Cabrillo College Faculty Senate

Tuesday, March 15, 2011

3:05 - 5:10 pm

Sesnon House

In Attendance: Eva Acosta (at-large/Wats. Ctr. Lias), Arturo Cantu (Counseling), Joseph Carter (BELA), Jean Gallagher-Heil (HASS), John Govsky (VAPA/Sec./CCFT Lias.), Steve Hodges (President), Calais Ingel (BELA), Denis Lim (NAS), Michael Mangin, Diego Navarro (at-large), Lenny Norton (HAWK/Treasurer), Jo-Ann Panzardi (at-large), Beth Regardz (at-large), Steve Rothwell(at-large), Pam Sanborn (HAWK), Alex Taurke (NAS), Deborah Shulman (Instructional Dev.), Sylvia Winder (Library), Marcy Alancraig(SLO Assessment Coor.), Rick Fillman (CCEU Liaison), Renee Kilmer (VP of Instr.), Gaby Avila (Student Senate Rep.)

Note Taker: David Kehn

Guests: Rhea Leonard, James Weckler, Wanda Garner , Brian King, Dale Attias

1. Call to Order
   1.1. The meeting was called to order at 3:05 PM

2. Special Guest – Jane Patton
   2.1. Challenges we face here are being faced across the state. Theme for plenary session “Shift Happens”. Possibilities of tax cuts may close some small community colleges. Possible consolidation of districts will create more larger districts. Bill Scroggins and Eli Oakley, college presidents, are speaking directly to commissioners.
   2.1.1. Problems faced are consolidations of districts, role of adult education and non-credit. Redundancy of K-12 then community colleges.
   2.2. Jane has an article regarding LAO recommendations:
      2.2.1. 100 unit cap on students, will then have to pay full price. Target is for adults in community. Programs viewed as recreational are under attack. Academic Senate has a group of P.E. teachers making a position paper, showing the necessity of those programs. Recreation for some may be necessary, i.e. weight lifting for firefighters.
   2.3. Chancellor Jack Scott spoke about focusing on our 3 primary missions: transfer, CTE and basic skills. Raises concerns for all other departments.
   2.4. BOG approved prerequisites.
   2.5. Jerry Brown wants to talk to the people, get out there with the electorate and constituency. Trying to talk with republicans.
      2.5.1. Encourage all faculty senate members to support Blakeslee and other local seats with a phone call.
   2.6. 5 Republicans holding out, ‘stone wall’.
   2.7. Transfer Degrees 1440, AA-T and AS-T. Three transfer models, Communications, Sociology, Psychology. Look at those and begin/continue to develop degrees. Technically, you are not required to follow curriculum. However, cooperation amongst community colleges will make the process smoother.
      2.7.1. 16 majors have met and are currently in process of finalizing 2-3 more, plus another dozen or so on deck. By the Fall hopefully 2 degrees. Yet, there are small majors that may not need transfer model curriculum (TMC).
2.7.2. Biology, chemistry both high unit majors, have been meeting and trying to organize TMC. Next year will be more of focus on high unit majors.

2.7.2.1. If you are in a transfer program, visit www.c-id.net, sign up, view the page and please tell faculty in your program.

2.8. How does faculty get involved in discipline groups?

2.8.1. If interested write to info@c-id.net “I teach ______, please contact me with information on how to get involved.”

2.9. It is important for all schools to speak up because if a course is on the transfer degree list that we don’t have, it may cause a disadvantage to our students. As of now, our feeder schools will work with us. What about when CSU doesn’t have a choice?

2.9.1. Liberal Studies talking about renaming the major, may help contain discussions, can be confusing if too broad.

2.9.2. Continued discussions about how to make it possible in 18 units. A lot of majors feel that they are ‘high unit majors’. This idea was first proposed to get students through, 60 here and 60 there. Committees are trying to give options so that colleges have choices of which classes to teach.

2.9.3. When lists are generated at committee meetings, faculty at campuses must go online and decide what is right and what is wrong. This is a first pass, feedback is crucial or else we will have to live with the outcome. If TMC is really out of line with our college, we can still do Plan B.

2.9.3.1. Will Plan B cause students to be disadvantaged? No, as long as it conforms with the law, must be submitted for approval which is not what we are currently doing. Chancellor’s office is fast-tracking programs that align with transfer degrees.

2.9.3.2. Just because a TMC comes out, does not mean we have to join. Do not have to change our current programs now, can still wait until dust settles.

2.9.4. ECE can agree on a 24-unit list, but some can be counted as GE, major has to have a minimum of 16.

2.10. Which group will have the final word? CID will be able to articulate to a descriptor instead of every campus having to work it out with CSU. Instead of going to CSU, just send in to CID and it will be compared with the program. Program descriptors of CID are long (2-3 pages). The CID brings together Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRG). Looks at models, does research, and will make sense of all field input. FDRG will make decisions, and send to two Academic Senates. FDRG are appointed by CSU Academic Senate and Community College Academic Senate, only discipline specific. Faculty oversight group will most likely approve FDRG suggestions. Must look at the TMC not only from our perspective, but from a broader view, a state perspective.

2.11. If a student gets a degree following TMC, and similar student without TMC, who gets priority? CID is currently trying to give the student with the TMC priority. Battle over the word similar, local, priority between CSU and chancellors. Local priority is at top of list. CSU leadership wants to avoid mandates. CSU has developed 23 highly unpredictable ways to manage who gets in. Latest issue is American Institution of Ideals.

2.12. What is the possibility of the CSU not changing? Our chancellor views this as a personal battle, and is extremely committed. Chancellor Scott met with Senator Padilla and are working together to make this happen.

2.12.1. UC is showing interest in a positive way. They need our transfer students for diversity. Would be in their best interest to accept CID.
2.12.2. Overall, will be a good thing to bring faculty from different disciplines together to discuss what needs to be accomplished in lower division. The guarantees in the bill are what make it a good thing.

2.13. Bill – SB 1143
2.13.1. Performance Based Funding: requires CC to create a task group to identify metrics for measuring student success with the ultimate goal to develop performance based funding. Also to identify best practices.
2.13.2. 5 out of 21 are faculty members on committee, the rest are administrators, community members who have influential positions, local trustees, college VP, college president, counselor in English and one in Math. At some level, over the next few years, we will see some performance based funding.
2.13.2.1. Departure of key legislative leadership is what has kept performance based funding from being implemented.
2.15. Curriculum Institute, try to send a team. Leadership Institute in Berkeley.
2.16. Brochures are intended for all faculty as a reminder of what “10 plus 1” is.
2.17. Participate on Academic Statewide Senate committees. Serving on statewide groups has varying workload.

3. Minutes
3.1. Feb 15
3.1.1. Names edited, unless person wanted to be identified.
3.1.2. SLO not SLL
3.1.3. 4.1.1. “This change would allow for content review”
3.1.4. 4.1.1.1. “could hurt diversity and increase barriers”
3.1.5. 4.2.5 CSU should not have apostrophe
3.1.6. Motion to approve, approved.
3.2. March 15, 2011
3.2.1. Alex Taurke, Deborah present
3.2.2. 2.10.4 Barbara Beno ACC JC
3.2.3. Marcy not Marcie
3.2.4. 4.1.2. “should we invite staff? Have they ever been invited?”
3.2.5. 4.1.4. “faculty gets a tent”
3.2.6. Motion to approve, approved.

4. Reports
4.1. President (Steve Hodges)
4.1.1. Several people contacted Steve regarding VP for this semester.
4.1.1.1. Michael Mangin approved for VP.
4.1.2. Needs 12 volunteers for evaluation committees. Would just show up, read, then write your opinion. In the area is preferable.
4.1.2.1. Volunteers collected for various positions.
4.1.3. Council on Instructional Planning – Review program planning. Someone from library or counseling would be good. Will meet Friday the 18th at 9 AM.
4.2. Vice President
4.2.1. Nothing new to report.
4.3. Secretary (John Govsky)
4.3.1. Please sign in at meetings.
4.3.2. New web page, for student success resources. If you have any resources you would like on that page, forward to Steve. All documents were posted before the meeting.
4.4. Treasure (Lenny Norton)
4.4.1. Nothing new to report.
4.5. CCFT (John Govsky)
   4.5.1. Friday is SDI deadline to vote.
   4.5.2. Negotiation on interdisciplinary, forum on Thursday March 24, 3:30 to 4:30 in room 435.
4.6. CCEU (Rick Fillman)
   4.6.1. Uncertainty, concerned about state budget. Come July 1st we may come to work and have to report to a new VP.
   4.6.2. Looking forward to neighborhood meetings.
4.7. Watsonville (Eva Acosta)
   4.7.1. New information kiosk at Watsonville Center. New one coming up near SAC.
   4.7.2. Ongoing parking problem just got worse. Used to be able to park in the church, now they can’t. Now have to park in municipal parking.
4.8. ASCC
   4.8.1. New representative Gaby Avila. The student senate sent students to March in March. Also sent disabled students, food was provided for all.
   4.8.2. Please share more information regarding elections for next year. Encourage students to get involved to be a part of our community.
   4.8.3. Went to CCL conference, with the help of Brian King, and talked with Luis Alejo, Sam Blakeslee to voice their opinions.
   4.8.4. If interested in running for student senate please go to SAC East.
4.9. SLO Assessment Coordinator (Marcy Alancraig)
   4.9.1. Last Friday was spent with ACC JC, they really wanted to hear what ‘we’ thought about SLO. Told them, that Fall 2012 goal is unrealistic. Asked if they are asking too much from us? Program review rubric, institutional effectiveness, and SLO. There are certain standards the rubric does not necessarily align with. Will be judged against standards, so it must be clear.
4.10. VPI (Renee Kilmer)
   4.10.1. Mission Envision flex’s were successful, got new draft mission statement. Have prepared a draft Vision Statement. Will have both next time.
   4.10.2. Neighborhood meetings starting this Friday and Monday. Brian has sent out emails with dates and times. An open dialogue.
   4.10.3. Met with affected departments and looking to provide new leadership roles. Margery currently reports to Renee, will change to Dennis. Changes are happening in Articulation and Honors.
5. Unfinished or Ongoing Business
5.1. Curriculum Report
   5.1.1. 204 courses this semester. 13 new and the rest were modified, also flex on instructional planning. Michael Strunk will head curriculum next year.
   5.1.2. Motion to accept report, accepted.
5.2. BP Updates
   5.2.1. BP3250
      5.2.1.1. Pruned legal language on BP, AR has been updated with additional language for clarity. Clarification, ‘the council is the academic council. An ‘authorized instructor’ is an ‘instructor in the discipline’.
      5.2.1.2. AR’s are formulated and reviewed by the people who implement them.
      5.2.1.3. Motion to approve, approved.
   5.2.2. BP3260
      5.2.2.1. Procedural language moved to AR. Took out actual scores because there is a separate list.
      5.2.2.2. Motion to approve, approved.
   5.2.3. BP3220
5.2.3.1. Updated according to lead policies, unbolded is unchanged. Putting in additional bold language would clarify about what is vs. not allowable. AR has procedural language. AR 3220 #2 where it says pass/no pass should indicate “any course in which option is available.” Pass/no pass option is found in catalog/schedule.

5.2.3.2. Motion to approve, approved.

5.2.4. BP 3020

5.2.4.1. Current had procedural language, moved all procedural language to AR with additional changes. AR says ‘these courses will not count in calculating the GPA’, incorrect, needs to be clear.

5.2.4.2. Motion to approve, approved.

5.2.5. BP 3025

5.2.5.1. Updated language, took out procedural language. Procedural language is in AR.

5.2.5.2. Motion to approve, approved.

6. New Business

6.1. Long Beach College Promise

6.1.1. Tabled for next time.

7. Open Forum

8. Adjourn