Cabrillo College Faculty Senate

Tuesday, March 13th, 2012

3:00 – 5:00 pm

Sesnon House

In Attendance: Winnie Baer, Cheryl Barkey, Arturo Cantu, John Govsky, Steve Hodges, Calais Ingel, Brian Legakis, Denise Lim, Jackie Logg, Michael Mangin, Diego Navarro, Lenny Norton, Ekua Omosupe, Jo-Ann Panzardi, Beth Guardz, Dan Rothwell, Pam Sanborn, Alex Taurke, Deborah Shulman, Sylvia Winder, Eva Acosta, Marcy Alancraig, Rick Fillman, Renee Kilmer, Chris Steele


Note Taker: Kayla Sikes

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

2. Minutes
   1. Tuesday, February 28th, 2012
      1. Revisions.
      2. Motion to approve, second.
         1. Approved.

3. Standing Reports
   1. President (Michael Mangin)
      1. Will deal with new business first.
      2. Student Success Task Force statement in conjunction with CCFT- will email Senate members a draft of what is emerging as consensus.
         1. Waiting for others to weigh in on it, but before end of the week will have a one-page statement of how CCFT and Senate are responding to politics of student success.
   3. Pre-plenary meeting on March 30th at Chabot College in Hayward.
   4. At end of CPC meeting last Wednesday, slide was shared showing General Unrestricted and Restricted Funds- Fund Balance for FY 2008-09 through projected FY 2012-13.
      1. Previous 3 years, money was saved for a “rainy day,” about $17 million. Some of this was spent recently.
      2. For next year, CPC is considering $2.5 million in next year’s cuts- about half of projected deficit, other half will come out of reserves.
      3. Initiatives on the ballot on November will change options depending on which (if any) pass.
      4. Generally, reserves go up despite being predicted to go down.
         1. However, this year it probably will decrease, not sure how much.
      5. Frequently hear of not being able to “meet payroll”- not aware of any community college that has missed payroll.
      6. Call out the reserve as a special category. Recommendation is that reserves are 5%
of budget.

2. Vice President (Steve Hodges)
   1. Looking for a replacement for SLRB, will send out an all-faculty email.
   2. Looking for a CIP replacement for the fall.
   3. This Thursday at 8 am, field trip to evaluate vendors at eight colleges, currently no faculty member involved. Let Steve know if you want to volunteer.
   4. Appointed to plan retirement party - on graduation day, will consult with past planners.

3. Secretary and CCFT (John Govsky)
   1. Getting Millionaire’s tax on ballot is a big concern, currently polling better than the Governor’s. Would bring in $6-7 million to Cabrillo.

4. Treasurer (Lenny Norton)

5. CCEU (Rick Fillman)
   1. A number of CCEU members are being considered for layoffs.
      1. At CPC last week, discussion of what happens to the work of people who won’t be around - SPRAC committee evaluates work plans.
      2. As a planning council, it would behoove the council to look back and see how layoffs effected the college after a few months’ time.
      3. Discussions of what it means to become a smaller college- is it about reducing numbers, or reducing infrastructure?
   2. College Master Planning event tomorrow from 3-5 at the Horticulture center, chance to have a voice in the master plan for where the college is going.

6. Watsonville (Eva Acosta)
   1. Already lost the bookstore, appears that it'll go from four office assistants to two. Trying to figure out how to work financial aid, admissions, and counseling with only two assistants.

7. Student Senate (Chris Steele and Charlotte Achen)
   1. Approved $5,000 for the athletic training program renovations.
   2. Fifty students attended the March in March.
   3. Newsletter just went out, encourage students to read it.
   4. Elections - encourage students to run for office, applications can be turned in until April 20th and voting is May 5th-11th.

8. SLO Assessment Coordinator (Marcy Alancraig)
   1. ARC met last week, starting to go over results of SLO survey.
      1. Aiming to produce a 1-2 page document that gives the highlights and suggests future directions based on what the numbers say.

9. VPI (Renee Kilmer)
   1. AMGEN tour - Monday, May 14th - will affect traffic on Soquel and parking, please read blurb. Brian will send something out reminding people where to park.
   2. Deadline for ordering cap and gown is March 30th.

4. Unfinished Business
   1. Program Reduction and Discontinuance Next Steps
      1. 3 main things to discuss - TU cuts (TUs in Core issues), qualitative considerations (what people may have brainstormed), and quantitative issues (clarify where that discussion is).
      1. Have a duty as faculty representatives to keep the best interests of students and the community in mind in these discussions. Community expects Cabrillo to continue being as important a part of the county as it has been in previous years.
      1. Vision of what a community college is - part of the Faculty Senate’s purview.
2. If Cabrillo does move toward eliminating programs, this conversation needs to have more process than what's in place right now.
3. Concern about the way the cut-off line was drawn- on the back side of the handout, list was added to. Didn't mean to imply that one criteria was the only thing that would be looked at. Other side is a summary of the qualitative conversation.
2. Don't know exactly what workload reductions will be next year and how over cap Cabrillo will be (but will be over cap.)
   1. Looks like it will be 340-360 over cap- about 3% over, a good place to be- assuming everything replicates from this year to next year.
   2. But workload reductions have to be accounted for. Assuming a 4% workload reduction, would want to cut about 350 FTS or so out of next year's budget.
      1. Higher if the workload reduction higher.
3. Looking at the best place to take those TUs, but not to overcut.
4. Other considerations- increases in fees, BOG changes, finaid eligibility changes, repetition changes- will have an effect, but not sure exactly what they are.
5. If Cabrillo waits to see what workload reductions are, summer and fall are already scheduled, then everything would come out of spring. Would be better to cut some out of summer and fall.
6. There were five programs on the below 50% list which have only adjunct faculty, one is donor-funded and won't be touched, three are at the very bottom. Those programs would probably be trimmed, maybe by a third, but not necessarily cut. (Real Estate, Welding, and Journalism).
   1. Real Estate is 12 TUs, students aren't getting degrees in it and the market for real estate agents isn't good. Would be easier to suspend and bring back.
   2. Welding and Journalism wouldn't be as easy to bring back, so might consider trimming them instead.
7. 1300 number from last time has been revised down to 350-400.
8. Is there a process for Real Estate, Welding and Journalism where faculty can have conversations where they can defend the utility of those programs?
   1. Options: don't touch them, eliminate them completely, or to take something from them.
      1. If we eliminate a program, there's a discontinuance process that involves the Senate. There hasn't been a process for cutting TUs because that happens at the department and division level.
      2. Many conversations with program chairs.
9. Does reduction of Journalism mean no student paper, or that part of BELA would take up the student paper?
   1. Paper would be less frequent but still existent.
   2. Idea is to be creative- if cuts can't be avoided, changes can be made, such as shifting the student paper to online.
10. If welding was reduced by 1/3, summer class, afternoon class, and Saturday class would be cut. Would have classes four nights a week. Classes are running full, so some students would be turned away.
   1. Would try to make up some of those classes using extension education.
   2. If welding classes are leading to careers that pay well, that should be considered.
11. Would help to figure out priority in registration. If students are working toward academic goals, they should be prioritized over people who have been taking classes for other purposes.
3. Interested in thoughts about private donors to preserve programs.
1. Prioritization needs to take place within the college and the Senate. Wouldn't be okay for donors to designate any kind of program. Takes away from the ability to help students get through.

2. If a donor wants to support the college, he/she should be able to support in the way they see fit.

3. A few programs are already funded by external bodies, in CTE there are a lot of businesses who support programs because they need workers with those skills-paying to have them trained.
   1. For example, hospital paid 70K a year for several years to support the Nursing program.

4. In this case, private donations add to Cabrillo's overall capacity.

5. Currently a partnership is formed between Cabrillo's needs and the donor's wishes- if someone can mandate their donation will support a certain program, it eliminates the partnership.

6. This discussion is different when Cabrillo has plenty of money versus times when it doesn't.

7. Many of these programs have already been vetted. If Cabrillo supports them now, it means it wants to continue them.
   1. Some programs are on the hit list because they aren't efficient. If we bring in money, it increases efficiency and helps the college.

8. If a donation saves a program, Cabrillo can use the money saved to apply to another program.

9. Community advisors don't drive curriculum in CTE programs, instructors make those decisions.

10. If someone makes a donation with a stipulation, Cabrillo can always deny that stipulation.

4. Handout on percentage of core courses in TUs.
   1. Correction- Music is 70.1.
   2. “Core” for Transfer was major prep (not just transferable courses) to the universities-the ones students most commonly go to- and/or on the CSU IGETC list.
   3. For CTE, “Core” was the courses for a degree or certificate of achievement, did not include optional electives.

4. Human Services program- multi-disciplinary program, incorporated classes in psychology, sociology, communications, etc. because this is what new social workers need to understand to work with clients.
   1. Don't fit easily on the matrix.
   2. Was created at a time when college was looking for more students. Was a way of incorporating existing classes without adding more costs.
   3. These courses would count as core in those programs but not in Human Services program.
   4. Courses in Human Services that were major prep that would transfer to universities would be counted as core.

5. Seeking to reduce the number of non-core courses or moving them from a non-core into programs that are heavily impacted.
   1. Data from the matrix. Those marked 100% are offering entirely core courses.
   2. These are TUs, not the laundry list of courses from the catalog. Looks at whether courses are being offered and what number of TUs are allocated to them.

6. Skills certificates are not core. Went with state approval and approval of UC/CSU
system as a definition for core. Cabrillo approves skills certificates, state approves 18-unit certificates.

7. Tried to make each one of the metrics as broadly applicable as possible- this is why there are multiple metrics- impossible to make every metric apply equally well to each program. A collection of them was considered the best way to evaluate programs.

8. Only criteria used for this measure was ASSIST. Doesn't necessarily reflect clearly what programs are about.
   1. Only 12 colleges that students were most likely to transfer to were included.

9. Punishes efficiency in some ways because some programs use courses (such as keyboarding) that would be inefficient to replicate with its own keyboarding courses.

10. Those that scored 0.0% are not being considered in this conversation.

11. There are some programs that just won't fit in these metrics. This is where qualitative considerations become important.

12. Don't necessarily want to say a program can't have any non-core. Question is, how much is enough?
   1. If you were to take a benchmark that 80% is enough (for example), there are programs close enough to that that cutting a few courses would get them to that level, but other programs would have to cut half their courses.
   2. Could say for example, that 80% is enough but no program should have to cut more than 10% of their courses. A method of figuring out what TUs to cut.

13. Getting the impression that if you're high on one criteria but low on another, everyone ends up in the middle, and matrix is not discriminating in any way.

   1. Two different conversations going on- one was the matrix, criteria were weighted differently, did show programs at the bottom of the list. This discussion of the TU core is the other conversation. Is it better to do it this way or say every program has to give up a certain percentage? The second option doesn't seem to work as well.
   2. Short-term point isn't to get programs to re-organize themselves to get more into core. Some kind of combination is likely to emerge where deans and academic council are informed by this data.

   3. The TU information is just a “zoom in” to one criteria out of 11-13. Isn't separate from the larger matrix.

14. This doesn't show degree of impact. If you take this list and shave, say, 5%, what number of TUs is that?

15. Core is not a perfect measure, but often tells something important about what classes to cut.

16. Is an input into the process of deans' and program chairs' discussions, not a result.

17. 1 TU=roughly $1570.

5. Task force will be meeting again to re-calibrate for next year.

5. **New Business**
      1. 220 course changes.
      2. Motion to approve, second.
      1. Approved.
   2. AR and BP 3280
      1. Trying to update Board Policies because they were dated.
      1. A lot of old BPs looked like ARs, BPs go to the board so would like Senate
approval.
2. BP 3280 was course repetition critical because this summer, changes in repetition go into effect and board policies need to be updated.
   1. Students can enroll a maximum of 3 times for a sub-standard grade.
   2. Used policy language, got rid of procedural language.
3. AR 3280 approved by Academic Council. Few changes to procedures, simply language updates to reflect limitations.
4. For AR, in #2- students that have already gotten 3 sub-standard classes can repeat it a fourth time if they wait two years or more.
   1. There are conditions under which a student can do another repeat, one of which is a significant lapse of time.
   2. Chancellor's office is looking at making a system-wide definition of what a lapse of time would be, looking at 3 years.
5. Issue with students taking Math 254A-B.
   1. Students can take a course 3 times with a substandard grade. Any equivalent course is considered taking that course.
   2. If a student takes 254 and failed, takes 254 again and went through, took it again and failed- that's their three times.
   3. For students who have those many tries, they can't be referred to A because they've maxed out.
   4. +1 is an extenuating circumstance for right now for students who are stuck.
6. On AR 3280, subsequent offerings must be for non-credit.
   1. There are no non-credit offerings right now, not planning on changing it.
   2. Only bolded language is new.
   3. APE doesn't mean that students can take it forever, there are limits. Students have to be enrolled in at least one credit course to take APE.
7. On AR exceptions to the repetition with a significant lapse of time of 2 years, you can do it only once- students historically have taken a class 4-5 times and tried it again a few years later, would they not be available for that fifth plus one?
   1. Gray area, would have to petition case-by-case.
8. Withdrawal deadline needs to be at same time as census- where is that conversation?
   1. Cleared up that the college will not get apportionment for a student during the period between census and the four-week withdrawal deadline.
   2. Students would get a W at the beginning of week 3 if they drop after census. If a student drops before census it will not show up on student record in any way, state won't know that they took it.
   3. Could choose, as a college, to take the loss from students who withdraw between census and the current two-week period after census.
   4. Will probably go live a few days before registration for summer.
9. Will put withdrawal timing on the agenda for next time.
10. Motion to approve, second.
    1. Approved.
3. BP 3240- No changes to final examinations.
    1. Final examinations scheduled for 3-hour period.
    2. Requires every course to have a graded final examination or activity.
    3. Motion to approve, second.
       1. Approved.
4. BP 3320 and AR 3320- discussed the old library.
    1. Call it the “library floor” rather than mezzanine.
2. Motion to approve BP 3320, second.
   1. Approved.

5. 3400- changed Cabrillo College to district.
   1. Motion to approve, second.
      1. Approved.

6. Adjourn.