Faculty Senate
Minutes

Tuesday, May 6th, 3:00-5:00 P.M.  Rm. 1804

Present: Jamie Abbott, Kim Belliveau, Nancy A. Brown, Nancy K. Brown, Louis Compoconis, Laura Dickie, Terry Fetterman, Mario Garcia, Bill Hill, Steve Hodges, Sue Holt, Helene Jara, Andre Neu, Kathy Niven, Dorothy Nunn, Rory O’Brien, Celia Rabinovitch, Dan Rothwell, Topsy Smalley, Christy Vogel

Absent: Jeff Hickey, Jay Jackson

Guests: Claire Biancalana, David Balogh, Marcy Alancraig, Nick Roberts

I. Call to Order 3:04
II. Minutes – Review and approve minutes from April 1st meeting
   Fabian’s last name is Gauthier.  The spelling of Dave Balogh’s name was corrected.  Sue motioned to accept the minutes, Jamie seconded.  The motion carried unanimously.

III. Reports
   A. SEIU Report – Helene Jara
      Helene reported that currently 10 classified staff are being eliminated, along with 17 to 18 whose contracts have been reduced.  Many part time hourlies who are not students were eliminated.  Claire explained that those people who will have reductions or be laid off would receive a letter on June 30 advising them on their option.  These include being laid off, displacement/bumping, or leaving/retiring.  Within 5 days the recipient must notify the personnel office of their choice.  If they wish to bump, then another letter goes out to the bumppee.  She stressed that this process could go on for quite a while and that if a job becomes available as a result of the process, it is advertised internally first.  The SEIU and the district are trying to help as many people as possible.  Helene explained that when an employee elects to bump, she/he does not necessarily know who the bumppee.  Laura asked if there would be continuing support for people going through this process.  Claire said that those who keep their jobs may need to deal with survivor guilt and that work will be done to help them with that.
   B. Tech Committee Report – Steve Hodges
      Steve reported that there was not a tech report at this time because the meeting keeps getting rescheduled, but there will be a report soon.
   C. Vice President’s Report – Rory O’Brien
      Rory reported that he and Nancy A. attended the plenary session of the Statewide Academic Senate in San Francisco.  Cabrillo’s new resolution about adding a third degree, the Associate in Applied Science, was defeated because people thought it would water down the AS degree.  Rory tried to refer it to the Executive Committee, but that proposal was not supported.  The general discussion about raising requirements on AA/AS degrees was passed on to the Executive Committee and will be brought up again in the fall.
   D. President’s Report – Nancy A. Brown
      Nancy added that she encountered some people at the sessions whose schools offered the third type of degree and called it an Associate of Occupation degree.  She explained that these schools had different GE requirements for each of the 3 degrees.  She and Claire will study this and bring it back to the Senate.  The ECE resolution has been reworked to be more general to support getting some funds for campus childcare and was approved by the Academic Senate.  Nancy explained that in reference to the budget, schools have been living off a one-time bubble of tech money taxes that won’t come back soon.  The Academic Senate’s
position is that there needs to be an increase in revenue, but the Republicans in Sacramento oppose tax increases. Rory added that there was much discussion about the budget and it was suggested that local faculty senates and the statewide Academic Senate need to get more politically active. A resolution was passed at the plenary session to enjoin people to think about forming a larger political action committee with administrators and CCLC.

IV. Old Business

A. Retirement Party – Rory O’Brien

Rory explained that he had arranged for an email message to go out to remind people about the party. It is open to the whole college and the Administration is cosponsoring it with the Senate.

B. Proposed Criteria for Program Reduction – Nancy A. and Claire.

Nancy handed out a revised set of criteria to the Senate and explained the changes. The timetable of three weeks has been added and the chart is different in the demand section. At Dave’s suggestion, Nancy agreed to change the % at no growth level to be % difference divided by 2. Dorothy asked how outside funding affected the criteria. Claire said that in that situation they would look at the number of students in the program and the number of fill in the program. Nancy noted that the scale for class load had changed and that anything less than 475 would be zero because they don’t want to give points for being below the college average. Claire noted that this criterion would not be used past next year without first being brought back to the Senate. Sue asked if a program should only be able to earn one set of points from each column under impact. Kim felt that programs with minimum unit requirements should be weighted in the impact category. Nancy A. noted that any program that is selected for reduction or deletion has a chance to show the committee why the points given to their program are inappropriate or incomplete. Steve moved to approve the criteria with the proposed changes. Andre seconded. In discussion, Dorothy asked if Productivity and FTES v. cost were the same. Claire explained that one has to do with instructors and one with students. Kim asked if the committee could look at statistics for the past 3 years. Claire said it was hard to get those statistics, but agreed that would be fairer. She will research this and get back to the Senate. Steve amended his motion to include using the 3-year statistics if possible. Andre accepted this as a second. Dan asked if highly paid faculty cost a program more. Claire said yes and pointed out that it also has to deal with how much money a program can generate. Steve called the question and asked for a vote on his motion, including the Dave Balogh amendment. Nancy asked for those in favor. Kathy challenged the ruling of the chair and requested a continuance of debate. The Senate voted and 10 agreed with Kathy and the ruling was overturned and discussion was allowed to continue. Celia asked how diversity of program was accounted for and Terry responded that it was in fill. Nancy K. wanted to know where this process fits in the context of the other cuts that are happening. Nancy A. explained that Claire has been making instructional component cuts down to the place where there’s no more to cut except programs. Nancy pointed out that this procedure may not necessarily eliminate programs, but it may reduce them. Claire explained that the CPC directed certain cuts, and a great deal of money was cut from the instructional budget. Next year it will be clear whether it is necessary to cut again, and if it is, something needs to be in place so it can be applied if it is needed. Steve called the question again and the motion carried unanimously.

C. Gen Ed Learning Outcomes – Marcy Alancraig and Nick Roberts

Nancy A. reminded the Senate that they’ve already viewed this document. She explained that four years ago the Academic Council came up with these criteria as a rationale for admitting or rejecting classes put before the council to be admitted to the GE program. She explained that it’s been a useful document because it helps people focus when designing or modifying a course. Now
Learner Outcomes need to be woven into the document and Marcy has added them into the prologue of the GE program. Marcy explained that in the new accreditation standards, there must be a way to assess them. That’s the rationale for the addition being brief. Nick read to the Senate the addition that includes the three bulleted statements and the general statement. Topsy pointed out that in #2, the parenthetical statement should say “demonstrating” instead of “using.” Terry added that “problem solve” should be changed to “solve problems.” Bill noted that in #3, there is a difference between awareness and understanding and that it should be changed to “understanding.” Kim asked why there were only three bullets. She expressed the feeling of her department that interpersonal and personal skills are important and should not be left out. Steve noted that there must be a way to measure anything in this document, and he did not feel there was a way to measure interpersonal and personal skills. Kim underscored her assertion that this addition should be a consideration. Sue offered that it was addressed in the paragraph that follows, in Area E and Nick agreed. Nancy asked if Kim’s division would be satisfied because it was included in area E and Kim responded that she couldn’t speak for them without further consultation. Dan said that it was a global statement, so the interpersonal/personal aspect is covered in speaking and listening. Laura asked how “communicate effectively” would affect deaf students and suggested changing it to include “and/or converse.” Celia felt that “communicate effectively” could cover that alone. Nick said he would change the statement to “read, write, listen, speak, and/or converse.” Marcy noted that one of the goals of this addition was that each course description would not have to be rewritten to incorporate the outcomes. She would like to see a checklist added to Fiesta that would cover them. Rory moved to approve the document with the amendments discussed but then withdrew the motion. Kim again asked that another category be added. Sue pointed out that the purpose of the list is to be a macro list so it must be extremely general. She added that not every single instructor has interpersonal instruction among their coursework. Sue moved that the Senate accept the document as amended. Rory seconded. Laura asked to clarify what changes were being voted on and it was explained to include changes proposed by Laura, Topsy, and Bill. Rory expressed concern about Kim’s concern. Kim explained that she felt the list is insufficient without the interpersonal skills addition. She stressed that it wasn’t that her division didn’t like 1-3; they just felt that a 4th statement would make the learner outcomes more inclusive. Dan said he liked the idea because it would incorporate teamwork. Kim said her division liked the Piedmont model. Nancy K. said that she would abstain from voting because she feels the issue should be discussed again next time. Terry motioned to table the issue and Lara seconded. Sue withdrew her previous motion. The motion to table passed unanimously and Marcy agreed to email the latest version to Nancy A. to send to the Senate. Kim will also email any suggestions from her division.

D. Academic Hiring Prioritization Process – Jamie Abbott
   This issue was tabled until the next meeting.

E. Great Teachers Seminar, August 3-7, Santa Barbara – Nancy A.
   Claire said she would fund what she could for someone to attend the seminar. Terry said he doesn’t think it’s worth spending the money on. He explained that he had fun when he went, but that he didn’t feel that the knowledge spreads around much. Jamie moved for the Senate to fund half of the cost of the seminar if Claire funds the other. Andre seconded. Terry abstained from voting. All those voting voted for the motion.

V. New Business – None
VI. Action – None
VII. Reports Continued
    There were no further reports
VIII. Agenda Building - A memo from Francine was sent around, soliciting the Senate’s endorsement of the flex week calendar. Steve noted that there were many neat programs on the calendar. Andre motioned to approve the calendar, Nancy K. seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Claire reminded the Senate that Francine is looking for students who are graduates of Cabrillo and quite successful to use as examples on all college day.

IX. Items from the Floor - There were no items.

X. Adjournment – 5:00 p.m. - Andre moved to adjourn and Laura seconded.