Cabrillo College Faculty Senate

Tuesday, November 15th, 2011

3:00 – 5:00 pm

Sesnon House

In Attendance: Eva Acosta, Arturo Cantu, Jean Gallagher-Heil, John Govsky, Steve Hodges, Calais Ingel, Michael Mangin, Aime McNamara, Diego Navarro, Lenny Norton, Ekua Omosupe, Jo-Ann Panzardi, Beth Regardz, Dan Rothwell, Pam Sanborn, Deborah Shulman, Alex Taurke, Sylvia Winder, Marcy Alancraig, Rick Fillman, Renee Kilmer, Arthur O'Reilly


Note Taker: Kayla Sikes

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

2. Minutes
   2.1 October 18, 2011
      2.1.1 Revisions.
      2.1.2 Motion to approve, second.
      2.1.2.1 Approved.

3. Standing Reports
   3.1 President (Steve Hodges)
      3.1.1 Repeatability and content review.
   3.2 Vice President (Michael Mangin)
   3.3 Secretary and CCFT (John Govsky)
   3.3.1 COPE Drive - four governing board members up for election, progressive tax initiative.
   3.4 Treasurer (Lenny Norton)
   3.5 CCEU (Rick Fillman)
   3.5.1 Turquoise Tuesdays
   3.5.2 Elections
   3.5.3 Concerns about decisions on classified hiring, beyond scope of reduction.
      3.6 Watsonville (Eva Acosta)
      3.7 ASCC (Arthur O'Reilly)
      3.8 SLO Assessment Coordinator (Marcy Alancraig)
   3.8.1 Report will be available next semester.
   3.8.2 Helping program chairs and deans lead the effort. Making SLOs easy.
   3.9 VPI (Renee Kilmer)
   3.9.1 Cabinet agreed four positions would be funded.
      3.9.1.1 RadTech- Clinical coordinator is required for accreditation.
      3.9.1.2 Biology - Lost two fulltime faculty in last three years, essential pipeline to Allied Health.
3.9.1.3. Medical Assistant - Only one fulltime faculty member, offers four programs.
3.9.1.4. Political Science - One fulltime faculty member, graduation requirement for Associates degree.

3.9.2 Faculty obligation number is 205 this year, 196 next year.
3.9.3 Learning Center position is categorically funded, DSPS budget is not balanced.

4. Unfinished/Ongoing Business
4.1 Program Reduction/Elimination Task Force Report
   4.1.1 Motion to approve what??
   4.1.2 Criterion Graphs (?)
      
   4.1.2.1 Primary difference is a graph showing core classes.
   4.1.2.2 For access criteria, spread was too even across all programs.
      4.1.2.2.1 Zero point was shifted from far end to above the median, so programs meeting community access needs would be only shown.
      
   4.1.2.2 Trying to return to original intent - if a program was cut, would a group of students lose access?
   4.1.2.2.3 Comparing programs, not individual courses - not targeting specific classes.
   4.1.2.3 Metric for completion and success points was left with its current point balance.
   4.1.2.4 Definition of “core” was left as is.
   4.1.3 Motion to approve report.
      4.1.1.1 Approved.

4.2 Fall Plenary Session Final Adopted Resolutions combined with 5.2 Student Success
4.2.1 Focuses on driving certain populations of students out of community colleges.
4.2.2 Individual comments can be sent online, URL is studentsuccess.ideascale.com.
      4.2.2.1 Senate will consider taking an official local stance at next meeting.
4.2.3 Student Success Task Force got a lukewarm reception.
      4.2.3.1 Encouraged to get more involved.
4.2.4 Task Force report will be influential, Senate should be engaged with the results.
4.2.5 Part of a national movement - how can Cabrillo be ahead of the curve? Proactive rather than negative stance.
4.2.6 Deals mainly with Student Services like Orientation and Ed Plans.
      4.2.6.1 Being able to look up Ed Plans online increases completion rate.
      4.2.6.2 More detail will take more manpower and more resources.
      4.2.6.3 Shortcuts can't be taken - generalized Ed Plans do not regard the individual's decisions.
      4.2.6.4 Ed Plans should have flexibility, online Ed Plans are not suitable.
      4.2.6.5 Decisions are so in flux that it's hard to know what pieces to “get ahead” of.
      4.2.6.5.1 Didn't know definitively with SLOs either. Still useful to think about.
4.2.7 CCA Feedback Document includes good responses and mobilization.
4.2.8 More a role for counselors than faculty.
4.2.9 Strengthening support for entering students is one thing that could be supported and institutionalized.
4.2.10 Steps the Senate can take:
4.2.10.1 Make time to study it more to see if there's merit in experimenting with any of these ideas.
4.2.10.2 Have a presentation from Student Services.
4.2.10.3 Student Senate can cooperate with Faculty Senate.
4.2.10.4 Read the document- not dense reading.
4.2.10.5 Next meeting should be mostly focused on the report. At flex, focus can be what is already being done.
4.2.11 Two-year ed plans do not work for everyone- some are not transfer ready- it's a degree plan, not two year plan.
4.2.12 Only 26% transfer or get a degree/certificate in 6 years- what is the goal?
   4.2.12.1 Groups that are not transfer ready can't be included in the statistic.
   4.2.12.2 The only way to increase the percentage by a large amount is to exclude groups that are not likely to succeed.
4.2.13 Two separate tracks- political and local.

4.3 CTE Program Reporting Changes
   4.3.1 Requirement to evaluate CTE program every two years for labor market and student success.
      4.3.1.1 Evaluation goes to the board which can eliminate programs.
      4.3.1.2 Notice from Chancellor's Office that evaluation needs to take place due to economic concerns.
   4.3.2 Every CTE program will go through that process this year.
      4.3.2.1 Will dovetail with Program Elimination/Reduction.
   4.3.3 Tools for analysis of labor market will provide programs with data.
      4.3.3.1 Gives a sense of where demand is in the current year.
      4.3.3.2 Core classes of non-CTE programs might not correspond to labor market data.
      4.3.3.3 Can give a short demo at a future Senate meeting.
      4.3.3.4 Study does look at people who are self-employed.

5. **New Business**

5.1 Content Review
   5.1.1 Content review with statistical validation to establish course prerequisites rather than merely recommended prep.
   5.1.2 Regulation changed to allow content review in conjunction with statistical validation.
      5.1.2.1 Change would be made, then data collected for two years.
   5.1.3 Allowing content review might increase number of courses a person has to take, contradicts state's direction.
   5.1.4 Pick a few programs as a pilot- ask the curriculum committee to pilot it.
   5.1.5 Some programs are afraid of enrollment issues if prerequisites are changed.
      5.1.5.1 Prerequisites would have to be across the board.
   5.1.6 There would be wide ramifications- making sure there are enough sections, etc.
   5.1.7 Focus should be on student success, not enrollment.
      5.1.8 Issues of timing should also be addressed.

6. **Adjourn**