1. **Call to Order**
   1.1. The meeting was called to order at 3:07 PM

2. **Minutes**
   2.1. March 15, 2011
      2.1.1. Motion to approve, approved.

3. **Reports**
   3.1. President (Steve Hodges)
      3.1.1. Request for volunteers for Review Committee.
      3.1.1.1. Volunteers collected.
      3.1.2. Textbook issues regarding the sale of books by faculty. Would like a discussion at future meeting.
      3.1.3. Presidential election, Steve will serve as election officer. Elections planned to start after spring break.
      3.1.4. Budget; want to have discussion about parameters and/or processes. The more active role we take the better the final results will be.
      3.1.5. Looking for CIP position.
   3.2. Vice President
      3.2.1. Year-end party; please tip student bartenders, in April will pass out sheet for volunteers to help out. Faculty Senate puts on event and whole campus invited, but there will be a drink limit.
   3.3. Secretary (John Govsky)
      3.3.1. Nothing new to report.
   3.4. Treasurer (Lenny Norton)
      3.4.1. Nothing new to report.
   3.5. CCFT (John Govsky)
      3.5.1. Paul Harvell passed out a handout, 4.3 Professional Autonomy, regarding academic freedom for faculty – from contract section IV – The contract gives primacy to instructor and pedagogy.
3.5.2. Choice of textbooks and curriculum are decided by academic faculty. Academic professionals decide.

3.5.3. Surveying program chairs to make sure that every 3 years there is an election. There is no term limit. In the past adjuncts have become chairs, but they must go through a hiring process. Some departments have program chairs that are in a related department, only the actual chair receives the stipend.

3.6. CCEU (Rick Fillman)

3.6.1. Used to have a prioritization process to define a process for hiring. Would like to reinstate a modified version, vacant positions included. Having some difficulty with district. We are bringing the issue to CPC (College Planning Council) and looking for faculty support.

3.6.2. Senate moves, seconded and approved to “support CCEU in their attempt to reinstate a modified (including vacant positions also) prioritization process.”

3.7. Watsonville (Eva Acosta)

3.7.1. Doing a lot of graduation petition, hopefully a bigger group this year. If attendees register after April 1st will not be on flyer.

3.8. ASCC (Gaby Avila)

3.8.1. Elections after spring break.

3.8.2. Tomorrow will be cooking to support Japanese relief effort. Camille Nava, independent student, interested in food on campus and wants to present a multi-tier approach to campus food. Donations appreciated.

3.9. SLO Assessment Coordinator (Marcy Alancraig)

3.9.1. ARC looks at everybody’s assessment results. Facilitating a discussion whether or not there should be a quantitative aspect. ACC JC does not want to see avoidance of the quantitative element.

3.9.2. Increased workload; from union perspective there has always been workload issues. Is faculty being compensated for the additional work? Adjuncts are encouraged to participate by funding the process. Currently the process is good; don’t want numbers to discourage that. What we have been doing and did last time may not be enough for ACC JC next time. Want to maintain instructors academic freedom. Possibly present what other schools have been doing.

3.9.2.1. Ideas; assign numbers to grades. Pre-and-Post test, GPA before and after, could work for many types of courses and maybe not take as much work. Could use classes that lead to graduation. Other schools have each individual department do their own way. Our senate decided to have it be uniform for the school. Since ARC meetings, Student services had an all-day training about how to assess.

3.9.2.2. Recent study about how ACC JC compares with other states around the country. Other accrediting commissions are referred to as ‘our’ commission where we refer to them as ‘the’ commission.

3.10. VPI (Renee Kilmer)

4. Unfinished or Ongoing Business

5. New Business

5.1. BRIC/TAP Guest Presentation

5.1.1. Gregory Stoup, Cañada College, project lead for our BRIC engagement team, and Michelle Grimes, BRIC team member, visited Cabrillo to talk about the BRIC grant and participate in a discussion regarding the process of inquiry on our campus.

5.1.2. Building Research Information Culture, a team of about 28-30 people, our school is 1 of 55 that applied for a grant, 15 chosen including ours. Cabrillo College wanted an outside perspective on 3 issues:

5.1.3. Basic Skills
5.1.4. Robust SLO structure
5.1.5. Culture of Inquiry (The many questions we have.)
  5.1.5.1. In a fairly routine way your professional questions are being answered.
  5.1.5.2. How are students doing once they transfer? What does well mean? Completion of degrees, grades. How did that day go? Don’t want to go a long time without knowing if students are following along.
  5.1.5.3. SLO’s have been a success for many, but is it working college wide? CTE collects data then uses that data for grants and other things. PRO is the Planning and Research Office that wanted concrete data to use. Came up with college master plan, took randomness out of process.
  5.1.5.4. It is important that institutional knowledge is not invested in one person or group of particular people, must be for everybody.
  5.1.5.5. What are the questions that we are interested college wide? Currently lot of talk about student success.
    5.1.5.5.1. What is student success? The definition should work for all faculty and also the ACC JC. How do we connect the SLO to planning to budgeting?
  5.1.5.6. How do we create student success? Then how to implement and determine if it is working?
  5.1.5.7. What are better ways to deal with underprepared students?
  5.1.5.8. Momentum points of students. Students who get out of basic skills, how many to 15, 30, 45, 60 units? Are our students progressing? Time needs to be a factor, repeats. Also look at exit points, ‘leakage points’. Where are the students falling off? Movement of cohorts over time. From the lowest level to the highest, how many make it. Could bring a personal element to the student to know where he/she is on the college road map to CTE or transfer. Would be good to see changes of students interest over time.
  5.1.5.9. An institutional system allows us to work together instead of individuals tracking progress.
  5.1.5.10. What about the cost of implementing any of this? If the state tells us to do it, we have to.
  5.1.5.11. How many students take just 1 class? For Greg’s college 48% for a sample semester. But breakdown is very important.
  5.1.5.12. Full time to total Cabrillo College students, 3200 out of 15000. Out of that, 1200 were basic skill level. Out of those how many completed basic skills, 30% of 1200. This has an impact on student psychology, students who take a fulltime load then drop. Many students work full time or have other obligations that can make them vulnerable to drop out. Assessment office is collecting data regarding vulnerability because many students have difficult backgrounds. Need a model to work with all walks of life and all types of students. Must look beyond math, English, reading.
  5.1.5.13. How many of our students come in and are assessed at basic level but then taking transfer level courses?
  5.1.5.14. Who gets to register when? A student with tons of units or an incoming student who is trying to get through.
  5.1.5.15. How many of our students could have easily been accepted to a 4-year university but come to Cabrillo College. Cabrillo offers a unique teaching challenge of having underprepared students sitting next to over prepared students. Many students who attend Cabrillo return to say that they miss the teaching and don’t like the 4-year as much.
5.1.5.16. Assessments are only for math, English, reading. If they don’t pass, they can still register in many transfer level classes. New model should use content review to choose prerequisites.

5.1.5.17. There is a disconnect between what faculty tells a student and what they do. Also what you tell a student and what the student hears. Not all students want to start with math and English. But how do students do in both cases? So what else are students learning in basic skills courses? Writing is a more complex issue because a poor writer could become a great writer if enthused. Important to realize that a students writing ability is not static. There are many people who may have excellent academic skills and yet there are life skills that need to be learned, i.e. test taking, and other psychological factors.

5.1.5.18. Some recent research suggests that the way students take assessments at community colleges and the way they are administered, are not accurate. Students may not know significance of assessments. So are we building a system on a not reliable source?

5.1.5.19. Prerequisites must be campus wide or else there will be an enrollment distortion. Need a discussion about having core requirements for students. There should be some sort of filtering process before students begin their transfer level courses.

5.1.5.20. There are programs that have helped bring teachers together to understand what the students are going through. New book called ‘Peer Pressure’ about student support for each other. Look up DR show on NPR for more details.

5.1.5.21. Some students have limited financial assistance and limited time to pass the basic skills class. They are not going to want to take those lower level classes and will want to attempt the transfer level, possibly failing. After financial assistance time is up, would the student rather have failed transfer level courses or have taken basic skills and be prepared for the rest of college?

5.1.6. Mechanics of BRIC/TAP system; we have received 150 hours of consulting advice. They can present models from other places along the lines of what we have been suggesting.

5.1.6.1. Would like to see a presentation on a college question for a year, then answers.

5.1.6.2. Prerequisites comparison, schools that are restricted vs. schools that are more open. Would like data and models regarding this issue.

5.1.6.3. Could we come up with a faculty senate consensus for a core level course suggestion campus wide? Our senate currently does not give direction to department on best practices.

5.1.7. Dialogue is robust, but action to change is limited.

5.2. Emergency Training

5.2.1. Tabled until next meeting.

6. Open Forum

7. Adjourn