes. Nancy will send Stephanie’s letter via e-mail for the Senate’s consideration. Marcy acknowledged Claire’s earlier comments and noted that the easy cuts had already been made and the more difficult cuts were to follow. Nancy praised the work of the Adjunct faculty and what they contribute to the college. Claire asked that any recommendations regarding where cuts could be made be sent to her. Marcy suggested not mailing out the Schedule of Classes to the County. Claire responded that would save $40,000.00.

B. Senate Goals- Nancy A. Brown
Nancy asked the Senate to send her any ideas.

VI. New Business
A. Academic Council Revised AR/BP- Nick Roberts
Nick reported that the Academic Council had met three times. Regarding information literacy, the Council had operated under the assumption the Chancellor’s Office would require it. The Council found out that was not the case, but continued to proceed and created a subcommittee; the criteria is that there are no new separate requirements.

Topsy noted that the subcommittee has not met yet. It was the Department of Finance that had pulled the information literacy requirement. This had gone through the Academic Senate. The Statewide Academic Senate had wanted a change in graduation requirements for AA/AS; the larger issue will be discussed in the plenary session.

Nick remarked that at the first council meeting, Mary Ellen pulled courses that are no longer being offered. Mary Ellen noted that this had come from the Statewide Academic Senate; Title 5 language states that courses not being offered must be removed. Nick noted that one course up to 6 units could not be used to satisfy two majors and GE’s.

Nick stated that Claire had brought changes to AR3010, BP3210, AR3020 and AR3260 to Academic Council. Nick noted that all the modifications proposed and approved by the Academic Council “simply reflects how the college does business”. Nick read through the changes in the AR/BP’s. Claire clarified that Title 5 non-degree applicable credit could not be used in calculating the grade point average. Nick noted that highlights are the added language, the strike through are the deletions.

Nick distributed copies of proposed changes to AR/BP 6070; this is a draft. These changes were proposed by Gloria Garing in A&R; Nick had requested that Gloria clarify the sequence of changes, he is still waiting to hear back. Nick noted that one changes was that a student now has to petition the Director of A&R for reinstatement to Cabrillo College “in
the event of their failure to maintain the required standards”. Nick asked if the Senate was clear with the changes. Claire noted that an automatic 6 units of credit for a student that had served in the military or Peace Corps had been removed from AR3260. Nick noted that the changes to AR/BP6070 had been approved in concept at yesterday’s Council meeting.

Nick noted the item from Allied Health. The past practice was that nursing applications had used the GPA as a determining factor. On Page 26 of the Catalog, under repeatability, Allied Health would like this language changed. A 2.5 GPA was required in BIO4, 5 and 6, Allied Health had looked at a study and determined that those students who need to retake courses to improve their grade are likely not to. Mary Ellen noted that currently the GPA required for BIO 5 and 6 is a 2.5 and if the student had to repeat there is a high failure rate, but the student may repeat the course again in two years. Claire noted that the study went back 5 years; the study showed what was needed to get through the program. Claire noted that more students have failed in Dental Hygiene, Radiologic Technology and Nursing than before. The Allied Health program is going after money to study students deficient in basic skills. Nancy A. noted that it was also an expensive program to put students through that fail. Claire noted the request was to remove the area that talks about Allied Health from the Catalog, not the repeatability. Claire remarked that the Academic Council has not make a recommendation about this yet.

Helene remarked that in 1999 a survey was done in Chemistry, Medical Terminology and Biology that showed that if students were tutored before the sixth week of school, they receive a higher GPA in the course. Claire noted that repeatability follows Title 5 language. Nancy noted that the work of the Academic Council goes to the Senate and usually the draft of AR/BP 6070 would come before the Senate first as an informational item, then as an action item. Marcy moved to “throw out the bylaws and act on AR/BP 6070”. Topsy seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion was passed unanimously. Mary Ellen moved to incorporate Gloria’s suggested changes to AR/BP 6070. Laura seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion was passed unanimously.

**B. Academic Staffing Priorities**

Nancy noted that this had already been discussed. The Senate will come back to this issue. Please read the handout before the next meeting. The next meeting (November 5) will be in Room 435 when the positions are advanced. Presenter will have 3 minutes; Faculty Senate will vote for ranking. It will be a single agenda meeting. Nancy would like the ranking to go to 12, but will probably only go to 9. This will also show where the student demand is and will then be prioritized to the Vice President of Instruction. On Page 3, Claire outlined how the points work. Nancy stated that this could be looked at next term, when the process is revisited. David requested that the Senators be on time to the next meeting.

**C. Curriculum Meeting Minutes and Duties- Claudia Close**

There are two issues today, the 9/18/02 minutes and the handout concerning the role of the Curriculum Committee. 

Regarding the 9/18/02 minutes, Claudia noted that she had already talked about the procedural issues, she had also talked about having a report from each Division, that idea was “trounced” so now there is a dissenting memo. The meetings of the mini-Curriculum Committees had been discussed. Claudia noted that, “the system so far seems to be working within the Divisions and the quality of curriculum is good that is coming to the Curriculum Committee”.

On Page 1, second to last paragraph, 7th sentence, Nancy expressed concern with Dan’s comments. Claudia clarified that they had discussed how the stringency was done at the
Division levels, “it is a very stringent process”. The bulk of the duty is done as a Division duty, if it is not done and it is a small amount, then Dale does it. If the workload is big, it is sent back to the Divisions to be done. Claudia stated that the new system is two-tiered, the cleanup is done at the Division level, the content at the Curriculum Committee. Steve moved to approve the process of the Curriculum Committee. Marcy seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Regarding the second issue, Claudia noted that there was a unanimous recommendation by the Curriculum Committee for the second piece of the reorganization. On the handout, the 5th bullet, the campus wide Curriculum Committee came up with a hybrid compromise regarding the fiscal impact. The first side is that the committee should only look at content, not whether the course could be taught or paid for. The second side is that fiscal should be considered because of the enormous consequences. Claudia cited the example of Math that had requested an extra unit, but due the many offerings of the section it had resulted in a lot of money. Claudia read through the compromise stated on the handout. Claudia asked that the Senate think about this issue; if it is passed, the AR/BP will be changed. Claudia stated that there was no sense of urgency on the matter and asked the Senate for any concerns that she could take back to the Curriculum Committee. In response to David B’s question about the fiscal form, Claudia replied that it was still in Fiesta.

Claudia informed the Senate that at some colleges, the Curriculum Committee determines scheduling. Claudia stated that, “she is thankful to be at Cabrillo College”. Claudia commented that it was more substantive having four meetings per year.

VII. Reports Continued
A. Library
A copy of a memo from Johanna Bowen to Victoria Morrow, the Interim Executive Vice Chancellor was distributed. The language in the memo opposes the “Chancellor’s Office proposal to delete the section of the Education Code with respect to library standards.” Johanna asked for your support.

VIII. Agenda Building
There were no further agenda items.

IX. Items From the Floor
Yelena distributed copies of the Student Senate publication, the Senate Advocate. There is a correction, there is no scholarship for Halloween but there will be a costume and pumpkin carving competition. This event will be held in the afternoon.

There are banners on campus urging students to vote; Nancy noted that the deadline had been October 21st. Yelena informed the Senate that there was also a banner for Proposition 47 up on campus.

X. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 5:00p.m.