

FACULTY SENATE
April 27, 2004
3:00pm to 5:00pm, Sesnon 1804

- Present:** Caroline Bliss-Isberg, Nancy A. Brown, Laura Dickie, James Durland, Carlos Figueroa, Paul Harvell, Bill Hill, Steve Hodges, Sue Holt, Jay Jackson, Geneffa Jonker, Andre Neu, Dorothy Nunn, Rory O'Brien, Dan Rothwell, Deborah Shulman, Topsy Smalley, Mary Ellen Sullivan, Christy Vogel, Marcy Wieland
- Guests:** Dave Balogh, Cherie Barkey, Virginia Coe, Fabien Gautier, Tom Marshall, Michael Pebworth, Daine Putnam, Jack Turner, Ramona Turner

1.0 Call to Order

The Meeting was called to order at 3:07 pm.

2.0 Minutes – Review and approve minutes

2.1 of March 30

Laurie moved to approve, Jay seconded, the motion carried unanimously.

2.2 of April 13, 2004

Jay suggested corrections to Item 5.2, namely: (a) the word “major” be struck (b) “the sentence “They are trying to move the counselor/student ratio closer towards one counselor per 370 students” be struck and replaced by “1. that the college system pursue funding to ensure that colleges make progress towards a counselor/student ration of 1:370 as soon as possible; and 2. that until such progress is possible that existing counselor/student ratios not be permitted to deteriorate.”

Steve moved approval, Mary Ellen seconded, motion carried unanimously.

3.0 Reports – including: Officers, Governance, Committees and Liaison

Rory suggested that the reports should be deferred, due to the number of guests and the need to discuss the presidential hire forum.

4.0 Information Items

4.1 CIP priorities

Jack Turner distributed the Priorities From Instruction Plans Completed in 2004. He explained the process by which the CIP prioritized funding requests related to those plans. He summarized the requests, stating that safety issues were “high on the agenda.” He said that the next step in the process would be CPC consideration and approval. Andre asked if replacing contract faculty was an allowable request. Jack replied in the affirmative.

4.2 Learning Outcomes Plan – Marcy Alanraig

This item was deferred.

4.3 Student Senate Resolution on the Bookstore

Jeff Hickey read the Associated Students of Cabrillo College Resolution on Book Prices. The whereas section explicated the following claims: (1) The students believe that the

college should do “everything in its power” to decrease the costs of texts; (2) The college bookstore contributed \$304,275 to the college during fiscal year 2002; the projected book sales for FY 2003–04 is \$2,582,000; (3) The ASCC believes the bookstore should not provide any contributions to the college above direct costs. The ASCC receives \$15,000 (or 25% of the Student Senate general budget) a year from the bookstore, but the Student Senate feels that this is an unfair imposition on the students who have to pay higher prices for the books. The resolution recommended that the Cabrillo Governing Board commit to a long term goal of decreasing the bookstore’s contribution to the minimum possible levels necessary to provide no cost to the district and minimal cost to the students, that the board direct the bookstore to have a zero projected profit, excluding a \$15,000 contribution to the library so that it can purchase some of the most expensive texts to make available on a loan basis to students.

Jeff said that although he thought that the “big picture of attacking legislation is important,” the students thought that they would begin with “our college.” Jeff said that he thought that the high text prices amounted to a “secret tax” on students to “pay for the college.” He suggested, “Don’t make money off the bookstore. Prices keep rising. I think there should be audits of real costs in energy, rent, books and paper.” Jeff pointed out that now that the college has a bond commitment, it did not need the \$1.44 million in cash fund for construction costs associated with the new bookstore. Jeff related that he had a commitment from John Hurd to bring the bookstore profit to zero, but “now he’s gone.”

Andre asked whether staff costs were factored into the students’ plans and Jeff replied that they were. Dave asked whether the students had discussed getting faculty cooperation and Jeff said they had. Dave also suggested that the text prices could be listed in the Course Schedule. Bill asked whether there had been discussions about going around the bookstore and exchanging texts on a no-cash basis. He said they would need the college to provide space and security for the project. Sue pointed out that there was a scheduled markup that included the contribution to the building fund. She pointed out that the problem was lack of competition, and that a bookstore run by private enterprise has a stronger incentive to keep costs down. Geneffa suggested that before the discussion proceeded further a representative from the bookstore should be invited to participate. Dave reminded the Senate that costs of texts and parking were endemic issues over the last 30 years. Geneffa said that it would be a problem if we had bookstore money going to the corporate world and not to our college. She said that Cabrillo is the only college without a private bookstore and that other colleges were unhappy with the decision that they had made to contract with private operations. Rory suggested that we consider the resolution put forward by the students at a subsequent meeting.

5.0 Action Items

5.1. Academic Priority Process – Dan Rothwell

Dan described the improved Full-time Faculty Hiring Priority Process, which had been crafted by the task force and distributed to the Senate. He said that the basic problem had been the difficulty of small departments in getting sufficient points to hire new or even replacement faculty. He said that to some extent this situation would improve under the newly revised process, using Anthropology as an example.

5.2 Counseling Resolution – Jay Jackson

Jay said that the counselors had decided to ask the Faculty Senate for support on the second of the two resolutions previously discussed, namely that “that until such progress is possible that existing counselor/student ratios not be permitted to deteriorate.”

Deborah added, “If we support this then what is intended is to send a signal that we don’t want our current ratio dropping.” Mary Ellen said that “We see this as a message to Student Services that counselors are a priority.” Carlos asked, “What’s the difference between hiring counselors and hiring other faculty?” Mary Ellen replied that counselor hiring does not go through the Academic Priority Process. Jack pointed out that Student Services is not under the “umbrella of the 50% law” but that the money does come from the general fund. Marcy said that in the faculty process there is considerable research to generate some numbers. She said that she would like to see similar research that supported requests for counselors. Steve said that it would be problematic for the Senate to come out with a statement that one category of faculty is protected. Jay replied that the Counseling division would not like to see the Senate do something that was in any way divisive. Rory said that a targeted ratio would engender the perception of a special class. Jay suggested that the battle needs to be on the 50% Law, that counselors and librarians should be included. Nancy said that the problem there is that would considerably reduce the portion of the budget devoted to classroom instruction, leaving the rest for administration. Caroline asked, “What percent of counseling is categorical?” Mary Ellen added, “I’d like to find out what percent of the Student Services budget the counseling faculty is.” Nancy agreed. Marcy said that “The ratio is important because it’s easy to quantify what faculty do but not staff and counselors.” Mary Ellen said that they would rewrite the resolution to include the request for information about what percentage of the Student Services budget goes to pay for counselors.

5.3 Scholarship

Bill informed the Senate that if they were to approve a \$250 scholarship, it would leave enough in the fund to grant a scholarship the following year. It was agreed that the scholarship would continue to be designated for a student who planned to pursue a career in education. Steve moved to approve, Sue seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

5.4 Graduation Reception Funding

Sue moved to fund the graduation buffet with a ceiling of \$500. Dan seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

5.5 Diversity Training – Geneffa Jonker and Tom Marshall

Rory welcomed the guests who had come for this topic and said that the Senate had been hoping for a conversation. Geneffa said that the English Division was concerned about “Senate oversight,” adding that the English division believed that a larger campus survey was needed. Steve said that “The Faculty Senate can speak for the Faculty Senate.” Geneffa asked whether campus-wide surveys had been done. Nancy pointed out that “policies for faculty professional development activities” was an explicit academic and professional matter under AB 1725 over which the Senate and the Board had entered into a primary reliance agreement.

Tom Marshall said that he wanted to “approach it from another angle.” He related the history of diversity training over the past several years, telling about the training that had inspired him for “self-critique.” He said that experience was followed by another highlight, the presence of Dr. Terrence Roberts. Tom reminded the Senate of “the hope and promise inspired by the heroes . . . the children of Little Rock.” Tom said “I was rocked by Roberts’ presence on this campus and the challenge he brought to us. When I heard that this body was threatening to limit diversity training, I felt it was an insult to me. I can’t allow you to insult us in this way.”

Sue replied that there was “a misunderstanding here. The Senate jurisdiction concerns the mandate regarding hiring committees. What the English Department is concerned with is broader, more everyday diversity training.” James reminded, “This is simply about the mandate” requiring diversity training to serve on hiring committees. Paul added, “We have never discussed general diversity training.” Laura said that her concern was that the training could be somehow more equal, since there was considerable variation in the different trainings. Diane Putnam said that there had not been discussion on the Division level and that the majority of the hiring done on the campus is not faculty. She added that the English Department was concerned with the “scope of the Senate’s concern with diversity.”

Caroline said that the Senate had an obligation to make sure everyone knew what the laws were. She said that John Hurd had decided there should be a wider training. She said she got no training as to the new laws governing hiring, instead there was a “watered-down diversity training” and that it “was not a good experience. My expectations were violated.”

Rory pointed out that the supposed “mandate” for diversity training was only a draft” and had never been finalized as a board policy or administrative regulation. Geneffa said, “I did bring this to the English Department – differing opinions are at the heart of this disagreement.” Virginia (Coe) said that part of the problem was the confrontation of the letter of the law and trying to observe the spirit of diversity training. She said that “people were mandated to go to that, to reenact or reactivate the spirit.”

Steve said that José Millan had brought something different to the Senate, a training in the requirements of the Connerly decision and that we had voted on that. He added that “This confusion had been unfortunate.” Bill said that one of the problems was that the “volunteers did not get any resources or training regarding the actual law. The biggest problem I see is the diversity of the pool of applicants. This institution hasn’t addressed that.” Tom said “The kind of diversity training I was pushing for is meant to solve the problem. The pools are influenced by impressions of applicants.” Mary Ellen said that she wanted to second what Bill said. She reminded, “We do work at a community college; we need to address the idea of increasing diversity of applicant pools.”

Dan said, “I want to be clear what the intention was. We suggested a Flex activity on All-College Day.” He added that there is concern about lawsuits if the college violated the new regulations regarding hiring. He said that there were insufficient numbers of qualified diversity applicants and related how when his department did a search, the one African American in the pool turned them down.

5.6 AA/AS Degree Requirement

Sue Holt reported that the Degree Requirement Committee met April 26 and that they were ready to make a recommendation to the Senate. The item was added to the agenda. Sue said that the committee had reviewed material regarding raising the AA degree requirement in Mathematics from Math 154 to Math 152. They discovered that had this been in place the previous year it would have affected only 11 students. She said that at the same time the committee had discussed raising the degree requirements in English to completion of a college level English course. Deborah said that she had wanted to make sure that there were enough support services in place, that if we did make college level Math or English a requirement for a degree we would need to investigate required

support. Mary Ellen added, “We needed to know how many students this would affect; they could not change the requirement to English IA without knowing how many students would be affected.” She said that they had already printed out the GE sheets with a warning about the Math requirement but not about English and because the sheets were already distributed no other changes could be made. Sue moved to raise the AA degree requirement from Math 154 to Math 152, effective for students entering Fall 2004. Steve seconded. The motion carried.

6.0 Reports Continued – if necessary and time permitting

6.1 ASCC

Fabian reported that the ASCC has planned a Cinco de Mayo celebration with a barbeque in the quad and live music in the amphitheater.

6.2 President’s Report

Rory thanked Caroline Bliss-Isberg for all her work on the Retirement Party. He showed the Senate the logo for the event, which is “Twist and Shout” and listed several of the tasks that need to be done before plans were completed. Jack agreed to send out a “save the date” email, Rory agreed to be responsible for the music, and Laura for a digital camera. Several senators expressed gratitude that the now-retired Pat Combs had agreed to help again this year coordinating the invitations with Human Resources. Mary Ellen and Topsy agreed to help address the invitations.

7.0 Agenda Building – 3 Minutes

7.1 University Redirects

Virginia Coe distributed a draft of letter to the Governor, the Board of Governors, the Governing Board and the Regents of the University of California expressing concern about the UC and CSU redirect program to be considered for the next meeting.

7.2 Accreditation

Rory distributed copies of the CPC discussion on accreditation to be discussed in the next meeting.

8.0 Items from the Floor

8.1 Reaction to the President’s Search and Selection Forums

Several guests and Senate representatives expressed reservations about the outcome of the search and selection process for a new college president. Particular concerns were focused around the fact that only two finalists had been presented to the college, one of whom was clearly unacceptable due to the widespread notoriety of his conflicts with the faculty of Diablo Valley College. Steve reported that he had read the minutes of the DVC Senate meetings describing the decision of the DVC Senate to vote no confidence in their president. Several Cabrillo faculty remarked that they found it difficult to understand how that same president could have become one of the finalists in the Cabrillo search. Nancy explained that members of the committee were legally constrained to at first consider only the material presented in the application papers and then, if the candidate were selected for interview, only the answers to the set of interview questions asked of all interviewed candidates. She said that any outside information possessed by members of the committee could not be formally considered. Several Senate representatives argued that the Senate should convey to the Governing Board that our first choice would be Dr. King and that our second choice would be “none of the above” – that we should go out again, because, in reality, there had only been one finalist. The general opinion was that “there was no reason to rush over a cliff,” that “we need better choices and more of

them,” and that “based upon what we’ve seen so far the search needs to be re-opened.” One of the several guests who had come to the meeting for the purpose of objecting to the possible selection of the former DVD president volunteered to write a resolution for the Senate, saying that we recognized that Cabrillo is one of the best colleges in the system, and that the candidate from DVD is fundamentally unacceptable, and that we encouraged the Board to consider reopening the search. The resolution was moved by Geneffa and seconded by Caroline. It passed unanimously.

9.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 pm.