Cabrillo College Faculty Senate

Tuesday, May 17, 2011

3:07 - 5:02 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 Ingel (BELA), Denis Lim (NAS), Michael Mangin, Diego Navarro (at-large), Lenny Norton (HAWK/Treasurer), Jo-An Panzardi (at-large), 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.)

Note Taker: David Kehn

Guests: Camille Nava, Dale Attias, Francine Van Meter, Nancy Brown, James Weckler, Margery Regalado-Rodriguez, Brian King, Brian Legakis, Helen Jackson Jones, Regina Decosse, Rhea Leonard

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

2. Minutes
   2.1. April 26, 2011
       2.1.1. Section 3.10.2 CEIBA not SABA
       2.1.2. Revisions in spelling.
       2.1.3. Motion to approve, second,
               2.1.3.1. Minutes Approved.

3. Reports
   3.1. President (Steve Hodges)
       3.1.1. Please make sure that Steve has the correct email address for all senators.
       3.1.2. Appointed Michael Willi to Food and Beverage Task Force.
       3.1.3. Congratulations to Dan Rothwell who won Outstanding Educator Award.
       3.1.4. Dan Rothwell volunteered to be on SPRAC, and is approved.
   3.2. Vice President (Michael Mangin)
       3.2.1. Passed out signup sheet for grad night. Will be same caterer from last year. Have about 21 retirees from the college, 8 are full time faculty. If there are long-term adjuncts who are retiring, please let Michael know. Needs help with publicity, setup, and then cleanup. Would like one person from each division to put up a flyer for the division that Michael passed out.
       3.2.2. In the past other organizations have given donations, any donations are appreciated.
       3.2.3. Announced running for President for next Fall.
   3.3. Secretary (John Govsky)
       3.3.1. Nothing new to report.
   3.4. Treasurer (Lenny Norton)
       3.4.1. A group that has helped support grad night before, CCEU.
       3.4.2. Motion to spend money on the party, in line with previous expenditures.
               3.4.2.1. Second, approved.
3.5. CCFT (John Govsky)
   3.5.1. Look for an announcement for a town-hall meeting to discuss how to respond to the current budget situation. Not scheduled yet, could be next Thursday. This is an opportunity for faculty to give input.

3.6. CCEU (Rick Fillman)
   3.6.1. Recently negotiated a retirement incentive. Need notices to the district by June 15.
   3.6.2. Concerns about morale, timing, and communication. Concerns that the reserves that were put forth, were to give us time. We are not feeling like there is enough time. Feels like CCEU members are being targeted.

3.7. Watsonville (Eva Acosta)
   3.7.1. Having Running Start this Friday from 9-2 to help high school seniors register. Workshops are happening to show students how to use WebAdvisor. Expecting up to 1000 students on Friday. The only students that can do Running Start are current county high school students.

3.8. SLO Assessment Coordinator (Marcy Alancraig)
   3.8.1. SLO survey has been postponed until the Fall.
   3.8.2. Greg Stoup recommendation, of one big research question, will be postponed until the Fall.
   3.8.3. ARC
   3.8.4. ARC is suggestion the addition of a numerical element to assessment of SLOs. Wanted to add numerical element to ARC. ARC believes that such a change should be made in advance of our next accreditation cycle.
   3.8.4.1. Could add a ‘pre and post’ test.
   3.8.4.2. Some departments would add a numerical part as a pilot. Looking for possible volunteers. Certain departments are more appropriate. The pilot would endorse the principle. Would want to make sure that different departments are not compared with each other.
   3.8.5. Motion to approve the proposal from ARC.
   3.8.5.1. Second, Approved.

3.9. VPI (Renee Kilmer)
   3.9.1. Currently, the distance program uses Blackboard. CPC recently approved that blackboard would do the hosting for us. Now IT has additional time to work on other issues. Staring July 1st, Blackboard will no longer be on our servers.
   3.9.2. Clarify rumors
   3.9.2.1. There is not an official list of programs that should be cut. We are developing a process. In the end though, a list will be developed, then there will be discussion about that.
   3.9.2.2. ACE formerly DBA is not being eliminated. They have 5 cohorts planned for Fall and 3 for Spring. The GATES Grant is coming to an end. When that ends, everything associated with the grant will go away when the grant goes, this includes staff.
   3.9.2.3. Watsonville Summer Session is happening. As for the future, there are no plans to eliminate summer session.

4. Unfinished or Ongoing Business
   4.1. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT
   4.1.1. Nothing new, modification. Fixed things up for the catalog. Change in Chair, so Mike Strunk sat in. Looking forward to next year, with 210 proposals for next Fall.
   4.1.2. Motion to Approve.
   4.1.2.1. Second, Motion Approved.
   4.2. FLEX CALENDAR APPROVAL
4.2.1.54 Workshops scheduled. Reduced the number of pages by 25%, want to go paperless but some people still want the paper version.

4.2.2. Motion to Approve.

4.2.2.1. Second, Motion Approved.

4.3. FACULTY HIRING PRIORITIZATION TASK FORCE REPORT

4.3.1. The four of them met, every item was looked at. For item 1, only added descriptive language. Item 3, overly descriptive, modified some language. Nothing changed to the calculations, just the language.

4.3.2. Item 5, unavailability of adjunct faculty. Now hiring is an ongoing process.

4.3.3. Added Item 6. Have the idea of 75% full 25% part-time. This ideal is not uniformly applied, CTE for example. The idea is that the new ideal will be a historical 5-year high point. Still need to run scenarios to figure out how to assign points. The concern is that some departments are steadily losing full time faculty. Bad timing for retiring could decimate a department quickly. The old way makes it hard for departments to get back to where they once were. This way programs would be compared to their own historical high.

4.3.3.1. Concerns that 5 years may not be enough time. Can still decide how long to look back.

4.3.3.2. Size of department could play a role. Larger departments will have more opportunities to lose faculty.

4.3.4. Clarification under accrediting. Bullet points are examples of things that can earn you points.

4.3.5. Item 1, initial charge to exam committee was to focus on adjunct pool. Item 1 could be better for large departments while 6 for smaller departments.

4.3.6. What is the latest we could approve this to be applied for use? Scenarios will be looked at over the summer. Will need it by first or second meeting.

4.3.7. Need a report from the committee so it will be possible to see how it will play out for large vs. small departments.

4.3.7.1. Motion to request scenarios are run according to number 6. The scenarios would help determine the scale. Will be discussed in first fall meeting.

4.3.7.1.1. Motion second, Approved.

4.4. BP 3140, BP 3150, BP 3500 DRAFT UPDATE PROPOSALS

4.4.1. BP 3140 – Steve sent out associated AR’s. Off campus programs, minor cleanups. Now have two centers, identified them. The bolded language is new.

4.4.2. In AR, Dean of Education Center is Rachel Mayo.

4.4.2.1. Motion to approve, second.

4.4.2.1.1. Approved.

4.4.3. BP 3150 – Minor changes, took out some of the procedural language.

4.4.3.1. Motion to approve, second.

4.4.3.1.1. Approved.

4.4.4. BP 3500 – CCFT and the district made some changes to clean up language. Changed the AR to reflect the procedures we are currently using. Bullet points came from past senate who preferred those bullet points.

4.4.4.1. Motion to approve, second.

4.4.4.1.1. Approved.

4.5. VIRTUAL LABS PRESENTATION

4.5.1. Presentation by Barbara Durland, Ray Ryder.

4.5.2. Passed out a hand out that summarizes virtual technology. Virtual Desktop Initiative. Computers on campus are getting older. Acknowledging the problem,
we have a program that should have been replaced every 5 years, it has been close to 10 years.

4.5.3. Looking at ways to solve this problem. Looking to launch this by thinking and participation. Started working with CIS and Cisco lab. Will look at results of this, then make possible recommendations.

4.5.4. Virtual Desktop, desktop does not need to crunch numbers. Will instead have all the data through a main server. Will still use some of the resources of the computer hardware, but the majority of processing will take place in the main server.

4.5.5. What about when the network goes down? If network does go down, you can still use some basic applications.

4.5.6. Once you have this system you could potentially access your school computer from home. The remote access is not new technology.

4.5.7. The advantage is that if your individual computer crashes you will still have all your data. The biggest advantage is cost savings of not buying all new computers.
4.5.7.1. Long term is that a student could take a lab and have access remotely.
4.5.7.2. If your current hard-drive crashes, it is gone. If it is in a server it is saved and backed up periodically.

4.5.8. SARS is a web based application, could be incorporated.

4.5.9. Faculty can currently back up their own computers. What about security? Only thing that could be stolen would be images.

4.5.10. Each department would still be able to have their own programs. Would need extra resources for some programs like AutoCAD. Will still be used for common applications. Programs installed the same as a desktop, will just need to have programs installed on main server also.

4.5.11. Will help IT so they can help classrooms remotely.

4.5.12. There will always be good reason to have hard drives, for people who have heavy usage. The issue right now is the classrooms that have 10 year old computers that are ready to break down.

4.5.13. The Initiative, is to get approval, then start looking at implementing.

4.5.14. There are some other colleges who are pursuing this. Could look at them to see how it goes. Orange County, Yosemite, San Mateo.

4.6. PROGRAM ELIMINATION CRITERIA AND PROCESS (CONTINUING)

4.6.1. Remind the senate, that there was the idea of scheduling one more meeting on May 24th. Two reasons:
4.6.1.1. Might not be able to finish our conversation today.
4.6.1.2. Next CPC meeting on the 18th, good to have discussion about that.

4.6.2. Not possible to bring results from the survey Steve took. Large variability with the ratings for the numbers. Some rated 10% for efficiency, other up to 50% for efficiency.

4.6.3. Deciding what the percentages will be still needs to be determined.

4.6.4. Regarding the survey, questions starting with “I” gives a sense of personal opinion.

4.6.5. Only 10 out of 25 voting senators voted. Didn’t find any particular meaning from the survey. In conclusion, the survey didn’t work.

4.6.6. Whether 3 categories or 1 category, the numbers ended up looking similar.

4.6.7. Motion that the senate approve a taskforce. Proposed membership is 3 faculty (Steve Hodges and two more), 3 admin (Renee and two she would appoint), 1 researcher (Rick Fillman). As suggested in the DRAFT document.
4.6.7.1. Motion to approve, second,
4.6.7.1.1. Approved.
4.6.7.2. In the end, 10 programs are going to be in the bottom. Eventually, there will be conflict, this is just helping us come up with a better starting point.
4.6.7.3. When faculty is represented on the taskforce it would be good to have people from CTE, Basic Skills and Transfer.

4.6.7.4. This taskforce is for developing ranking criteria. SPRAC is for looking at process.

4.6.7.5. Further discussion would be needed if senate does not approve the taskforce recommendations. If we wait too long to develop criteria it will give less time once programs are chosen.

4.6.7.6. Timing, if we start the discussion at the first meeting the reps here need to get back to the faculty. Somehow the faculty needs to find out what is happening. Senate needs to see results then take to faculty, discuss, then decide.

4.6.7.7. Possible amendment, results would come back to flex meeting, hear results of taskforce, then have meeting on September 13th.
   4.6.7.7.1. Motion to approve, second,
   4.6.7.7.2. Approved.

4.6.8. Today, voting on whether or not would have a matrix. The matrix will be presented during flex week. Then meet 1st or 2nd week of class.

4.6.9. Reminded that this is a joint taskforce that will come forward with criteria.
   4.6.9.1. During the summer the administration will have more contact with other administration, the faculty will have less contact because no classes.

4.7. Motion to have next meeting on May 24th.
   4.7.1. Motion to approve, second.
   4.7.1.1. Approved.

5. Adjourn