PRESENT: Dennis Bailey-Fougnier, Jill Gallo, Diane Goody, Paul Harvell, Steve Hodges, Victoria Lewis, Graciano Mendoza, Dan Rothwell, Barbara Schultz-Perez

ABSENT: Gabby Avila, Renee Kilmer, Brian King, Michael Mangin, Lena Mason, Stephanie Stainback


1.0 Call to Order and Introduction of Substitutes
Isabel O’Conner for Renee Kilmer, Lena Mason for Stephanie Stainback, Jim Weckler for Kathie Welch

2.0 Review of Agenda
No Comments.

3.0 Oral Communications
None.

4.0 Approval of Minutes
None

5.0 SPRAC Reports
First discussed were the proposed purchasing and mailroom reductions. Jill commented that the information about the changes in service needs to be communicated to the greater campus. Jim suggested a comprehensive list of what services the mailroom provides and when they are available. Jim also suggested sending the list to the IDAs. Victoria said the information is posted on the mailroom’s web site. Jill said also communicate what no longer will be done, especially if this is a service people are used to.

Next discussed were the proposed Learning Skills program and Adaptive PE reductions. Marcy reported that the Learning Skills staff expressed concerns about space and workload. Margery added that Learning Skills is moving to the library.

Last discussed was the proposed reduction to the Public Safety program. Marcy said the plan was very complex. The program coordinator would like to be involved as plans go forward, and there were concerns about whether or not the workload items were assessed accurately. Barbara asked how much of the coordinator’s job deals with in-service. Eireann said 75 percent is in-service and 25 percent pre-service. Isabel said they have already cut some services, so there will be less scheduling and mailing of reminder notices. Isabel said a lot of things that have been done as a courtesy will no longer be proved. Lena asked about the portion of workload will go to the division offices that are being cut, and she has a lot of concern. Lena said if the work is
being moved to another group that needs to be negotiated, and if that work does not go through to another group then who will do it. Isabel said the in-service work is the main responsibility of this position, and that work is being eliminated. Marcy said the program’s load is what is being negotiated.

Jill asked to discuss the process SPRAC went through on the Public Safety reductions. Jill thinks it is important to have a larger discussion about whether this report is accepted by CPC, and what that means. Jill also senses a strong level of emotional frustration on both sides, and is concerned about the timing of input by both parties. There are some downsides to it happening that way, Jill said and she thinks the impact can be communicated in a less contentious way. The timing of who is in the room together could be different. Jill continued to say that this discussion turned defensive. Lena said it did not go well to have the manager and classified member in the room at the same time. Marcy said SPRAC always offers the classified member an opportunity to speak without the manager present and to date no one has let SPRAC know they wanted that. Marcy added that faculty attended this particular meeting which made the dynamic different, and the faculty member kept discussing the cut to their program not the cut to the classified position. Marcy said SPRAC has set up a time to talk about the process.

Isabel said she was there and was not sure what Jill is referring to, but thinks Marcy is correct in saying that the faculty member spoke to a different plan than the classified position plan. The faculty member was speaking about the overall in-service program reduction. Isabel believes that everyone in the room tried to participate in a professional manner. Marcy said she felt positive that one of the decisions SPRAC made as a result of that particular meeting, was that the meeting time was extended so there could be a full discussion. Dan said it is not fair to equate contentiousness with bad process. This is not pleasant but they are trying to keep it as fair and reasonable as possible. SPRAC made multiple attempts to move the conversation back to the classified positions and reiterated multiple times that there is a difference between the classified reduction and the program reduction, and SPRAC only addresses the classified reduction. Jill asked if there is a way to redesign the process making it less contentious. Dan said the only other way to do it is to separate sides, but then people do not have a chance to respond to each other. SPRAC needs to hear the debate and the emotion; Dan said SPRAC realizes they are cutting people. Steve agreed with Dan and said in order for CPC to make decisions SPRAC needs to host collegial discussions but that doesn’t necessarily mean they are not contentious discussions.

Alta said she was there as a SPRAC member and SPRAC was there to hear the debate. Alta said SPRAC tries to make the process good for both parties. Alta asked about next steps and asked if it is possible for SPRAC to submit the manager’s plans to CPC when it submits its report. Alta also asked if there going to be a continued discussion about a six month review. Lena said without seeing the manager’s plan the CPC’s review often just leads to more questions, and we do need a mechanism for six month review.

Victoria said CPC did agree to the six month review at the last CPC meeting when Brian said if someone wants to add a review to CPC’s agenda they can. Jim added that SPRAC is a subcommittee to CPC and the whole reason it exists is to provide a report to CPC. Jim said CPC has to have a level of trust in SPRAC. If it is a subcommittee of CPC we need to empower them to do what they were charged to do. Paul said he does not see a problem attaching the manager’s plans when the SPRAC report goes out to CPC.
Steve moved to accept the reports and Jim seconded it. Lena asked what accepting the reports means. Jim said CPC is accepting that SPRAC did its due diligence and CPC is accepting SPRAC’s work. Jill asked under what circumstances are there that CPC would not accept a report. Dan said last year CPC did not accept one report. Steve agreed with Jim’s description of what it means for CPC to accept a report. Steve said it does not mean he is happy or approves the cuts, but it means SPRAC did its due diligence and he believes the SPRAC reports correctly summarize the discussions that took place. Steve is also confident that accepting means that there would be no productive progress if it sent the report back to SPRAC.

CPC voted to accept the plans.

Dennis said CPC is advisory to Brian who has a fiduciary responsibility to the Board, and there are not a whole lot of other choices in terms of cuts. Dennis added that none of these decisions are things the college wants to do, and they have large impacts on students, but the options are limited. Dennis said Brian was directed by the Board to make $2.5m in cuts, and Brian in turn directed the vice presidents to identify areas to target.

Jill said it is a discussion about the plan, and if the plan can be implemented in the way it has been presented. Dan said if SPRAC received a plan that they thought was an unmitigated disaster they would not bring it forward. Dan added that if SPRAC came to CPC with a plan and said they do not see how it could possibly work, it would be up to CPC to decide what to do and as a CPC member he would recommend sending it back to the manager.

Steve said he does appreciate hearing from the administrators what position they are in, in terms of having to identify the cuts. Steve feels as a CPC member he does have the ability to reject a proposal, but recognizes that if CPC rejects a cut then administration has to decide on another cut to replace the one CPC rejected.

Barbara said she is interested in a six month review. Barbara asked if there is a calendar for this. Steve said his understanding is if someone has a concern and wants a follow up, they need to ask to add it to CPC’s agenda.

Jim said six months is arbitrary. If a manager senses a plan is not working they will conduct a review immediately. Some plans may never need to come back. If something is a disaster everyone will hear about it long before six months have gone by.

Victoria said next week CPC will review the Phase III cuts.

Dan said he sees six months as the furthest point out. If it is not working Dan wants to hear about it sooner. George said given the magnitude of some of the cuts and changes maybe it is not a bad thing so say that during the fall CPC will hear reports on these plans and how they are working.

Marcy said SPRAC is trying to help staff have a voice of whether or not a plan is workable. The unfortunate thing that is happening with the timing of the cuts is that SPRAC is looking at problems and have faith that it will work out. Marcy believes the six month review will give staff the opportunity to have a voice and say whether or not the plan is working.

Eireann questions who is really looking at the reports, and is managing how they are being implemented. Steve said each group who reviews the reports is taking responsibility. No group
is going to pass something along that they find completely unworkable, from SPRAC, to CPC, to Brian.

Lena said the classified voice having a follow up voice is really important. Classified staff cannot put something on CPC’s agenda. Dennis said that is not true because classified staff has representation at CPC, and it is the classified staff member’s responsibility to report back to the classified staff. Steve said CPC is a representative body. Lena said there is no way for the CPC rep to know what is happening in each office.

Lena said the summary of the public safety reduction plan has a lot of unanswered questions, and asked if everything has been identified. Dan said that is in the SPRAC discussion.

Paul said he is somewhat uncomfortable of a six month review, he sees things as more evolving and continuous. Paul does think that if CPC wants SPRAC to revisit a plan then CPC needs to make the decision to direct SPRAC to do so. Paul does believe it is SPRAC’s responsibility.

Marcy said it is problematic so say the union should be polling staff because SPRAC has worked hard to not made this a union process. Marcy said they are not crazy about doing the six month review, but in some instances it may be appropriate.

CPC agreed to discuss the six month review again at its next meeting.

6.0 4th Grade Experience Update
Dennis said Barbara Samper donated $1m to the college, $500k of which goes to Santa Cruz County College Commitment Scholarships. The 4th grade experience is scheduled for May 11. 2800+ 4th graders will be on campus that day, along with 500 adults. Dennis provided the schedule for the day. The County of Education has provided funding for t-shirts for each student.

7.0 Watsonville Leases Update
The college currently has two leases with the Watsonville Center, which were one year leases. SOS would like to continue their lease. The lease is a $40k annual lease, and the college is cautiously optimistic in that it will be a longer term lease. The Ceiba proposal doubled the number of students currently there, from about 62 students to 130 students. After many meetings and discussions the college determined the increase in students is not feasible, so the college let Ceiba know it can accommodate the current amount of students but not an increase. Rachel thanked Victoria and the management team for not just going for the money but putting Cabrillo’s mission and students first.

Victoria said there is a Health and Wellness faculty proposal which will be presented at next week’s CPC meeting.

8.0 Adjourn
The meet was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.