Cabrillo College Faculty Senate

Tuesday, April 26, 2011

3:05 - 5:10 pm

Sesnon House

In Attendance: Eva Acosta (at-large/Wats. Ctr. Lias.), Joseph Carter (BELA), Jean Gallagher-Heil (HASS), John Govsky (VAPA/Sec./CCFT Lias.), Steve Hodges (President), Calais Íngel (BELA), Denis Lim (NAS), Michael Mangin (VP/at-large), Diego Navarro (at-large), Lenny Norton (HAWK/Treasurer), Jo-Ann Panzardi (at-large), Yasmina Porter (VAPA) Beth Regardz (at-large), Dan 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), Renée Kilmer (VP of Instr.), Gaby Avila (Student Senate Rep.)

Note Taker: David Kehn

Guests: Sesario R. Escoto, Margitta Dietrick-Welsh, Victoria May, Paul Harvell, David Douglass, Regina DeCosse, Brian Legakis, Susan Washington, Brian King, Kathie Welch, Tanya Brown, Rhea Leonard, James Weckler, Wanda Garner, Brian King

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

2. Minutes
   2.1. April 26, 2011
      2.1.1. Revision to attendance.
      2.1.2. (3.10.1) Revision.
      2.1.3. (3.10.2.5) Revision and addition, make clear definition of drop vs. withdraw.
      2.1.4. Motion to approve minutes. Approved.

3. Reports
   3.1. President (Steve Hodges)
      3.1.1. Looking for faculty representatives for Student Rights & Responsibilities meetings. Should be done in 2 – 3 meetings.
      3.1.1.1. Michael Mangin and Yasmina Porter volunteered and were appointed.
      3.1.2. Also looking for Food Beverage and Vending Committee volunteers. Pepsi contract is expired, and Taher contract was recently extended for one more year; This committee will explore all options related to food and vending services. Next meeting is May 12. Committee chair is Serena Muindi, Interim Director of Purchasing and Risk Management.
      3.1.3. Request for faculty senate reception at graduation. Request for $500.
      3.1.3.1. Motion for $500, seconded. Approved.
      3.1.3.2. At ASCCC spring plenary session colleagues statewide were all showing concerns about the state budget. Thanks to Michael Mangin for serving as the Cabrillo voting delegate.

3.2. Vice President (Michael Mangin)
   3.2.1. Michael reported his observations from the plenary session. Regarding the drop resolution, recommended that perhaps colleges can set their withdraw deadline
nearer to 50% of the semester. Went ahead with limiting number of withdrawals per course.

3.3. Secretary (John Govsky)
   3.3.1. John attend the plenary session for the part-time instructor caucus (he is a founding member) as was appointed communication director for the caucus.
   3.3.2. The website is updated, except committees page. If you are serving on a committee, please review this page for accuracy/updates. If you have any feedback about the website, please let John know.

3.4. Treasure (Lenny Norton)
   3.4.1. Nothing new to report.

3.5. CCFT (John Govsky)
   3.5.1. Burrito Bash, next Friday May 6th.
   3.5.2. CCFT Monday at 2:30.

3.6. CCEU (Rick Fillman)
   3.6.1. Hiring prioritization, thanks faculty senate for their support. Other things that came out of discussion helped figure out what the CCEU is looking for in the near term. Faced with reductions and looking for input. SPRAC came out of discussion as well, it is a committee which will allow faculty and classified input regarding Services and Program Reduction Advisory Committee. 3 classified, couple faculty, and administration from the affected areas. They are trying to plan for reductions by being reactive.

3.7. Watsonville (Eva Acosta)
   3.7.1. Had a meeting about the new look of Watsonville center after cuts. Looking at new ways of being creative about bringing in funds.

3.8. ASCC (Gaby Avila)
   3.8.1. Next Thursday will be meeting at Scotts Valley. Looking to fund ASCC advisor. Elections are still going on until Friday.
   3.8.1.1. There have been complaints regarding safety of information with HigherOne who administer our financial aid distribution.

3.9. SLO Assessment Coordinator (Marcy Alancraig)
   3.9.1. Went to conference and Greg Stoup was there. She reported that he felt that the BRIC discussion was great, however, the next task is to get from discussion to action. At Greg’s college they have a research advisory committee that answers one question per year. That way there would be a method of developing a culture of inquiry.
   3.9.1.1. Senate shows support of considering this method and endorsed exploration of our own implementation of that idea.
   3.9.2. Soon there will be a questionnaire regarding the SLO processes. How involved they are, what barriers they have, and how the college can help them overcome those barriers. Faculty will receive an email.

3.10. VPI (Renée Kilmer)
   3.10.1. Next SAC meeting on Thursday about repetition/withdrawal. Clarification, that if a student may not be getting an F, but maybe a C, that in the past a student may be recommended to retake the class. Now in the new system the number of times you drop is more important.
   3.10.2. Possible leases of facilities. Hard to generate revenue, Brian King has been looking at new ways. Prep. school is looking for a space, possibility of leasing out the Scotts Valley center in the day. This keeps our presence in the community and generates revenue. Also, another small prep. school is looking into leasing out a part of Watsonville center as well, CEIBA Charter School. Through that we would
lease out the ‘old’ building, classes and office space. Still costs like energy, custodial, and maintenance.

3.10.3. This is a new approach making the most of empty classrooms on campus. Monterey Prep School is the school looking to lease. Looking at around $100,000 revenue. However, tenants are not free, but this is an appealing opportunity. CEIBA, a 9th-12th grade school, is currently renting out space at 280 Main Street from PVUSD so we are close and convenient to their current location. County of Office of Education is using most of the first floor at Watsonville center. Last week, had meeting and estimates $40,000 from Office of Education and CEIBA each. Introduces new issues, security of the building, different ages of people in building. It would be good to have people in the building all day. SOS has been using a lot of the building and will now have to determine how much they need. Spaces at Watsonville, old post office would be best for both, but may not be able to do that. Must be aware that market value is fluctuating. Want to be very conservative in being a landlord.

3.10.3.1. Must note that it can be easy to become addicted to revenue. May want the space back in the future. In the future, may become a ‘revenue or classes for new students?’ issue. There will come a time when we are looking at increased enrollment.

3.10.3.1.1. Will be 1-year pilot. Won’t look at this revenue as operating budget but as a one-time budget.

3.10.3.2. Neither deal is finalized. Hopefully will be proposed in June meeting.

4. Unfinished or Ongoing Business
5. New Business

5.1.5.1 SLO Assessment Review Committee Recommendation

5.1.1. Assessment Review Committee has recommended a change to our assessment process. The senate will begin a discussion in advance of a vote at a future meeting.

5.1.2. ARC has been trying to deal with issues regarding SLO. Currently, faculty analyze specific questions then orally report results of assessment, no numbers, the program chair reports what people discovered and recommends change. This method has been declared proficient. However, the ACCJC keeps raising the bar. They say the SLO should be in syllabus and catalog. They are also concerned that we are not using any numbering system. May look like we are hiding our data.

5.1.3. ARC has come up with two things. Add a third assessment method, before and after test for applicable courses. Good for numbering system. Also, want to start a pilot with a department by adding a numbers aspect that they choose. ARC wants to see what happens with pilot and wait on ACCJC decisions.

5.1.4. Just for instruction courses, many student services are already using numbers. Will only be to augment what we are already doing. Want to keep great discussion but have numbers to put in charts and other visuals.

5.1.5. Issues with using data to prove what happened. Must be careful not to show cause and effect with data.

5.1.6. If we start to use numbers, will this cause people to stop having discussions and just get the numbers?

5.2. Reduction and Elimination

5.2.1. Given the current budget situation, the senate will discuss criteria and procedures to be used if it becomes necessary to significantly reduce or eliminate instruction programs.

5.2.2. Passed out several handouts that could be found on website as well.
5.2.3. Read Section 4 of AR3120 (PRO is now Office of Institutional Research). In Part A, the list is not in any particular order. This is a vague outline without any time references. The tone of our current program deletion is targeted toward poorly performing programs. Important to start with what is currently stated. This is for instruction programs.

5.2.4. Steve has been working with Renée on a draft that was passed out at the meeting. Proposed Process for Program Discontinuation (DRAFT).

5.2.5. Notes/Comments regarding DRAFT

5.2.6. This is a way of getting data to find out which programs will eventually be targeted.

5.2.7. Matrix, want to have a response to the process, and then get a matrix that will quantify qualities. The numbers in the handout are not the focus. It is the process that is in question.

5.2.8. Want to form a joint taskforce of 7 members. The senate as a whole would not want to rank/recommend programs to be deleted. However, the faculty voice in that process needs to be strong. Will be a delicate balance to maintain. The primary goal of the taskforce would be to go through the matrix. The matrix has variety to try and describe various aspects of all departments.

5.2.9. If a program is going to be significantly reduced, it still needs to have a process just as if it were going to be eliminated. With pressing issues it would be good to have a process for both.

5.2.10. This is for next year in a worst-case scenario.

5.2.11. Idea to give a numerical value to success, use success rates, retention rates. Success is a C/pass or better.

5.2.12. Hard to define ‘significant’, vague and not exact.

5.2.13. Basic skills should be getting equal points awarded. Can they get as much as a transfer course? If equally important, then equal point values. Using legislative graduation requirements, English and math, then there is graduation/transfer requirements. Looking at whole program not individual courses.

5.2.14. What will qualitative element be? What does the faculty senate want to have as the qualitative aspects? The taskforce will have a part in designing a plan to use both quantitative and qualitative aspects.

5.2.15. If ten bottom programs are at the bottom, will there then be a qualitative discussion?

5.2.16. Could use an even numbering system or just positives.

5.2.17. First charge of the taskforce would be to make a matrix then have it approved by the faculty senate. Once a final list is generated, then it will come back to senate.

5.2.18. The end of the process will be before March 15, 2012. Want to approve the process and the taskforce by the end of the semester.

5.2.19. Must be aware of affect on other departments as a factor. Need to make sure that large/small programs are equally represented.

5.2.20. The idea of having so many categories in the matrix is so that every program gets points. But if everybody gets points then it won’t mean anything. The taskforce should get a list of what is important then make a scale that will give valuable information. Qualitative guidelines should be known before decisions are made. The faculty senate needs to decide what are the most important qualitative points. What the senate values and what they support.

5.2.21. Although senate makes recommendations, the vice president will make the penultimate decision and the president will make the final. If senate felt that recommendation was different then what they thought, they could make their own. Senate should not recommend what programs get cut, just work on process/criteria.
5.2.22. There is a significant difference between severe reduction and elimination financially speaking from the college perspective.

5.2.23. Senate has to have a serious discussion about what we value and what criteria is important. That discussion needs to drive the matrix and process before the taskforce is put together.

5.2.24. Faculty prioritization process, worked it out so that not everyone gets 100%. Must have criteria spelled out, but in the end we are looking at how to save money. Money also has to play a role in our values because that is the reason for this. This matrix will show some programs that they are actually not on the chopping block, which would be could for campus morale.

5.2.25. Want to make sure that DRAFT is clearly labeled DRAFT.

5.2.26. Next meeting is next week May 3rd. Just on this issue.

6. **Open Forum**

7. **Adjourn**