Greetings CPC Members,

As directed by CPC, SPRAC has conducted follow up with each of the departments that have incurred reductions in both the 11-12 and the 12-13 fiscal years, to assess the impact of reductions made. In conducting follow up, SPRAC members used the issues that were raised in the CPC-accepted SPRAC reduction reports as a baseline, and performed outreach with department managers, who were asked to forward the review questions on to all impacted staff and faculty members within their departments for feedback.

Those providing feedback were requested to answer the same four questions, in light of the issues raised in the CPC-accepted review:

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?

Attached for your review and reference, are the SPRAC Follow-up Reports from each of the SPRAC reductions made in 11-12 and 12-13, grouped by business unit. Please note, there are some follow up requests for which we did not receive any feedback. Those reports are included for the purpose of highlighting issues, however the questions indicate no responses received.

It is our understanding that CPC will discuss and move to accept this report at its July 17th CPC meeting.

Thank you,
SPRAC
Lori Amato (Chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Rep)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Division/Dept</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Elimin</th>
<th>Reduce</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
<th>SPRAC ID # on Web Site</th>
<th>SPRAC member Assigned</th>
<th>Follow Up Request Sent</th>
<th>Reponses Received from Depts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>AS/Bkstr</td>
<td>Bookstore Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>01-2011</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>AS/Bkstr</td>
<td>Bookstore Assistant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>01-2011</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>AS/Bkstr</td>
<td>Bookstore Asst, Buyer, Storekeep</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-2011</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>AS/Bkstr</td>
<td>Bookstore Purchasing Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-2011</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>Business Off</td>
<td>Bookstore -Sr Accounting Spec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>09-2011</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>Business Off</td>
<td>Bank, Accounting Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>07-2012</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>Business Off</td>
<td>Bank, Accounting Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>07-2012</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>Business Off</td>
<td>Business Office, Acctg Spec</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>17-2012</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>Business Srvc</td>
<td>Purchasing/Mailroom/Dups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-2011</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>Business Srvc</td>
<td>Mail Services Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>09-2012</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>Business Srvc</td>
<td>Purchasing, Buyer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-2012</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>Business Srvc</td>
<td>Purchasing, Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-2012</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>FPPO</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-2012</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>FPPO</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>06-2012</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>FPPO</td>
<td>Grounds Maintenance Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-2011</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>I.T.</td>
<td>Computer Systems Maint Tech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>01-2012</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>I.T.</td>
<td>Information Systems Coord</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>01-2012</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Admin Svcs</td>
<td>I.T.</td>
<td>Multimedia Services Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-2012</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Instruction</td>
<td>BELA</td>
<td>Writing Center Lia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>22-2012</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Instruction</td>
<td>BELA</td>
<td>Writing Center Lia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>05-2011</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Instruction</td>
<td>HASS</td>
<td>Children's Center Cook II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>04-2011</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Instruction</td>
<td>HAWK</td>
<td>Medical Assistant Lia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>14-2012</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Instruction</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library Lia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-2012</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Instruction</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Tutorials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Instruction</td>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>Math Learning Center Lia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>21-2012</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Instruction</td>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>Math Lia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>14-2011</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Instruction</td>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>Science Lab Tech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>13-2011,18-2011</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Instruction</td>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>Public Safety Program Coord</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-2012</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Instruction</td>
<td>VAPA</td>
<td>Performing Arts Complex Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-2012</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Instruction</td>
<td>VAPA</td>
<td>Photo Lab Technician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>12-2012</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Instruction</td>
<td>VAPA</td>
<td>Visual Arts Technician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>13-2012</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Instruction</td>
<td>CEED</td>
<td>Program Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-2012</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Instruction</td>
<td>VOCED/ACE</td>
<td>ACE Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12-2011</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Instruction</td>
<td>VOCED/ACE</td>
<td>ACE Program Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12-2011</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Instruction</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>Instructional Division Assistant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-2012</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Instruction</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Computer Lab Lia, Watsonville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>05-2012</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 President</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>MarCom Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-2012</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Student Svcs</td>
<td>CESS</td>
<td>Assessment, Program Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-2012</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Student Svcs</td>
<td>CESS</td>
<td>Counseling, Division Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-2012</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Student Svcs</td>
<td>CESS</td>
<td>Counseling, Office Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-2012</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Student Svcs</td>
<td>CESS</td>
<td>Transfer Center, Lia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>16-2012</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Student Svcs</td>
<td>CESS/DSPS</td>
<td>Adaptive PE, Lia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>08-2012</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Student Svcs</td>
<td>CESS/DSPS</td>
<td>LS/DSPS Program Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>08-2012</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Student Svcs</td>
<td>ES/A&amp;R</td>
<td>Adm &amp; Records Asst II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>07-2011</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Student Svcs</td>
<td>ES/A&amp;R</td>
<td>Adm &amp; Records Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>29-2012</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Student Svcs</td>
<td>ES/A&amp;R</td>
<td>Adm &amp; Records Asst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>03-2012</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Student Svcs</td>
<td>ES/Fin Aid</td>
<td>Financial Aid Advisor</td>
<td>Frozen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>08-2011</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Student Svcs</td>
<td>ES/Fin Aid</td>
<td>Financial Aid Program Spec (occup)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>29-2012</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Student Svcs</td>
<td>ES/Fin Aid</td>
<td>Financial Aid Program Spec (vacant)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>29-2012</td>
<td>KF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Student Svcs</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Student Affairs Program Spec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>34-2012</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Student Svcs</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Student Employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>27-2012</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Student Svcs</td>
<td>VPS</td>
<td>Outreach Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>04-2012</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPRAC Members:
Lori Amato (Classified Staff, Chair), Krisin Fabos (Management), Alicia Hernandez (Classified Staff), Charlotte Achen (Student - Advisory)
1 Classified Staff, 1 Faculty Senate, 1 CCFT Member = Unfilled
SPARC Summary/Final Report
Submitted to CPC for review at the June 19th, 2013 CPC Mtg.

Bookstore Purchasing Assistant(s)/Specialist/Storekeeper/ Buyers (SPARC ID #01-2011/11-2011)
Department: Bookstore
Component: Admin Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website for reference.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- All of the facilities consultants are gone and bidding for the remaining projects has fallen to the Purchasing Dept. However, the last major construction project associated with the 1998 and 2004 bonds has just been completed and the last state-funded projects for the 300 building and the Health and Welfare complex are in the process of being closed out. The completion of these projects should cause a significant reduction in bidding, contracting, equipment purchasing, and purchase requisitions that are impacting the workload of staff in the Purchasing department.
- New Purchasing timelines may impact the Business Office in terms of turnaround time on accountant approvals.
- The campus at large will be impacted as the timeline for making purchases and processing orders are lengthened.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Reorganized/No responses received

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Reorganized/No responses received

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Reorganized/No responses received

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   Reorganized/No responses received

SPARC Members: Lori Amato (chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Advisor)
Bookstore -Sr Accounting Spec (SPRAC ID #09-2011)
Department: Business Office
Component: Admin Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- There is a disagreement regarding whether the bookstore portion of the senior accounting specialist is 70% or 80% of the full-time position.
- This will be a one-year pilot. If the bookstore accounting position is actually 80%, a review will be conducted during the pilot to determine this for possible future adjustment.
- Meanwhile, the 10% cut in the position will result in a 10% reduction in actual hours worked by the party in that position.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Originally, the plan provided for a 10% reduction to the Senior Accounting Specialist position. This reduction was tied to the proposed, overall reduction to the bookstore and its staff. Subsequently, the incumbent who filled the Sr. Accounting Specialist position retired. The transitioning to Barnes & Noble will significantly impact the accounting duties which the District will have to perform related to the bookstore.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No, refer to response in question 2.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   Additional changes to the position will need to be considered and implemented.
SPARC Summary/Final Report
Submitted to CPC for review at the June 19th, 2013 CPC Mtg.

Bank Accounting Specialist, Accounting Assistants (SPARC ID #07-2012)
Department: Business Office
Component: Admin Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPARC Reviews are available on the SPARC website)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Limited availability of services on Friday may present a hardship to some students.
- Cabrillo departments/entities needing to make deposits will need to adjust to new hours.
- The balancing of Friday’s accounts will need to be moved to Monday which may move some internal campus services to Tuesday through Thursday.
- Payday may be problematic when it falls on a Friday for folks who pick up their checks at Bank.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   As expected. Additionally, processing of receipts/cash now takes longer and pushes out the timing of college deposits to their bank. County documents are more frequently driven/delivered by District employees in their personal vehicles instead of being mailed as was previously done.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   It appears the workload has not been reduced/distributed commensurate to the 10% reduction. It has caused overloading of Mondays with unfinished work from Fridays and the pick-up of checks by faculty and staff has been disrupted by the early close on Fridays. It also seems that other departments (i.e. Pino Alto) are relying upon student workers to tally up cash receipt totals, etc. When errors occur, it creates more work for the bank staff to go back and research/correct.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   It has been somewhat workable. It appears that more attention needs to be directed towards solutions dealing with Monday workloads as a result of the early Friday bank closure.
SPRAC Summary/Final Report
Submitted to CPC for review at the June 19th, 2013 CPC Mtg.

Business Office Accounting Specialist (SPRAC ID #07-2012)
Department: Business Office
Component: Admin Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Accounts Payable utilized support from this position for 5 hours a week. Managers intend to have this position continue this support.
- This position has been frozen while it was being determined how best it might serve the Business Office. Now that it has been decided, SPRAC supports the intention to unfreeze this position to fill it with a classified member.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes, fully implemented.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Impact appears to be as anticipated.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Impact to workload appears to be as anticipated.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   Based on current known information, the plan appears workable and sustainable.
Duplications (SPARC ID #10-2011)
Department: Business Office
Component: Admin Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

• longer waits for duplications job fulfillment,
• lack of delivery
• lack of service for time sensitive copy jobs

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes
2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes. Delivery of completed copy jobs to requester has been curtailed, but pick-up availability has been moved to the campus mail-room.
3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes. The combination of a classified hourly employee and offsite printer services were able to fulfill jobs in a standard 4-7 day turn-around period (if off peak), and provide service for time-sensitive projects
4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   Of the 53.4% of surveyed respondents in the fall of 2012 who indicated that they knew about Cabrillo duplications services, 48% of those indicated that they are satisfied with duplications services and hours of operation. From the percentage, it appears that adjustments should be made to improve services and/or hours.
SPARC Summary/Final Report
Submitted to CPC for review at the June 19th, 2013 CPC Mtg.

Mail Services Assistant (SPARC ID #09-2012)
Department: Business Office
Component: Admin Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPARC Reviews are available on the SPARC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- 7 days notice of bulk mailings would be required
- Emergency same day mail packages may not be able to be accommodated and special handling.
- Staff is concerned that mail would not have backup in case of absence, though warehouse staff is cross-trained in all mailroom functions and will cover in the case of absence.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   Yes. In the Fall of 2012, the campus community was surveyed. 70.5% of the respondents reported being “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the ease of sending or receiving college related mail. 68.1% of were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the hours of operation
Purchasing Buyer, Purchasing Specialist (SPRAC ID #24-2012)
Department: Business Office
Component: Admin Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- All of the facilities consultants are gone and bidding for the remaining projects has fallen to the Purchasing Dept. However, the last major construction project associated with the 1998 and 2004 bonds has just been completed and the last state-funded projects for the 300 building and the Health and Welfare complex are in the process of being closed out. The completion of these projects should cause a significant reduction in bidding, contracting, equipment purchasing, and purchase requisitions that are impacting the workload of staff in the Purchasing department.
- New Purchasing timelines may impact the Business Office in terms of turnaround time on accountant approvals.
- The campus at large will be impacted as the timeline for making purchases and processing orders are lengthened.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes
2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No. Purchasing buyer had to be hired back to 100% through June 30th in order to complete some projects that were not getting done. This also affected the work that could be completed by the buyer on regular projects.
3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No. It was not expected that the buyer would have to return to the job at 100% to get the remaining projects done.
4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   No. The 90% contract did not enable all the required projects to be managed.

Footnote: All responses refer to the Buyer Position (No responses were received regarding the Purchasing Specialist.)
FPPO Grounds Maintenance Worker/Custodian(s) (SPRAC ID #02-2011/25-2012/06/2012)
Department: FPPO
Component: Admin Svcs

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Buildings, classrooms, meetings rooms, locker rooms, labs, offices, bathrooms, etc., will not be maintained at current standard.
- Staff are concerned that there may be a workload issue that could lead to an increase in illness and accidents when the reality of these cuts are realized. The number of custodial positions will be reduced from [30] to [28]; however, the workload reductions outlined in the Plan are aimed at mitigating impact on remaining staff.
- Additional measures, such as improve the “No dogs on campus” signs, no food/drink in classrooms, only allow clean shoes used on gym equipment, may need to be implemented to help keep the facilities cleaner.
- Personal offices may need to be maintained by occupants.
- Long-term effect on facilities that are not able to be well maintained may be:
  - loss of respect and care for run-down facilities by users
  - degradation of carpet, flooring, equipment and other items
  - health and safety issues
  - graffiti becomes more of a problem

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   No responses received

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No responses received

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No responses received

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   No responses received
SPARC Summary/Final Report
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Computer Systems Maintenance Tech (# 01-2012)
Information Systems Coordinator (#01-2012)
Multimedia Services Specialist (#23-2012)
Department: IT
Component: Administrative Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Impact on end user departments
- Loss of a level of service
- Loss in timeliness of service
- Moving one Technician to Watsonville to support growth in technology-reliant programs at the Watsonville Center will create a hole in instructional support in student computer classrooms and labs for the Aptos campus

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   No. The plan has evolved given that there were two retirements during this time. The Help Desk has not yet been brought up to speed with Datatel support. Training has not been given on other redistributed tasks.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No. The plan states that there will be a longer wait for service. Workload and response time have not gone down, especially with STEM coming online.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   One respondent wrote that much work has been shifted back to the requesting departments as expected. Another responded that training on reallocated tasks, adjustment to timeline of request response and the communication of that adjustment have not happened as expected.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   One respondent wrote that it has proved workable but a coordinator would still be a tremendous asset. Another respondent wrote that it has not been workable; the workload is overwhelming.
SPARC Summary/Final Report
Submitted to CPC for review at the June 19th, 2013 CPC Mtg.

Writing Center LIAs (SPARC ID# 22-2012)
Writing Center LIAs (SPARC ID# 05-2011)
Department: BELA
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPARC Reviews are available on the SPARC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- As a result of this plan, the Writing Center now opens one hour later and closes one hour earlier. A potential issue was that the adjusted hours would limit students’ access to the lab.
- Because there is very little wiggle room in the schedule, more general tasks (answering phones, helping students print, etc.) tend to substantially inhibit focusing on tutoring.
- Students have less evening access. Students may see substantial wait times on busy days.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes. There have been significant wait times for students during busy periods. Staff doing work across administrative and tutoring duties.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes. Staff is busy and has assumed new tasks.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   As current director of the Writing Center, I need an additional LIA to cover morning labs, so the reductions have created more work and larger lab sections for LIAs.

SPARC Members: Lori Amato (chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Advisor)
SPARC Summary/Final Report  
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Children’s Center Cook II (SPARC ID #04-2011)  
Department: HASS  
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPARC Reviews are available on the SPARC website)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- There was concern that teachers would not be able to prepare snacks while simultaneously instructing in the class.
- Proper training of USDA guidelines would need to be offered to faculty.
- Parent-students might find it harder to attend college since the Center was changing its hours so that it would be closed from 12:00-1:00.
- The remaining worker, a Program Specialist, was very concerned that she would be required to help backfill for the cook’s position.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.  
Yes.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

   No. The food preparation is reportedly taking away from the teacher’s ability to conduct programs in the classroom. Parents are sometimes not able to complete school and work responsibilities with the current hours of childcare offered by the Children’s Center due to the elimination of the cook. Shopping for food items has become the responsibility of the classroom teacher. There is some doubt as to whether or not all teachers have completed the required USDA food preparation guidelines training.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

   No. Work has been passed on to the remaining program specialist that is not part of the job description. Student workers have been hired to help out with food preparation, which was not in the submitted SPARC plan. It appears the Children’s Center teachers haven’t been sharing the responsibilities that they agreed to in the plan, making paperwork late and incomplete to the office. It was also said that only one Children’s Center teacher had taken the online webinars.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?

   There are still adjustments to be made. The Center cannot afford to hire student employees to help with food preparation. All teachers should have an equal share in the new responsibilities. Director is not fulfilling the stated requirements as put forth in the submitted SPARC plan.

SPARC Members: Lori Amato (chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Advisor)
Medical Assistant LIA (SPRAC ID #14-2012)
Department: HAWK
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Although students support will be reduced, they may gain practical experience as some instructors may build lab set up and tear down into their lab assignments.
- Additional responsibilities will be added to the clinical instructors, but should be incorporated without great impact—as noted above, they have done this before. Examples of the additional responsibilities of the MA clinical instructors are:
  - Keeping their own inventory for replacement when necessary.
  - Restocking their own shelves when supplies arrive.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?

The clinical courses/faculty have “keenly” felt the impact/loss and hope to bring back this position through the prioritization process.
Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Circulation will experience longer student waits and lines at the beginning of each term and other peak times.
- Training student workers at the Circulation Desk will be difficult at the beginning of each term without this position.
- The elimination of the Library LIA position held by the CCEU’s president has significant implications to the institution. During these difficult budgetary times the consistency of leadership of Cabrillo’s various shared governance constituencies if of great importance.
- NOTE: The rotating managers from this unit felt that this issue was not suitable for this report as it is focused on the person holding the position rather than the LIA position. Because the concern over the role this person plays in college leadership was brought up by several affected staff and faculty members in this unit, if follows consistent practice for SPRAC to include this as an issue that may need to be addressed.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Mostly. This has had an impact on A&R staff, as they now received drop/add/move requests from nearly a dozen librarians rather than one consolidated list from a single person. Library is working with A&R to coordinate this process.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes. Reduction of services and transfer of tasks from the LIA position to other staff, faculty and departments have been survivable.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   This plan has proved workable.
Tutorials LIA (No SPRAC ID# Assigned)
Department: Tutorials
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Reduction of face-to-face contact (i.e. answering phones, walk-ins, individual orientations) with students may result in lost students.
- Students who do not receive face-to-face help may not return to Tutorials and may have difficulty succeeding in classes.
- Difficulty in completing and reduced accuracy in detail-oriented budgetary and clerical tasks (i.e. recording positive hours, scheduling, verifying enrollment in sections) while maintaining student contact (i.e. answering phones, handling questions on walk-in, etc.)
- Coverage during breaks, sickness, vacation

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes.
2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes.
3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes.
4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?

Overall, this plan is workable. However, breaks/absences are an ongoing problem as this is now a one-person department. Role confusion between the responsibilities of the SA and the tutors who often assist with office work is being addressed. Because the Coordinator needs to absorb the critical LIA work it is important that the SA not function like and LIA.

SPRAC Members: Lori Amato (chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Advisor)
Math LIA (#14-2011)
Math Learning Center LIA (#21-2012)
Department: NAS
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Students will have a longer wait time to receive math assistance.
- Hours of operation for the MLC may need to be reduced.
- With the new repeat policy from the State, the MLC may see a significant increase in demand for tutoring services just as the reductions are reducing the amount of time that can be spent with each student.
- Reduction of service may increase demand for assistance via Tutorial Services.
- Tutorials, MESA, and the Math Learning Center offer independent services to math students. In light of reductions in these areas, perhaps collaboration between these services could be of benefit to the students.
- The impact on the Director of the MLC is undetermined.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   We have reduced hours but more may need to be cut.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Students do wait longer periods of time for help. This extends the amount of time they need to stay in the MLC and bloats the demand for assistance.
The MLC Director is working more hours in the MLC to help prevent any further reduction in operating hours and to try to help accommodate student demand.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   The Tutorials department does not have the resources to serve all of the students that the MLC can no longer accommodate.
   Schedules of student tutors’ schedules change more often and they don’t have the experience LIA’s have and so are a weaker substitute; we cannot expect them to work at the level of an LIA. And out highest level student tutors are often close to transfer and may not take the required 6 unit minimum to be hired as a student at Cabrillo.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   Further adjustments may need to be made.

SPARC Members: Lori Amato (chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Advisor)
SPARC Summary/Final Report
Submitted to CPC for review at the June 19th, 2013 CPC Mtg.

Science Lab Tech (#12-2011, 18-2012)
Department: NAS
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- As noted in the Plan, lab sessions may need to be shortened to enable proper setup and tear down of labs. Modifying curriculum to accommodate this reduction may affect the students’ experience.
- Safety and other regulations will continue to be an area of focus for the staff and faculty; however, the elimination of this position will spread the same responsibilities across fewer employees.
- Utilizing students enrolled in the lab for setting up and cleaning up the lab may accelerate the deterioration of equipment due to their inexperience.
- Additional student assistants may need to be hired for lower level duties, if the additional lab work is appropriate for that level.
- Preserved specimens may need to be purchased rather than gathered—this would increase supply expenses but preserved specimens can often be used for several years. Loss of this position will require many instructors to prepare and breakdown their own labs. This brings up two major concerns (see Safety, bullet one; Impact to Students).
- Safety
  - Overly packed and limited storage space in stockrooms requires careful and artful attention. Procedures for tracking, storing, reserving, disposing, and allocating temporary space for materials must be strictly followed or risks to efficiency and safety may result. Materials include dangerous chemicals and biological specimens.
  - Labs are subject to inspection and compliancy. Substantial fines are a possibility for violations.
  - Additional transportation of lab materials may add safety and liability issues (see Watsonville below).
- Impact to Students
  - Due to lab availability limitations and maximized scheduling of science classes, instructors may need to use actual lab time to set up, deploy, and break down their own labs. From feedback received, this time could be substantial. Feedback received between the Dean and instructors involves a high degree of variance, from 10-90 minutes. Some of the more complex labs may have to be simplified. Students may experience a reduced quality of education.
- Watsonville
  - Although this position does not support the science lab in Watsonville, the only Lab Tech that does serve on that campus is planned to be pulled to Aptos in order to help fill the gap for this lost position. In the original proposal it was stated that there will be no Lab Tech support in Watsonville. This was modified in a subsequent email from the Dean who posits that it may be possible to reduce rather than totally eliminate support in Watsonville, but not sure how.
  - Without classified support in Watsonville, the stockroom there will likely deteriorate. Also, instructors will need to transport lab materials between the two campuses. This presents additional safety and liability issues.
• Student Assistants
  o It is planned that student assistants will be hired to help. They will need constant supervision (required) from Lab Techs and will be limited in tasks. Research should be done to see how effective and feasible this is. There may be contract issues if they do classified work – student assistants cannot be hired to replace classified staff.

• Chemistry
  o The two remaining lab techs will absorb the 20% cut. This includes additional tasks of maintaining log books and safety records that were maintained by the eliminated Tech.

• Biology
  o Remaining Lab techs each will support one additional instructor to help absorb workload.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?

The responses received did not correlate directly to the questions above, most likely because of the overlap/varieties of depts/labs. Various concerns were expressed and are summarized below:

• The maintenance/upkeep (prep, cleaning, log books, etc.) of the chemistry labs is faltering and not being covered by the existing student assistants (who require supervision). The instructors are helpful, but it is not nearly enough.
• Lab sessions have not been sufficiently shortened. Some set-ups have had to be modified to accommodate this.
• It was suggested that Student Assistants be hired to assist the Lab Techs and not just the faculty.
• Techs are often unable to take breaks or full lunch hours.
• It was suggested that a Student Assistant be hired for Watsonville.
SPRAC Summary/Final Report
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Public Safety Program Coordinator (SPRAC ID #10-2012)
Department: Public Safety/HASS
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Aspects of the implementation still need to be worked out. Now that the Board has approved the reduction of the Director of Public Safety at the April 2 Board meeting more planning on the implementation can get underway. The manager states she will continue to work with staff on the best way to implement this plan.
- Reducing the Program Coordinator and eliminating the Director of Public Safety at the same time may lead to unanticipated consequences. All adjustments needed for that reduction may take some time to sort out.
- Some in-service responsibilities may not be significantly reduced with the reduction of in-service funding. Public Safety, Admissions & Records, and the Business Office will need to continue to look for more efficiencies in this complex process.
- As the plan moves to the implementation phase, the staff is concerned with what duties will be eliminated or redistributed. Workload for this position and the division staff who may inherit work for this program will need to continue to be a topic of the ongoing discussion during implementation.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   No responses received

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No responses received

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No responses received

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   No responses received
Performing Arts Complex Assistant (SPARC ID #11-2012)
Department: VAPA
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- It is already difficult for the Performing Arts Coordinator to take any vacation time. This reduction will make it even more difficult.
- Cabrillo Stage will need to pay for more services during the summer.
- No use of the Recital Hall during the summer months with only one employee.
- Loss of some income as the previous rates and policies regarding fees for the use of these facilities are being updated and increased just as our ability to rent out the space is decreasing due to staffing reductions.
- Lost income opportunity as the reduction postpones indefinitely the hoped for summer camps for youth.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes. The Performing Arts Complex Assistant took no-pay months in July, August, and September 2012.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes, the impact has been largely as expected, leaving the summer instructional theatre program (Cabrillo Stage) with one less staff support position at a very busy time, which is less than ideal. The off-contract months of July, August, and September were chosen to avoid the peak instructional programming times during the normal academic terms, particularly May and December.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes, the distribution of the workload happened largely as expected, but it remains to be seen if continued minimal staffing during the Cabrillo Stage summer season will be sufficient and sustainable. Cabrillo Stage has just recently been fully weaned from the College’s general fund for operational support, so should there be a need for increased peak season temp hourly support, as was the case even before the reduction, the budgetary impact on Cabrillo Stage may not be sustainable.
4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?

The plan has been largely workable, though the college has moved to a three-performance facility five years ago and has reduced the staffing. Two critical adjustments will need to be made as we move forward:

a) **The three off-contract months for the now 9-month, 100% Performing Arts Complex Assistant may need to be scheduled non-consecutively and far more strategically.** Cabrillo College HR has confirmed that it is possible to exercise far greater flexibility in scheduling the Performing Arts Complex Assistant without negatively impacting the individual’s benefits package. Further conversation with end users (faculty) and the Performing Arts Complex Coordinator will be required to design a more effective work schedule for the Performing Arts Complex Assistant in 2013-14.

b) **Increase the pool of temp hourly individuals who meet the MQs for the Performing Arts Complex Coordinator and Performing Arts Complex Assistant for assistance during peak periods, illness, and as vacation.** With the combined reduction in these two positions from 2 to 1.75 FTE and a gradually increasing operational tempo caused by increased rentals of the performing venues to outside users, there is a need to establish a pool of qualified temp hourly staff who can provide additional support during peak periods and backfill for the Performing Arts Complex Coordinator and Performing Arts Complex Assistant when they are ill or need to take vacation. This need was identified even before the current reduction, but has become even more critical following the reduction. Newly implemented higher rental fees should provide enough direct cost reimbursement revenue from outside renters to cover the cost of hiring temp hourly staff for peak periods and backfill.
Photo Lab Technician – Reduce from two (1.31 FTE) to one (.75 FTE) for total reduction of (.56 FTE)
Eliminate Visual Arts Technician II – a 10-month, 50% Position
Department: VAPA
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

Photo Lab Technician
- Changing the staffing of a two-person lab to a one-person lab makes taking breaks, absences and vacations problematic for the remaining staff member. Unlike other areas of the college where one would put up a sign and lock the door, students are in various stages of working on their projects with chemicals and time-sensitive processes that cannot be interrupted. A solution will need to be worked out that will allow for breaks, absences, and vacations without shutting down the labs that are required for students to complete assignments for their course work.
- Reputation as a stellar program and faith of the community that supported the new facilities may be in jeopardy.
- Student Success in these classes will be directly impacted by this reduction. Lab hours will need to be reduced and curriculum will need to be changed to adapt to restricted access to equipment and supplies in the lab.
- Safety and the supervision of students’ use of chemicals and equipment will be adversely impacted.
- Lab hours will need to be reduced or eliminated in the evening which will negatively impact working students.
- Work that the remaining staff member is not able to perform will be pushed off to faculty who, in turn, will have less time to spend instructing their students and may need to increase the hours they spend on campus supporting the needs of the lab.
- Some of the current work may need to be shifted to other departments—such as locking and securing the rooms and maintenance of equipment.
- Degeneration of the equipment and facilities will occur as repair and maintenance during slower times in the lab will no longer be possible.
- A budget for equipment maintenance may need to be established.
- Curriculum may need to be changed to channel the flow into the labs differently. There is a concern that this may lead to less rigorous courses.
- Class prep services for faculty will be reduced.

Visual Arts Technician II
- Student pathways may be interrupted as it becomes harder for students to finish their course work within 2 to 3 years due to curriculum changes necessitated by this reduction.
- Reputation as a stellar program and faith of the community that supported the new facilities may be in jeopardy.
- Student Success in these classes will be directly impacted by this reduction. Toolroom hours will need to be reduced and curriculum will need to be changed to adapt to restricted access to the tools.

SPARC Members: Lori Amato (chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Advisor)
• Safety and supervision of students’ use of tools will be adversely impacted.
• Lab hours will need to be reduced or eliminated in the evening which will negatively impact working students.
• Students benefit from the tools we provide for them to use in their 2D and 3D art classes. Maintaining these tools may become problematic with the reduction in staff.
• A budget for equipment maintenance may need to be established.
• Work that the remaining staff member is not able to perform will be pushed off to faculty who, in turn, will have less time to spend instructing their students and may need to increase the hours they spend on campus supporting these needs.
• Locking and securing the power tool work room, foundry area, jewelry/metal lab area, and possibly a portion of the ceramics lab will fall to faculty—including inventorying, shutting off and locking down equipment.
• Curriculum may need to be changed to channel the flow into the labs differently. There is a concern that this may lead to less rigorous courses.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Photo Lab Technician –
   Partially – the part of the plan that has been implemented is the reduction in open lab hours. Not implemented is the coverage of breaks, absences and vacation. Though faculty members were directed to assume primary responsibility for equipment check out, this has not happened consistently.
   Visual Arts Technician –
   Yes – Visual Arts Lab hours have been reduced and shifted to allow for a mix of day/evening coverage. Arts Tool Room Coordinator has increased his reliance on student volunteers, but are less than adequate in terms fo skill, availability and dependability. More paid student assistants need to be engaged to increase dependability and reliability.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Photo Lab Technician –
   Students have been negatively impacted – student one on one time with lab techs has been reduced due to need for one tech to also oversee equipment check-out/check-in and maintenance. Equipment maintenance has lagged, and some needs to be sent off-campus for repair, at additional cost. The way to get lab coverage is by additional student assistants, which are not reliable and an inadequate solution. Student assistant budget would also need to be increased from $2K to $4K to cover cost.
Visual Arts Technician –
Negative impact on students has been as expected. Hours have been reduced – completely closed on Mondays. Only one staff support person, equipment maintenance and repair is traded off with student support. Equipment has been lost because student volunteers are less experienced/diligent.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

Photo Lab Technician –
The workload of remaining lab technician has increased, due to elimination of one lab tech, the lack of reliable and dependable student volunteers. Faculty are not devoting class time as agreed to checking out and checking in equipment, placing greater strain on remaining lab tech. Interrupting classes for faculty to address check-in/check out or equipment issues is problematic. This aspect of the plan has proven to be unworkable.

Visual Arts Technician –
Less than adequate implementation of reduction plan. Faculty does not make clear to students that when Art Tool Room Coordinator is not present, the lab is closed. More and better signage of lab open/closed hours also is needed. Students interrupting classes to check out equipment or get assistance formerly provided by Visual Arts Technician is a problem.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?

Photo Lab Technician –
Plan has only been proven to be partially workable. Division Dean recommends two adjustments:
1). Increase remaining photo lab tech from 100%, 9 months to 100%, 10 months
2). Increase current, $2,000 student photo assistant budget to at least $4,000 to increase reliable student assistance

Remaining Photo Lab Tech states that though breaks are scheduled on paper, she does not have time to take them.

Visual Arts Technician –
Plan has only been proven to be partially workable. Division Dean recommends two adjustments:
1). The ENTIRE visual arts faculty need to clarify with their students that when the lab is closed, the area and its equipment are NOT accessible to students.
2). Increase the current Visual Arts Student Assistant budget. Student assistants and volunteers were used prior to the reduction, but with the reduction, the need for reliable, dependable, and regular assistance from student workers has become more critical.
SPARC Summary/Final Report
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Program Specialist (SPARC ID #31-2012)
Department: CEED
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPARC Reviews are available on the SPARC website)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Staff members were concerned that the quality of service and/or the capacity to provide the current level of service will be adversely affected.
- Going forward, including the remaining Program Specialist in planning and implementation will be very important in achieving the most favorable reorganization results for the department.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented. No responses received
2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations. No responses received
3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations. No responses received
4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made? No responses received

SPARC Members: Lori Amato (chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Advisor)
ACE Program Coordinator & ACE Program Specialist (# 12-2011)
Department: VOCED/ACE
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Who will maintain ACE’s presence on the college website? This is still being worked out, but 2 non-grant-funded STARS employees will be taking broader Learning Communities responsibilities. At this point it is thought that they will maintain both ACE and STARS websites.
- Who will do the ACE student intake? Recruitment is no longer part of the ACE strategy, as they are moving to an “opt out” approach. This may eliminate the need for intake forms? Currently there is an “Apply Now” link on their website. Will this go away?
- Who will enter Datatel student cohorts (not to be confused with ACE cohorts) into Datatel? Possibly the STARS staff in their expanded role.
- Who will handle the coordination, training, supervising, timetards, and paperwork needed for student interns? Possibly the STARS staff in their expanded role.
- Who will coordinate all of the offerings across departments and divisions? An ACE offerings template has been established. The ACE faculty coordinator and STARS staff will be involved in changes that happen to the schedule throughout the planning stages.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Program/grant funds ended. No responses received

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Program/grant funds ended. No responses received

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Program/grant funds ended. No responses received

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   Program/grant funds ended. No responses received
Instructional Division Assistants (SPARC ID # 02-2012)
Department: Instructional Division Assistants
Component: Instruction

[Eliminate 4 IDA positions (2 vacant, 1 retirement, 1 occupied). Currently there are 10 IDA positions, 2 for each division. In this plan, each division will have 1 IDA and the sixth IDA will become a central IDA who will do projects for all 5 divisions.]

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:
- Centralized IDA may not be able to handle all of the projects in the Plan for all five divisions.
- Level of service to faculty and students will be affected.
- Vacations and 11-month contracts will affect functioning of division offices.
- Further issues of workload, service, and logistics may arise during the development of the implementation plan and implementation itself.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.

   Appears to have been fully implemented - we no longer have a second IDA and that was the implementation, with a central IDA taking over the flex agreements and office hours and syllabi tracking.

   Central IDA reports that she provides:

   Office administrative support to 5 Divisions when needed.
   Audit Faculty office Hours on line (SALSA) for 5 Divisions.
   Audit, Tracking and Archive of flex agreements (On line) for 5 Divisions
   Audit, Tracking and Archive all faculty SLO/Syllabi on line for 5 Divisions.
   Create worksheets to monitor faculty paper work for 5 Divisions.
   Research, draft and compose correspondence, reports and specialized documents related to the Division I am working on.

   Provide factual information regarding policies, procedures, Division courses, activities and functions to faculty, students, and potential students.
   Receive and within guidelines, resolve complaints and concerns that arise on the part of faculty, staff and students, in accordance with established College and state procedures and regulations.
   Enter and retrieve data to prepare reports.
   Operate standard office equipment.
   Perform related duties as required or assigned.

   Central IDA believes the position is the appropriate solution to the overload of work for the IDA Division – especially at peak times, when level of service is critical for Faculty and students.
SPRAC Summary/Final Report
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The magnitude of workload and critical issues regarding the Central IDA position, have been resolved along the academic semester. To audit, file, and archive multiple projects for 5 Divisions has been a challenge, but to have all the faculty-required paperwork for each semester in one place, has been a great solution for Instruction and Divisions.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

They don’t believe there has been a reduction in services except that we are ACTUALLY closed for lunch and when there is only one person working and that person has to go to the mailroom or to post class canceled signs or elsewhere on campus we have to close the office, which does rather annoy both faculty and students who are trying to get information/copies/mail/answers etc.

Others report same open hours, same demands and the work moved to Central IDA still comes back to individual IDAs and juggling requires more time.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

Don’t believe that the distribution of the workload has really changed much, once the central IDA has done her tracking she hands over those still remaining to the division offices and we still have to track them down and hound them about their missing syllabi, missing office hours and missing flex agreements, whilst still trying to do all the other work associated with the missing 2nd IDA position – let’s just say thank goodness book requests are now online only! Perhaps we can finally get NOA’s to be emailed out instead of printed out at some point.

Another person believes the distribution has gone heavily to the DAS and DC and is interfering with their ability to keep up with their own workload. Example: DAS is the IDA from 7-9, both cover breaks and mail run etc.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?

Definitely needs adjustments to allow the single IDA to be able to have time to do their job and cover all the bases and still have time to take breaks and lunch breaks. Either that or make office hours shorter so there is time at the beginning and end of the day to do the work that can’t be done in the midst of students/faculty in office. Also with the new rules that faculty have to open their own doors, the number of door openings because of “forgotten keys” that have to happen at 8am or 6pm is adding to the feeling of utter inability to cope with the job.

If Faculty turned them in ON TIME, there would be a lot less work for the single IDA to do and perhaps the job could be done with just one person. But a person and half would be best case scenario if we can’t have 2 again. Perhaps there could be job sharing on campus where someone works 50% in 2 divisions one in the am and one in the pm – depending on their preferences or all mornings and someone else does all afternoons… or whatever is needed most in the divisions that would prefer to have a secondary helper position.
Another reports current plan is not workable, because absences or vacations cause the work to get behind and the normal checks and balances to not happen. Another reports it is not workable because interruptions that require immediate attention cause other work to not get completed in a timely manner. Faculty expectations remain high, regardless of reduction in staff.

Another reports that the plan is workable, but gives more work to Division Offices and the Central IDA.
Computer Lab LIA, Watsonville (SPARC ID # 05-2012)
Department: Watsonville
Component: Instruction

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Loss of services to summer students who may be directed to the Aptos campus for their lab work.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.

This plan has been fully implemented, though the employee seems to lack clarity on their class title, as well as a definition of the class, indicating the type of duties and responsibilities, and a statement of distinguishing characteristics which differentiates the class from other related or similar classes. The Watsonville Center Computer Lab LIA is now a 9-month assignment, active only during the primary terms of fall and spring.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

The reduction has had the anticipated effect at the Watsonville Center. Since the computer lab was already closed during the summer, students have not been affected. The Watsonville Center does not have a full-time computer maintenance Tech. Due to the lack of support, staff must cover technical support for the entire campus when IT coverage is not available.

Employee notes that he assists staff, faculty and the ILC with tech support. This is what he believes can be listed as out-of-class work which goes unnoticed due to undertaking technical needs when IT personnel are not available.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

The distribution of workload has happened as anticipated. Although the computer maintenance technician position that was planned to be filled at a 100% level was scaled back to the original 50% assignment, summer work assignments have been able to be completed in a timely manner.

The impact of the assignment being filled at 50% rather than 100% has not affected regular tech
support for staff and faculty, since their requests are handled as top priority. However, there is an impact on future projects, which are prioritized after direct tech support. Some of these will take much longer to be completed due to the reduced amount of computer maintenance tech time and the short window of collaboration time with the CTC Coordinator for projects, training, and IT general topics. Instead of being proactive about IT needs to prevent problems, we must be more reactive in solving them.

Employee requests that he has the knowledge and capability of fulfilling the IT needs for the Watsonville campus. He requests a review of the duties assigned and completed to the LIA position to perhaps determine if the duties are at a higher level than the current classification.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?

This plan has proven to be workable. There may be adjustments in terms of workflow, meetings and responsibilities if and when the Watsonville Center Computer Lab LIA position becomes a CABT Instructional Assistant position, but this is a process that will be determined by centralized decisions in Human Resources.

We have not received any reports from students that this has been a hardship.
SPRAC Summary/Final Report
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MarCom Coordinator (SPRAC ID #30-2012)
Department: Marketing
Component: President

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- The student intern will need to be limited to peak cycles and finite tasks that are not among the duties currently performed by the Coordinator.
- New/additional funding sources for the .25 FTE may be needed.
- The implementation of the reduction—specifically what the reduction in services will look like—has not yet been developed; however, the next planning meeting with the coordinator, the Director of Marketing and Communications and the Dean of VAPA has already been set.
- For the equivalent of 3 months out of the year, the Coordinator duties will become the responsibility of the manager who already has a full plate of responsibilities.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   The plan has been implemented but without guidelines for the remaining workload distribution. Employee had no input from managers to what should be removed from the workload and what should not.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No reduction in services to students but a definite reduction in services to faculty, staff and departments, especially the VAPA division. The expected support from faculty and staff to help fill the backlog from this reduction has not occurred.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No. The distribution of the workload that has happened has overloaded both the graphic designer and the marketing director. Jobs to be performed when the coordinator is out on contract days due to the reduced contract have not been completed, causing deadlines to be missed and marketing opportunities to have been dropped. This causes a drop in revenue for ticket sales and lower attendance at events.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   No. It has succeeded in overwhelming the remaining employees and had a negative impact on the marketing of Cabrillo’s events. Student workers have to be trained to do backfill work which takes time away from the coordinator performing the duties of the job. Weekly meetings regarding department needs was recommended. Due to the need to increase enrollment to achieve higher FTES for funding, this decrease in the marketing position is not workable. It was suggested that he position needs to be funded to 75% at least, but preferably to 100%.

SPRAC Members: Lori Amato (chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Advisor)
SPARC Summary/Final Report
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There are numerous underlying issues that tie into the needs/demands of VAPA/Cabrillo Stage. Both the Dean of VAPA and the Director of Marketing (and their staffs) have much work to do as a team to remedy the issues.
Assessment, Program Specialist (SPARC ID #19-2012)
Department: CESS
Component: Student Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- ESL testing will expand in response to ESL’s program planning which intends to enforce prerequisites. Staff members are worried about their testing ability as this population’s needs grow.
- Assessment also lost their temp hourly budget which will further impact this area.
- Running Start is an especially heavy time for this office and will need consideration as Running Start is reworked for next year.
- Students will experience longer lines and will wait longer for staff to return their phone and email inquiries.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes. Signs are posted when assessment services has to be closed and students return when the signs say they will be open again. Running Start was a success again due to efficiency improvements.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes. Student hourly help has not been needed as was expected. However, ESL testing did not increase as was expected and this may affect the need for student hourly workers if it does increase in the future.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   Yes, it has. And the department feels it is in response to their excellent problem-solving skills. The employees are absolutely focused on students and redesign processes around their needs.
Counseling, Division Assistant (#15-2012)
Counseling, Office Specialist (#15-2012)
Transfer Center, LIA (#16-2012)
Department: CESS
Component: Student Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- As staff is working on new strategies of triaging student inquiries to align them with the most appropriate service, they are spending much more time on each call and in-person interaction. Institutionalizing and streamlining this strategy will be of great importance as staffing is being reduced.
- As reductions are made in Counseling, Transfer/Career Center staff is feeling added stress of handling appointments that would generally go to Counseling and making files.
- The classifications of staff are not interchangeable. There is some belief that some may already being “working out of class.” This will be addressed now by the dean. If they will be expected to assist each other with items that are out of class due to these reductions, further discussions will be needed to work through these areas.
- Accommodations for staff member disabilities (one in Counseling and one in the Transfer Center) will need to be part of the implementation plan.
- Because the Counseling and Transfer Center offices are open to walk-in traffic and receive many inquiries that are not within the services that these offices provide, the configuration of the flow of traffic in the 100 Building will need to be examined to mitigate the impact of these reductions.
- Much of the plan is dependent upon technology solutions that have not been implemented, including: eTranscripts, eFiles, and eSARS. The eTranscripts will be the first of these solutions to go live as it is required to be implemented (or at least underway) by the end of 2012. Work will most likely not begin on eFiles (imaging files with SoftDocs) solutions until next year as the system is being upgraded and another department is slated to go live before Counseling. The eSARS (students make appointments with counselors via the web) solution is not yet scheduled with IT but is a priority within the Counseling Dept.
- The college may need to help reduce, at all levels, students’ expectations of immediate service. This can be done through signage, web content, phone greetings, and management support.
- A college-wide education of staff on strategies of saying “no,” being helpful without feeling helpless in establishing reasonable boundaries, and the education of managers in the importance of supporting staff members when issues escalate may ease the stress many workers are experiencing.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   No. But the reconfiguration has been approved by Cabinet and FPAC and plans for new flow are being drawn up with a summer goal for implementation.
The eSARS project is on IT’s schedule and counseling is doing work so it will be ready to go when it is time, but technology solutions have not yet been implemented.

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

Not as bad. The work is getting done; students are being served. Student Success strategies currently being implemented have augmented the demand for our services. We still get students with questions for Financial Aid and A&R when those offices are closed or have long student lines.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

The distribution of workload is the same as it was before the reductions.
An actual increase in workload was expected after the contract reduction. However, class scheduling has more than doubled and department meetings have doubled. These issues were unforeseen when the changes to staffing were being planned.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?

This plan may prove to be workable when it is fully implemented.
SPARC Summary/Final Report
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Adaptive PE, LIA (SPARC ID #08-2012)
Department: CESS/DSPS
Component: Student Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPARC Reviews are available on the SPARC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Some adjustments may need to be made around the issue of researching any new disabilities that students may have when they use the Adaptive PE services as this staff member will not be available to assist faculty to the extent that she has in the past.
- Safety issues continue to be foremost in their work.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Due to the move of the DSPS program into existing LS program space, the Proctoring Center was remodeled to include storage for student files, equipment and supplies. This resulted in a loss of proctoring space and while the Library has been generous in allowing them to use one of their Quiet Rooms during finals week, the Proctoring Center space for the day-to-day tests is frequently inadequate. They are forced to use the Learning Skills Lab, which means that the Lab is not usable for students receiving tutoring or using the computers with assistive software.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   DSPS and LSP students did not get the services they should have and the staff/faculty did not get the support the plan indicated would be forthcoming due to bumping and retirement of staff members involved in the transition. The original LIA/Alt Media person returned to DSPS/LSP now, so that students are now receiving services/support in a timely fashion, however they are still working and identifying duties that need to be shared.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   Until they have a 100% Program Specialist we will not know if this plan is workable. Even when a 50% backfill is found and trained there will still be adjustments that will need to be made and dealt with on a daily basis.

SPARC Members: Lori Amato (chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Advisor)
Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- Learning Skills and DSPS have been in conversation for years about combining these two offices and already have made some inroads in this regard. This consolidation was codified in the 2007 space allocation plan. This reduction plan will further help them to achieve efficiencies if the two programs are brought into the same work space. However, if a new space cannot be located the staff feel that this plan will be more difficult to implement and not benefit this student population.
- It is not possible to fully plan for what current services and processes will be redesigned, reduced or eliminated because some are dependent on knowing their new location which is yet to be determined.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   - Yes

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

4. Workload has been taken on by other staff members on top of their original jobs. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   - As other workers have taken on the work previously done by the program specialist it has decreased the amount of work they can do in their own job on a regular basis.
SPARC Summary/Final Report  
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Admissions & Records Asst II (SPARC ID #07-2011)  
Admissions & Records Asst (SPARC ID #29-2012)  
Admissions & Records Asst (SPARC ID #03-2012)  
Department: Admissions and Records  
Component: Student Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

Pertaining to the elimination of two of the four A&R Assistant II positions. Re-title and re-train remaining A&R Assistants to new “Enrollment Services Program Specialist” position to be created at the same salary levels (30/34):
- Concerns from staff that the implementation aspect of the Plan had not yet been fleshed out and that staff would not be part of that conversation.
- “Too soon to tell” whether or not this plan is workable. Phase 4 reduction made before the impacts of the cuts made in Phase 2 were fully realized and addressed.
- Level of service to students will be affected.
- New position still needed classification review by HR.
- Further issues of workload, service, and logistics may arise during implementation.
- Reliant on another impacted department, IT, to implement initiatives to lighten the load.

Pertaining to the reclass of the last A&R Assistant II position to an A&R Technician II (higher class) position (vacant) and eliminate the A&R Assistant position made vacant by this reclass:
- Differing hours of other services offered in the 100 building impact the A&R counter—when other offices are closed students come to A&R for help. (Discussion with these offices is ongoing).
- Admissions and Records will continue to build efficiencies to maximize the chance of success at the new staffing level.
- Fine-tuning the roll out of the SRC portion of the Phase 2 plan to ensure students are greeted at the Enrollment Services counter for centralized services.
- Continue to work toward updating the expectations and self-service skills of traditionally high-touch populations.

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Not yet fully implemented.
   What has been implemented: Reclassed last A&R Assistant II position to the A&R Technician II, that position is still vacant. The Watsonville Program Specialist position, currently vacant, was reclassed to be an Enrollment Service Program Specialist. The Watsonville A&R Assistant II still needs to be reclassed to be an Enrollment Service Program Specialist. There have been varying opinions on exactly how that is to be accomplished while the position is filled. I am awaiting HR's guidance on this topic.

SPARC Members: Lori Amato (chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Advisor)
2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

We had less than six months to get a feel for how this impacted the services in the offices before experiencing the increase in workload due to three vacant positions due to one retirement and two people leaving for other campus positions. During that brief period, it did seem a workable scenario.

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.

As indicated above, it is difficult to tell at this point. We certainly are aware that there is less flexibility since the reduction when there are vacancies and having temps certainly helps to carry the workload but not 100%. We are hopeful the positions will be filled soon, to know for certain.

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?

Yes, it is workable.
SPRAC Summary/Final Report
Submitted to CPC for review at the June 19th, 2013 CPC Mtg.

Financial Aid Advisor (SPRAC ID #08-2011)
Financial Aid Program Specialist (2) (SPRAC ID #29-2012)
Department: Enrollment Services/Financial Aid
Component: Student Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

Pertaining to the freezing of the Financial Aid Advisor Position

- Fewer staff are available to do the same amount of work. Re-allocated and eliminated work must be clearly and specifically identified in a work plan. With the loss of one employee, will the Financial Aid office be open fewer hours? Will there be less face-to-face contact with students? Will face-to-face contact only occur during limited hours?
- Staff workload issues that may arise with structuring shorter hours of window availability in order for them to process awards. He sees their ability to process awards efficiently as a remedy for long lines at the windows.
- Staff are unclear as to what duties will be assigned to the interim director and which will be handled by the Director of Enrollment Services. They are unclear as to who they should report to for specific tasks. They are also concerned that the Interim Assistant Director will have more work than one person can do.
- What will happen when the Interim Assistant Director position expires after one year? At the end of one year, a new Assistant Director may be hired and the Interim Director will
  - The plan presumes that greater reliance on electronic documentation will result in less contact with students. How will students get face-to-face assistance for technical problems?
  - How will increased reliance on electronic documentation affect IT Department?

Pertaining to the Elimination of 1 Financial Aid Specialist and Reclass of Remaining FA Program Specialists to “Enrollment Services Program Specialists”

- Staff at the Resource Center at the Watsonville Center serve many areas outside of Financial Aid and Admissions and Records, including: Counseling, Health Services, Student Affairs and EOPS. They don’t see how one person can do this work.
- Vacations, breaks, and absences may be an issue in staffing in Watsonville.
- New building coming on-line may increase traffic for Watsonville services.
- Level of service to students will be affected.
- New position still needs classification review by HR.
- Further issues of workload, service, and logistics may arise during implementation.
- Reliant on another impacted department, IT, to implement initiatives to lighten the load.

Pertaining to the Elimination of 1 Financial Aid Specialist (vacant, 1.0 FTE):

- Staff are concerned how this reduction will work when one of the two Aptos FA Specialists is ill or on vacation.
- Since the FA Specialist was currently made vacant, the FA department is already experiencing a shift in everyone’s workload—the Advisors have to do more phone answering, which pulls time away from packaging students’ loans.
- Temp worker(s) will need to be limited to peak cycles and finite tasks.
- If the Aptos Campus cannot address student inquiries immediately, some of the overflow may land at the Enrollment Services workers at the Watsonville Center.

SPRAC Members: Lori Amato (chair), Kristin Fabos, Alicia Hernandez, Charlotte Achen (Student Advisor)
Financial Aid will want to continue to build efficiencies to maximize the opportunity for success within this new staffing level. In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   Yes, it has been fully implemented

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Better than expected. Reduction forced conversations about responsibilities at staff and Administrative levels, and in Watsonville for Counseling, A&R and FA. There were dependencies upon the FA staff that were redefined and better understood by all parties. FA funds and staff are realigned to focus only on the duties of the newly revised Enrollment Services Program Specialist, relocated to the ES area (formerly the Bookstore).

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   Yes, but even better. Cross training in Watsonville benefits staff and students. In Aptos, the FA Advisor position was filled so there are now more advisors than at the time of the SPRAC proposal. The concerns staff brought up about having more phone duties was not related to the reduction but revisiting an office policy of making sure that all staff are trained and knowledgeable of office policies/procedures and have the experience of working students on the phone and at the counter, at least one hour a week. This gives them a chance to know where our processes might need improvement (information on the website that may be unclear, FAQ's that should be made available with answers, and most important, that no one misses the opportunity to interact with students to remember their needs and how to work together to meet them). Plans are in place to deal with absences, there are assigned backups and a calling system in place when that occurs.

Another concern the staff expressed was the need to reduce service hours due to fewer staff. That has been addressed but not necessarily in the manner expected by staff, changing our hours of operation. Instead we assessed and then revised several practices in order to make more efficient use of time and resources in ways that would impact students the least. For example, in both A&R and FA, staff had varying work schedules (7:30-4:30, 8-5, 8:30-5:30), now all staff work 8-5 so that there are the maximum number of staff available to assist students during our open hours. In the past, FA would close for a couple of weeks in August to catch up on files so that awards were available when the semester began. Now they are closed for 1/2 day one week each month in order to "crunch out" more awards in a proactive manner instead of at the last minute. When the Bank reduced their Friday hours to noon, FA and A&R changed their hours to match, instead of closing at 1:00. Although only one hour, again we asked people to take simultaneous lunches, instead of at different times, so that when they returned we could have more time to conduct trainings or meetings.
4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   Yes, it is workable and there are always adjustments to be made, that's the nature of our work, but we have a strong team with creative ideas to help make our current reality work.
SPRAC Summary/Final Report
Submitted to CPC for review at the June 19th, 2013 CPC Mtg.

Student Affairs Program Spec/Student Employment (SPRAC ID #34-2012/27-2012)
Department: Student Affairs
Component: Student Services

(The original Reduction/Elimination Plans and SPRAC Reviews are available on the SPRAC website.)

Synopsis of potential issues that were highlighted in the CPC-accepted Review:

- No issues emerged that were not anticipated in the plan.
- Once the hours of operation and planned days off are established to accomplish this reduction, the department will be on the watch for any unintended consequences.
- Potential liability if student employment paperwork is not processed in a timely manner
- Departments need to be diligent in not allowing students to work until they have received clearance.
- Students will experience reduced availability of the Student Employment office.
- There may be a longer wait time for students and departments to get closure on the requested service

In relationship to the identified potential issues listed above, the following questions were submitted to the affected departments and a summary of the responses/feedback received from staff members is listed below.

1. Has this plan been fully implemented? If it has not, briefly describe what has yet to be implemented.
   No responses received

2. Has the reduction in service(s) to students and/or other departments, staff, and faculty been what you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No responses received

3. Understanding that plans evolve, has the distribution of the workload happened as you expected based on the plan? If not, please describe how it is different from your expectations.
   No responses received

4. In your view, has this plan proved workable or are there adjustments yet to be made?
   No responses received