Cabrillo College Faculty Senate

Tuesday, May 3, 2011

3:03 - 5:05 pm

Sesnon House

In Attendance: Arturo Cantu (Counseling), Joseph Carter (BELA), Jean Gallagher-Heil (HASS), John Govsky (VAPA/Sec./CCFT Lias.), Steve Hodges (President), Calais Ingel (BELA), Denise Lim (NAS), Michael Mangin (at-large/Vice Pres.), 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), Renee Kilmer (VP of Instr.), Gaby Avila (Student Senate Rep.)

Note Taker: David Kehn

Guests: Rhea Leonard, David Balogh, Bridgete Clark, David Schwartz, Sarah Albertson, Jason Molone, Brian Legakis, Regina Decosse, David King, Helen Jackson, Kim Belliveau, Annie Killefer, Rick Pfotenhauer, Nancy Brown, Jim Weckler, Topsy Smalley, David Douglass, Beth McMinnon, Merritt Tucker, Claire Thorson, Geneffa Jonker, Nancy Stucker, Peter Shaw, Steve Larson, Maya Bendotoff, Susan Hoisington, Lesley Louden

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

2. Reports
   2.1. Special Meeting Agenda

3. Unfinished or Ongoing Business
   3.1. We currently have a Title V grant, going for another one in STEM. Thanks to Jo-Ann Panzardi for her help working on the grant.
   3.2. This is a special "one topic only" meeting to discuss criteria (and related process discussions) to provide strong input to the "task force" (should that process be endorsed by the Senate) or whatever body is tasked with program reductions. There will be no other business conducted at this meeting.
   3.2.1. This is about developing criteria. If faculty senate wants to help with the criteria this is the time to do give their input. Not making a recommendation.
   3.2.2. Every program is different, but in order to have monetary savings we need to make budgetary considerations. If we cut small parts of programs that will just increase the relative expense of those programs. If a program can show that a reduction, instead of elimination, will be beneficial for savings then that needs to be brought up.
   3.2.3. Want to generate a list that has some constraints on specific recommendations. Hopefully generate a ballot to vote on. Could vote on email, tally, then come back next meeting and look at votes.
   3.2.4. Steve has had a number of recommendations that he passed out copies of. The meeting will start with specific comments then open to senators and guests.
   3.2.5. At this meeting there will be two sets of minutes, as well as an appendix of all recommendations. Please email any recommendations you have to Steve and he will collect them and put into the appendix.

3.3. Individual Comments
3.3.1. Steve read several individual email comments out loud.
3.3.2. CTE has a degree to show success. Accreditation as well. Labor market analysis used should be based on SC County as well as the Bay Area. Since we are a commuter community that area should be considered as well.
3.3.3. Where data comes from should be clearly identified.
3.3.4. Foreign languages are concerned. Criteria related to AA degrees would strengthen their position.
3.3.5. Suggestion about Taskforce, the group should represent Transfer, CTE and Basic Skills.
3.3.6. Criteria should reflect broad social goals.
3.4. Open Comments
3.4.1. Allied Health is considered CTE, concern because allied health is different from other CTE programs. Strongly encourage us to look at job market in our area.
3.4.2. Still want to have education available to academically disadvantaged students, as well as students with disabilities.
3.4.3. Implications on other programs need to be considered. Costs in other places.
3.4.4. Possible domino affect, not necessarily courses. Example of library and counseling, want to preserve LIA’s, could be greater efficiency in merging manager positions.
3.4.5. When students are taking academic courses, they still need an outlet with non-academic courses. Students who do not have outlets may not be as successful overall.
3.4.6. Should focus on reductions not eliminations. Discussing elimination could evoke a fight or flight feeling. This could make the departments think of every way to save themselves. What if everybody takes a cut from janitors to the president?
3.4.7. Divisional efficiency, could think of this as an opportunity build for a better future.
3.4.8. May not be able to close certain programs due to the 50% Law. The 50% Law states that a college has to spend 50% of its budget on direct instruction. Historically, Cabrillo College has been very close to this. Direction from the governing board says we must stay on the right side of the 50% law. (Schools that fall into the wrong side face significant financial penalties.) Direct instruction costs include the salaries and benefits of the teachers and in-class classroom support.
3.4.9. We are all in this together, we must recognize this and maintain the great staff and faculty that we have.
3.5. DRAFT criteria comments
3.5.1. The function of this first round should just look at efficiency. However, it is good having the broader base. In the past, 2003, we just used efficiency. Efficiency should be a central criteria.
3.5.2. Will ‘one size fits all’ criteria be beneficial for everybody? Could have different criteria for different programs. With each one of those having their own criteria.
3.5.3. What is essential to making this an institution of higher learning? Are you college if you don’t have a decent library? Should keep in mind things that we think a college should have.
3.5.4. What if not fair? Not about fair, about developing values.
3.5.5. Remember that once something is cut, it is gone forever.
3.5.6. Suspended animation, if a program is suspended do we still get credit for reduction? This way we could possibly bring it back when funds come back.
3.5.7. Lifelong learning segment of college may be in jeopardy. Those kinds of classes are part of our college mission. We are being pushed to redefine our college mission to be like the college mission of the state of CA.
3.5.8. Fresno State has chosen to take a 25% reduction instead of cutting programs.
3.5.9. Discontinued programs, salary reductions, every college is doing things different. Most schools are still looking at their own options and have yet to come to a decision.
3.5.10. We’re not called a Junior College, we are a Community College, our service to the community should not take a backseat even when dealing with this type of situation.

3.5.11. Efficiency, how does it relate to student success? Is transferring a success? Is getting a job that pays rent success? Efficiency could be related to other programs in the state.

3.5.12. UC is shifting as well. Must also look at the changes that UC and CSU systems are taking. Don’t want to work with an old model.

3.5.13. ESL is being cut in many places. Community college is all that is left for students to have access to higher education.

3.6. Need to decide if we are going to look at criteria for all programs, or individual CTE, Transfer, and Basic skills.

3.6.1. In the mission statement, there is a classic goal of liberal arts education. State core mission is CTE, Transfer, Basic Skills. If the criteria uses numerical data, could compare the 3.

3.6.2. Some programs span 2 categories. Would still be rated in both categories and could give more data about the program.

3.6.3. Talking about elimination of programs, if it was reduction it would be different. Want to create numerical ranking to look at the bottom programs. Then look at those bottom programs and discuss.

3.6.4. The matrix will only be to identify programs. Then there would be a qualitative discussion regarding those programs.

3.6.5. Each area comes up with it’s own criteria or weights the data.

3.6.6. Some things should be across the college. No matter what program, should all be compared against one standing.

3.6.7. What do we value? But also what do we value least to not keep?

3.6.8. Non-binding vote of who thinks 3 lists or 1 list

3.6.8.1. 3 different criteria list – (CTE, Transfer, Basic Skills) ≈ 7

3.6.8.2. 1 matrix ≈ 7

3.6.9. Concerns that with 3 task groups, will eventually end up grading your own dept.

3.6.10. Since matrix is not the decision, could use one matrix, then see what comes of the matrix, then rate the bottom programs.

3.6.11. If you did have separate taskforces, the senate could give separate values for each.

3.6.12. Will come back to ‘3 lists vs. 1’ at another time.

3.6.12.1. No recommendation at this time.

4. Review DRAFT document

4.1. If there is a particular thing to measure, we should just measure it once and not be redundant.

4.2. Efficiency

4.2.1. It’s important to determine how many students are being served. Some courses require more 1-on-1 teaching. Efficiency is about finding how many students per dollar. How many students are actually affected if a program is cut?

4.2.2. If we need to get rid of something, we should try to harm the least number of students.

4.2.3. With five different categories efficiency is just one.

4.2.4. Efficiency is about saving money. The other four criteria cover values.

4.2.5. Maybe add another criteria called ‘size of impact’, ‘number of students affected’ and ‘dollar amount savings of impact.’

4.2.6. Whether in the matrix or after the matrix the quantity of the savings is very important.

4.2.7. Is comparing with 5 years ago enough time to get a good snapshot of our current situation?

4.2.8. Talking about the public’s money, so efficiency is important. Possible metrics include FTES/FTEF or WSCH/FTEF.
4.2.9. Motion to give efficiency 40-50 percent.
    4.2.9.1. Motion tabled.

4.3. State Designated Core Mission

4.4. Student Success

   4.4.1. We are talking about past data, but if we pass this we are showing what is important. Showing what we value will have an affect of future faculty and programs so we need to be careful how we judge program success.

   4.4.2. Ways to value success are through program planning and SLO’s. Should get points for program planning and doing SLO’s. This is good that it doesn’t say what success is, but that we value program planning and SLO’s. Everybody is supposed to be doing SLO’s and yet there are still some departments who are not doing them, or only partially doing them.

   4.4.3. They are process measures, but we need outcome measures. Concerned about grade inflation. What can you measure that won’t lead to grade inflation? For Transfer, how many transferred? For CTE, who got certificates? Basic Skills, look 2 semesters later to see how they are performing in transfer level classes.

   4.4.4. Statewide documents say – programs should not be eliminated immediately, need to be warned. However, that is for programs who are performing poorly, we are in a situation caused by budget shortfalls and there may not be time to give “probation” to low-ranked programs.

   4.4.5. Momentum points need to be broken down for each program. Momentum points refer to key areas that are milestones.

4.5. Broad Access

   4.5.1. Programs that serve communities that other programs don’t.

4.6. Community Support

   4.6.1. Steve will make a ballot to rank the five categories, through email.

   4.6.1.1. Also a follow up survey about generation of 3 vs. 1 list of criteria.

   4.6.1.2. Percentages of 3 vs. 1 list of criteria.

   4.6.2. Senators represent several programs. It is not the job of the senators to protect their departments; they need to protect the college. Also how to get the college the best overall results.

   4.6.3. Student success, what if you are efficient at producing students who are not successful?

   4.6.4. Must look at student success and programmatic compliance.

   4.6.5. As faculty senate our job is to protect the intellectual integrity of the school. It is the administrations job to administer.

   4.6.6. The way student success is measured in this document needs to be revised.

4.7. Steve will send out a survey, then come back next time to approve/deny them. This will give us the best direction for the next meeting.

   4.7.1. Either/or follow up questions.

   4.7.2. Possibly add a 6th category, ‘size of impact’, ‘cost of savings’

   4.7.3. Some programs have to do certain things that affect their efficiency. Must note when state requirements affect efficiency.

   4.7.4. Doing SLO assessments is a better measure of success. Beyond grades.

   4.7.5. Broad Access

   4.7.5.1. What’s the demographic that defines a community? How well do programs help those communities? List communities that we want data for.

   4.7.5.2. Caps are for classes based on accreditation, safety. Could class caps be incorporated?

   4.7.6. Some senators are representing divisions. There are also at-large reps.
4.7.7. Email should go out to everybody, with references to division representatives. The division could then talk with their representatives.

4.7.8. Motion for faculty senate committed towards draft proposed matrix.

4.7.8.1. Motion second, approved.

5. **Adjourn**