Cabrillo College Faculty Senate
Tuesday, August 23, 2011 (Fall Flex Week)
3:00 – 5:00pm
Sesnon House


Note Taker: Steve Hodges

Guests: Dave Balough, David Douglass, Wanda Garner, James Weckler, Sean Connery, Margery Regalado, Victor Ramos, Ofelia Garcia, Dave Reynolds, Patrick Meyer, Peter Shaw, Mark DeSmet, Albi Romero, Kim Belliveau, Sarah Albertson, Claudia Close, Kathy Niven, Rock Pfotenhauer, Brian Legakis, Gordon Hammer, Robin Mcfarland, Alice Rink, Charlotte Achen, Deirde Scholar, M. Rinhovsky, Isabel O'Connor, Jennifer S. Lee, Mark Eastman, Phil Carr, Kathie Welch, John Graulty, Beth McKinnon, Deborah Bone, Claire Thorson,

1.0 Call to Order
   1.1 The meeting was called to order at 3:10 PM.

2.0 Minutes
   2.1 No minutes were reviewed at this meeting. Steve noted that there are difficulties hiring new note takers every semester. Steve requested that senators help in the recruitment of a new note taker.

3.0 Reports
   3.1 Presidents Report: Steve reported that the Program Reduction/Elimination Task Force has been meeting over the summer. It was hoped that the group would be ready to report out at the first Faculty Senate meeting, but the group is not ready to report yet. The task force is still working on the numeric matrix and hopes to report soon, possibly at the next senate meeting. Minutes of the groups meetings, and some additional documents are available on the senate website.
   3.1.1 Steve reported that he made some committee appointments and confirmations over the summer: for the statewide C-ID project Mo Hassan (Business) and Ofelia E. Garcia and Jean Gallahger-Heil (Early Childhood Education) also Michelle Rivard to the Repeatability Task Force.
3.1.2 Some committees are looking for faculty: Staff Development (replacing Chuck Smith, who retired) Yasmina Porter volunteered and (also replacing Chuck Smith) on SLRB and Alex Taurke volunteered.

3.1.3 Steve reminded attendees to fill out the flex evaluation and sign the flex attendance sheet.

3.2 VP Report: Michael reports that the feeling at CPC is that the budget situation is less dire than a few months ago. Revisions continue to the Student Rights and Responsibilities document, and the next version is expected this semester. Also, work on an Academic Integrity/Honor Code is ongoing and Michael will bring this topic to a future senate meeting.

3.3 Secretary: John reminded those in attendance to sign the roster.

3.4 CCFT: John announced that there was an important CCFT council meeting tomorrow and encouraged faculty to bring their own plates and tableware to tomorrow’s CCFT luncheon.

3.5 Treasurer: Lenny reported that the budget looks fine after last semester’s retirement party.

3.6 CCEU: Rick reported that cards had been sent to CCEU members that had been affected by recent layoffs.

3.7 Watsonville: Eva reported that faculty now have more parking and students are parking behind the tech center.

3.8 ASCC: The student senate reported that they had seven meetings over the summer and are excited to begin a new semester.

3.9 SLO Assessment Coordinator: Marcy requested that faculty please participate in an upcoming SLO ARC survey. Marcy also reported that she had been invited to present (along with the ACCJC) on successful SLO implementation.

3.10 VPI: Renee announced the kick-off or the next accreditation cycle (and corresponding self study.)

3.10.1 Renee talked about the SC County College Commitment and that a pilot 2 year transfer pathway cohort would guarantee courses to transfer students with certain majors. Implementation details remain to be decided.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Discussion of Program Reduction vs. Program Elimination

5.1.1 It was reported that the 11-12 budget is fairly well set. Classified and operational reductions have been made, health increases were lower than expected, Victoria has planned for midyear cuts in the budget, and there are still unknowns and anything can happen.
5.1.2 Paul Harvel reported that we are down about $3.3M now – possibly as much as $5M and that $2M to $3M is the approximate target for reductions.

5.1.3 It was noted that this is a hard topic to discuss due to the complexities of program reduction vs. program elimination.

5.1.4 Several senators noted that the imposition of an across the board % cut to programs would be “a disaster” due to the current state of many of our instruction programs.

5.1.5 Some was noted that reductions would be preferential to elimination of programs and that care must be made to minimize impact of reductions on our students, while others felt the opposite.

5.1.6 Dave reminded us that we have a moral (and not just legal) responsibility to our students to allow them to continue in their chosen field of study.

5.1.7 Student demand should be a factor in our eventual actions.

5.1.8 Another senator stated that everyone wants to pitch-in (to the eventual solution) but that across-the-board cuts can’t be made.

5.1.9 Electives/extras should be reduced before core offerings.

5.1.10 The possibility of reducing the number of units for some classes was discussed. Should courses be reduced to match the typical transfer units allowed for that course? It was noted that programs have often had long discussions when setting course units and that decisions have been made for pedagogical reasons. Also, a university has different resources than we do in terms of lecture+discussion sections due to graduate student population.

5.1.11 Our programs (and processes) should always be looking at change and improvement.

5.1.12 One option, in the face of reduction to elective/boutique/special interest courses, is to infuse some of that material into the department’s core courses.

5.1.13 There was some discussion of the possibility that the senate would offer guidance to our Curriculum Committee regarding program efficiency (for example unit cost of courses.) It was requested that discussion of this topic continue at future senate meetings.

5.1.14 As much as possible, diversity of our programs should be maintained. We should be aware of unintended consequences of changes to the college, and we should always be aware of access/equity issues.
5.1.15 It was noted that it is commonly held that Sacramento is planning for a smaller community college system. We should be mindful of the effects on our students and community. Success and retention should be determinants of our response. Where possible, we should be looking to increase our effectiveness. Throughput and quality are important.

5.2 Faculty Retirement, Hiring, and the FON
5.2.1 It was decided that we would conduct the usual faculty prioritization process. Renee will bring a draft timeline to the next meeting.
5.2.2 The use of savings from retirement/vacant positions was discussed. Some departments will have critical needs.
5.2.3 We can’t drop below the FON.

5.3 Agenda Building
5.3.1 Additional topics for future meetings this semester include: college bookstore and (e-) textbook issues, SLO survey report (late in semester), staffing for the green technology center, accreditation, budget issues,

6.0 Open Forum and Agenda Building

6.1 Faculty are encouraged to retain use of previous editions of textbooks where possible, and to email their students in advance of the semester alerting them to the possibility of older/used textbooks.

7.0 Adjourn

7.1 The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 PM.