Cabrillo College Faculty Senate

Tuesday, May 24, 2011

3:15 - 5:10 pm

Horticulture Building

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), Denise Lim (NAS), Michael Mangin (at-large/Vice Pres.), Diego Navarro (at-large), Jo-Ann Panzardi (at-large), Yasmina Porter (VAPA), Beth Regardz (at-large), Dan Rothwell (at-large), Pam Sanborn (HAWK), Deborah Shulman (Instructional Dev.), Marcy Alancraig(SLO Assessment Coor.), Rick Fillman (CCEU Liaison), Renee Kilmer (VP of Instr.)

Note Taker: David Kehn

Guests: Barbara Schule Perez, Sarah Albertson, Sharon Took-Zozoya, Rhea Leonard, Nancy Brown, Wanda Garner, James Weckler, Jason Malone, Peter Shaw, Claire Thorson

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

2. **Minutes**  
   2.1. May 3, 2011  
      2.1.1. Revisions.  
      2.1.2. Motion to approve, second,  
      2.1.2.1. Approved.

3. **Reports**  
   3.1. President (Steve Hodges)  
      3.1.1. One main item today with two things,  
      3.1.1.1. Task Force makeup  
      3.1.1.2. Criteria  
      3.1.2. Looking forward to graduation and end of the year party.
   3.2. Vice President
   3.3. Secretary (John Govsky)  
      3.3.1. Website has been caught up.
   3.4. Treasurer (Lenny Norton)
   3.5. CCFT (John Govsky)  
      3.5.1. Ongoing election, vote by Thursday. Ballot boxes in division office.  
      3.5.2. Thursday room 456. Discussion of how to deal with benefits program.
      Vote on dues increase, needs majority yes.
   3.6. CCEU (Rick Fillman)
3.6.1. Classified Appreciation Week came and went. Feeling that the process is going to fast. District has brought 7 positions that are to be eliminated. Going to hit again with next round.

3.7. Watsonville (Eva Acosta)
3.8. ASCC (Gaby Avila)
3.9. SLO Assessment Coordinator (Marcy Alancraig)
3.10. VPI (Renee Kilmer)
   3.10.1. Morale has become very low for classified staff. Most of the eliminated positions were vacancies.
   3.10.2. District is looking for ways to increase revenue. Possible leases in Watsonville are about to happen. Scotts Valley Center not going as well. Sharing will probably not work, conflict in schedules between us and them. There is another prep school, Oasis, looking into renting out the 350 building. They took a tour, and liked the possible space. The building as it exists, would need major remodel purposes. Want to be able to eventually use the 350 building for us when funds do come. Looking at all possible ways of generating revenue.

4. This semester (Spring 2011) the AC did the following
   4.1. Made some clarifications in the catalog:
      4.1.1. Clarified the term "completion" in determining continuous enrollment.
      4.1.2. Clarified the wording for GPA calculation for repeatable courses.
      4.1.3. Removed the limit on the number of courses that can be double counted in GE and Major coursework effective Fall 2011.
      4.1.4. Allowed the following courses baccalaureate credit for a course with no lower division parallel.: FT6, CIS 130, CJ 110.
      4.1.5. Added CG 52 to area E (AA/AS)
      4.1.6. Added ECE 52 to area D (AA/AS, CSU) and multicultural list.
      4.1.7. Students with DD 214 can use it for 3 units in area E
      4.1.8. Reviewed and approved ARs: 3020, 3120, 3010, 3260, 3220, 3150, 3250, 3030, 3121, 3230, 3025, 3140
      4.1.9. Overall we had a most excellent semester!

5. Unfinished or Ongoing Business
   5.1. Program Elimination Criteria and Process (continuing)
   5.2. Two things for us to work on are:
      5.2.1. Give tentative approval of taskforce.
      5.2.2. Criteria.
   5.3. Examples of how to choose people:
      5.3.1. How do you choose people who are not going to be in the bottom.
      5.3.2. Pick people who have experience as program chair.
      5.3.3. Only pick people good with numbers.
      5.3.4. At least one adjunct.
      5.3.5. Only people who have been at this college a long time.
   5.4. Trickier to firm up criteria. Could enumerate categories that we think should be in the college.
   5.5. Concern that senate will not make specific recommendation. Then when committee comes back with results, may not agree. There is no ranking system
that won’t put some at the bottom. Must come up with criteria that will rank programs differently, so as not all are the same.

5.6. On the taskforce, 7 people (Steve, Renee, 1 Steve choice(tentative), 2 more admin, 2 more faculty

5.7. Was chosen to be seven people because wanted equal number of reps. Don’t want only faculty senate, but not all administration. Must be small enough to make decisions. Committee will have to meet frequently, possibly weekly or every other week.

5.8. Possibility to have a ‘preview’ draft so that the criteria will not be totally new. If faculty and admin have the chance to talk with their peers over the summer, it could benefit the process. The faculty and administration may want to have meetings together after the taskforce meeting.

5.9. Clarification, Joint Taskforce between Faculty Senate and Administration.

5.9.1. Executive board will choose two faculty. 4 people, President, VP, Secretary, Treasurer.

5.10. 11 names have been given to Steve to go onto the Taskforce. People have put forth other peoples names. Possibly have those 11 people ‘run’ for the taskforce. People could be nominated, then voted for. A vote could be difficult to implement.

5.11. Administration, Renee has already picked two deans. Wanda Garner and Kathy Welch, and they have agreed.

5.12. If you increase the number, there may be more ties, which would slow down the process. Less people means easier to where the ‘college hat’.

5.13. The taskforce is actually writing the document. 3 admin, 3 faculty, and Rick. Will be consensus process. The committee will create a numerical ranking, this will not eliminate programs. The bottom programs will then be discussed.

5.14. Eventually, checking the numbers has to be done by someone. Someone who is familiar with numbers would be good to advise.

5.15. Rick sees himself having a functional roll, if a CCEU Rep. is desired then the CCEU could appoint one.

5.16. Must set criteria today, if not it will be up to the taskforce. This group puts forth the criteria they want. Joint taskforce, will be voices for both sides at all steps.

5.17. Motion to select faculty from, CTE, Basic Skills, Transfer.

5.17.1. Second,
5.17.2. That composition would allow for two people from same division. This is for ranking programs, however, Basic Skills is not just one program.
5.17.3. Steve represents Transfer.
5.17.4. Is Basic Skills in jeopardy? Each department will have its own basic skills.
5.17.5. Who will these people be? Is this going away from who is actually available and who will be here?
5.17.6. Basic Skills is the foundation of what we do. We could get more diversity by choosing from a different dept.
5.17.7. Could be one from math/science, arts, humanities. What about CTE, occupational programs?

5.17.8. Motion that one member represent CTE:
   5.17.8.1. For – 10
   5.17.8.2. Against – 4
   5.17.8.3. Abstain – 4

5.17.9. Not unanimous, but still strong vote. VAPA feeling that they are a left out of those categories.

5.17.10. NEW Motion

5.18. Motion for executive board to appoint two other, that are represented to their best judgment.
   5.18.1. Second, approved.

5.19. Every person that was suggested to Steve was by recommendation. Most were one faculty recommending another faculty. Specifically for HAWK, and VAPA to be represented.

5.20. Criteria

5.21. General Comments

5.22. 1 Efficiency
   5.22.1. Weekly student contact hours.
   5.22.2. Some programs have state mandated less students and more faculty. Leads to ‘were expensive because we have to be’.
   5.22.3. Is there a way to weight student demand? Some programs take a lot of money, but there is a large demand.
   5.22.4. Student demand would fall under a different criteria.
   5.22.5. 90% of students coming in have to take basic skills program. If you look only at cost factor and not at through-put not a good measurement.
   5.22.6. Could look at the state average. Look at WSCH of programs.

5.23. 2 State Designated core Mission
   5.23.1. State has primary goals of transfer, CTE and Basic Skills.

5.24. 3 Student Success
   5.24.1. If the senate wants to include SLO, the data is of the people who participated. We already do them, and that shows we value them. Sometimes you can get at some things not measured by numbers.
   5.24.2. Student Success should be a lot smaller percentage than the others, namely Efficiency.
   5.24.3. Retroactive, is it bad to use numbers for SLO’s when people didn’t know that their program was in jeopardy based on the SLO’s.
   5.24.4. Do we just use hard numbers? Or mix with other measurements, such as participation.
   5.24.5. Motion to make it 1/3% each, Success, Retention, Process (SLO & ARC program planning).
      5.24.5.1. Second,
      5.24.5.2. Program planning will be based on the expectation of the time, when underwent the process.
      5.24.5.3. Persistence numbers, and other traditional numbers should be a large majority.
5.24.5.4. SLO and Program Planning do not have to do with student success. It shows faculty success and faculty following directions.

5.24.5.4.1. Motion to include SLO as a criteria

5.24.5.4.1.1. For-8
5.24.5.4.1.2. Against – 5
5.24.5.4.1.3. Abstain - 3

5.25. 4 Broad Access

5.25.1. How do we measure this? Is this just a demographic search? Does a program that serves a traditionally disadvantaged group get more points?

5.25.2. There is a lot of demographic data on all programs, it would just be difficult to measure.

5.25.3. Idea: ‘What language is spoken at home”, or “which program attracts international students’

5.25.4. Needs to be broad, possibly ‘re-entry students’.

5.25.5. Would need to look at data that we already have, and a new way to look at it. Students that graduate from comprehensive high schools and those that didn’t. ‘Non-traditional’ could not work with other programs.

5.25.6. Broad Access may be a counter balance to the other categories.

5.25.7. Ideas: Veterans, students who live far away, can only go to class at night. Distance Education has looked at this and may be good to get input from.

5.25.8. Graduating high school, where do they rank? As opposed to a re-entry student. Few and fewer high-school students are going straight to a 4 year.

5.25.9. Some programs will naturally fall out, using the criteria put forth. There must be the institutional value of what is important, we must choose.

5.26. 5 Community Support

5.27. Motion for 25% for Community Support. Motion failed for want of a second.

5.28. These were chosen because: 1- need dollars, 2 - state has a clear preference of funding, 3 - gives more points to successful programs, 4 - needs to remain diverse, 5 - recognizing community college.

5.28.1. Motion that student demand be put into one of these categories.

5.28.1.1. Second,
5.28.1.2. Must be sensitive about demands. When staring a new program, will need a recruiting staff. At least 40 colleges use an opt-out program. Ours is opt-in, if students want in they have to find out about it on their own.

5.28.1.2.1. Motion Approved.

5.29. Thanks to Steve for his time and effort for the survey. Many people took the survey seriously. We are a community college, we need at least 25% to Broad Based Community Support. We are a strong art based community.

5.29.1. Coming up with the criteria is just the first step. If you are way down on the bottom, you are not necessarily out.

5.29.2. Motion that there be a starting point suggested of 40 Efficiency then 15,15,15,15.

5.29.2.1. Second,
5.29.2.2. Concerns that we are talking about state values, not our values. We should ask for what we actually value and then when the decision comes it may or it may not be different.

5.29.2.3. Two most important categories for saving money are Efficiency and Student Success. Costs money for a student to start, not finish and then take it again.

5.29.2.4. Motion for 40-15-15-15 weighting:
   5.29.2.4.1. For-2
   5.29.2.4.2. Against-13

5.29.3. Motion for minimum 40 percent for Efficiency,
   5.29.3.1. Second,
   5.29.3.2. Vote:
   5.29.3.2.1. For – 11
   5.29.3.2.2. Against-4
   5.29.3.2.3. Abstain-1

5.29.4. Motion that Student Success 25%
   5.29.4.1. Second,
   5.29.4.1.1. Vote:
   5.29.4.1.1.1. For-9
   5.29.4.1.1.2. Against-3
   5.29.4.1.1.3. Abstain-4

5.29.5. Motion that the joint force faculty gives the other faculty info – keeping faculty informed to the progress of the task force.
   5.29.5.1. Second,
   5.29.5.2. Administration wears all ‘hats’ and will have a better idea of each programs nuances.
   5.29.5.3. Motion approved.

5.29.6. Make sure if you want to be a part of the process check your email throughout the summer.

5.29.7. Motion for at least for 15% community support.
   5.29.7.1. Second,
   5.29.7.2. What exactly does community support entail? Values of such a large community could vary.
   5.29.7.3. Motion for at least 15% for community support:
   5.29.7.3.1. For-3
   5.29.7.3.2. Against-5
   5.29.7.3.3. Abstain-9

6. Adjourn