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

2. **Minutes**
   1. Tuesday, February 14th, 2012
      1. Revisions.
      2. Motion to approve, second.
      1. Approved.

3. **Standing Reports**
   1. President (Michael Mangin)
      1. Cabrillo Reads Ellison this Thursday night at 7 pm, March 1st, at Cabrillo Music Recital Hall. 100-120 people estimated to attend. Please encourage students to go.
      2. Board of Governors special meeting last Tuesday night, two community members volunteered to be interviewed.
      1. Margarita Cortez appointed to vacant Area 5 position- active with Loaves and Fishes.
      2. Four seats on Board up for election in November.
   3. Meeting of Santa Cruz County College Commitment (S4C) last Friday night in the Horticulture center. First Student Success Task Force recommendation is integration with K-12, good step in that direction.
      1. March 21st there will be meetings with K-12 instructors and Math/English departments.
   4. Student Success Task Force Sub-Committee has made some progress on crafting a definition of success and coming to a statement of position.
      1. Legislation moving forward that many have concerns about, especially without funding- something that needs to be advocated for.
      2. Got an email saying someone introduced a “gotcha” resolution where funding for classes will be changed (half when they register, half when they finish).
      3. Need for political engagement at the state level is ongoing.
   5. CPC- not great news on the budget in the last 2-3 weeks, in addition to January triggers
there is another $150 million hit to community colleges that came out yesterday. Will be several billion dollars in shortfall. Informs much of what will be discussed today.

1. Tomorrow's CPC meeting will be hearing the first proposed reductions.

2. Vice President (Steve Hodges)
   1. Vacancy on SLRB, need a volunteer. Can send an email.

3. Secretary and CCFT (John Govsky)
   1. Deborah Bone sent out factsheet about community colleges, request for faculty to help educate students about major statistics on March 1st.
      1. Day of action for education- fees cover 22%, taxpayers cover the rest. CA community colleges educate a quarter of US community college students. Estimates of how tax proposals will affect budget.

4. Treasurer (Lenny Norton)
   1. Sent $250 for Social Justice Conference. Received an email of thanks, request for students to become part of it.

5. CCEU (Lori Amato)
   1. Positions slated to be cut- four instructional division assistant positions, two IT coordinator positions. More may be identified.
      1. IDAs will have one full-time person in each office and one centralized position.
      2. IDA has one upcoming retirement.
      3. Classified staff is having a difficult time with cut announcements, bad for morale, led to high meeting attendance. Student success is being emphasized but seems at odds with losing support staff that assists those students. It's hard to come up with new ideas for student success with fewer people and resources.

6. Watsonville (Eva Acosta)
   1. Staff meeting yesterday about the budget, how to be creative with the situation ahead? Green tech center is opening, more students there.
      1. Gave orientation to 60 Watsonville high school students coming in the fall. Discussed how to deal with cuts.

7. Student Senate (Chris Steele)
   1. “March in March” this Monday, advocating for education funding. Students are encouraged to go.
   2. Student Senate holding elections for senators and president, applications accepted starting in March.
   3. Discussed the millionaire's tax, the Student Success Task Force, concerns about food and beverage on campus.
   4. Blood drive on March 27th-28th in the cafeteria.
   5. Welcome Week was a big success, showed students clubs and extra-curriculars. MLK Event was a success as well.

8. SLO Assessment Coordinator (Marcy Alancraig)
   1. Will present ARC Report.

9. Brian Legakis
   1. Memorial to Kathryn McBride in the VAPA complex.
   2. Two efforts through the Foundation, a scholarship and support for the ceramics program. Donations can be made.

10. VPI (Renee Kilmer)
    1. 800 Building- could serve students more effectively and efficiently if they had the entire building.
      1. Stroke Center and DSPS have shrunk due to budget cuts, so DSPS will move into Stroke Center area. Puts disabled services together and allows expansion of STEM
fields. Good opportunity for services to merge. Almost ready to bring in the architect.

2. DSPS mandates are still in effect, may have more funding in the future and more staff, should have some flexibility.
   1. Will have to adjust as necessary but currently feel comfortable with the change.

3. Renee and Brian are now on the second floor of SAC West. Fast Track to Work/Student Employment is now on the lower level of the SAC West building.

4. Learning Skills may be moving to the Stroke Center along with DSPS; this is still being discussed.

4. Unfinished Business
   1. Program Reduction and Discontinuance Next Steps
      1. Program chairs had the opportunity to point out any errors in rankings. Have taken the feedback on SLOs and core, made a few minor shifts, no dramatic changes.
      2. Numerical scores are a starting point, not an end. Don't want to cut anything based on a small numerical difference. Handout shows programs that didn't fit onto the matrix, and possible qualitative considerations.
         1. Not a definitive list, open to other major categories. Need to be broad enough so they are not program-specific.
         2. Potential for FTES growth- would be foolish to cut programs with high FTES potential because currently Cabrillo will be over cap next year.
            1. Don't want to encourage FTES growth at expense of core classes with a specific purpose.
            2. Could be ranked based on how big waitlists are, how fast they're filled, etc.- seems more quantitative rather than qualitative. This can be measured, not a qualitative value as much.
            3. Not easily determined by data pulled for the matrix. Didn't fit the hard numbers that were accessible from the system to create the matrix- can it be pulled from the same data and do comparisons? Rationale is that data could be found on waitlists but not directly from the system.
      3. High numbers of students served in the core- is this a program which serves many students?
         1. Original matrix considered core courses but not the number of students in them.
      4. Program completion- can look at CTE and the transfer track. Course completion is already on the matrix, this is too complex to put on matrix.
      5. Employment potential- more important for CTE than transfer. Are there jobs available in that field?
         1. Should consider the needs of the community- for example, geriatric care is in demand and has been contemplated- programs can come up with courses they could offer to satisfy a community need.
      6. Hispanic Serving Institution- serves under-represented students- appears on numerical matrix, but rises enough that it should be thought about qualitatively too.
         1. If there are programs where millions of dollars were given from the fed. gov't to serve Hispanic students and that program happens to be low on the matrix, what should be done about that?
         2. Other under-represented groups should be considered as well.
      7. Potential to raise revenue for the program/college- some programs raise revenue for themselves and for the institution- is there something a program does that really brings in enough money to offset program and college costs?
8. Provides “free” or “low cost” college marketing- programs that are very visible, get press- don't have to pay for marketing because those programs provide it for free.
9. Programs that have faculty working in them but primary purpose is not for instruction- didn't want to compare them to instructional programs.

3. Ideas for Qualitative Considerations
1. Several years ago when institution wanted a class that would fill quickly, data is still available- can show what courses will be popular.
2. What does “significant revenue” mean?
   1. Would depend on costs of program. If program costs 100K a year and you can bring in over half that amount, it would be significant. If program cost a million a year, it would not be.
   2. Programs like culinary arts or dental hygiene have potential for significant increases in revenue.
   3. Should use this qualitative data to look at programs near the bottom and consider whether it would be a wise decision to cut it based on these considerations.
3. FTES data- informed guesses can be based on numbers, but projections would be more qualitative because they are not certain.
4. Over 60% students come in with basic skills, should look at programs that prepare students for programs that give degrees or completion momentum- what programs feed other programs?
5. If growth potential is considered, shrinkage potential should be considered as well.
6. Should use this draft as a starting point for discussions with colleagues, will be on the agenda again next meeting.
7. These considerations are not included in the data about to be presented, but are next steps.

4. New matrix ranking list- two handouts.
1. Ranking of transfer and basic skills programs, ranking and point score for each criteria on the reverse side.
2. Ranking of CTE programs, ranking and point score for each criteria on the reverse side.
3. SLOs were simple points (0, 5 or 10)- some were investigated and adjusted.
4. Will not be cutting full-time faculty in 2012-13, may happen in 2013-14. Data will be updated this summer- a living document.
   1. Gives a chance to update SLOs.
5. Programs below 100 points are considered “Programs At Risk”.
   1. In order of ranked points, lowest to highest.
   2. On reverse side, programs that should be considered separately.
   3. Math, Art and English still need data on Full Time Faculty.
   4. With CG and Library, which are general funded, costs were embedded. Couldn't delineate what percentage of costs were for TUs/classes.
   5. A few hundred FTES and TBA will be lost, might bring down to 1100 over cap. Want to run 3-5% over cap. Will have to look for more FTES, can't take it out of full-time faculty. Have cut programs around the edges so much that it's difficult to continue doing so.
   6. Chancellor's office evaluates what percent workload reduction will be. Then there will be an equivalent number of full-time faculty obligations reduced. Would be a 6% reduction of full-time faculty required. Don't do that calculation until just before fall.
   7. It might be necessary to look at those programs that have only adjunct faculty, so
you don't have to give March 15 notices. But the costs of those part-time programs are fairly low, doesn't provide much money when you have a deficit of $3-5 million.

1. Going into next year, $200K (the cost of adjunct-only programs) would be a fair amount, even if it's not a significant part of the 5-year deficit.

8. Now that we are above cap, some of the programs without full-time faculty may have to be cut.
   1. Saying that no programs would be cut was based on the financial numbers available at the time.
   2. If there has been a shift, the college community should be apprised of that. Needs to be communicated.

9. Is there a way to not offer courses in a certain program and not eliminate it altogether?
   1. In a program with full-time faculty, it is unlikely, but in a program with adjunct faculty where students are not locked into a 2-year program, it is possible to suspend a program.

10. There are adjunct costs in each of these programs that were not included. Can be included if necessary.

11. Cap has been reduced by the state next year, if Cabrillo is over cap, state doesn't pay for that- can the college afford to continue to offer those courses? 13% over cap. Would like to be 3-5% over.
   1. If meeting on Friday produces any sense of the number of TUs that need to be cut, it will be presented.

12. If TUs need to be cut, administration would do so, but if programs need to be eliminated, the Senate needs to discuss.

13. When program is eliminated, an analysis is done of students who are majoring in the program. To eliminate the program you wouldn't take in a new class, would get the second year through and then close the program.

5. New Business
   1. Photo Op
   2. ARC Report
      1. SLO Assessment Review Committee 2011 Annual Report
         1. Entire campus is supposed to be doing SLO assessment. Every year in June committee looks at what people have done and writes a report.
         2. Page 3- what reports were received this year.
         3. Last page- ARC has been concerned about emerging trends of adjunct participation. Full-time faculty are doing more assessment than adjunct faculty, adjunct faculty are not coming to discussions at same rate as full-time faculty.
         4. Page 7- what transfer and basic skills programs were supposed to be assessing. Only 2 departments assessed all of the core 4 and all of course SLOs- English and History.
         5. Page 8- what CTE programs were supposed to assess.
         6. When programs don't do SLO assessment, they present to CIP and have to work to get it done. Funding requests (hypothetically) won't be forwarded for them.
         8. Staff Development Committee is planning a flex workshop on how departments inspire other departments.
         9. Recommendations for the SLO process.
            1. Will provide better training for program chairs- started with flex workshop in February.
2. Will convene a meeting to deal with adjunct faculty's issues.
3. Will create a web tool so that program chairs can see what should be assessed each semester.
4. Flex workshops for departments to discuss their findings when they address the Core Four.
5. Administrative departments should write administrative unit outcomes and assess them as part of program planning.
   1. Needs to be an assessment instrument in administrative departments.
6. Will revise and update the SLO website.
10. Wanted to make SLO reports electronic, programs were too expensive. Still considering ideas.
11. Make recommendations every year, most have been institutionalized.
12. Have requested more adjunct participation for four years- ongoing, state-wide issue.
13. Qualitative consideration for Program Reduction could include the ARC Reports.
3. If Millionaire's Tax passes, would provide somewhere around $6 million to Cabrillo.
4. Cabrillo Stage is having auditions next weekend for Anything Goes and a chorus line.

6. Adjourn.