



**FALL 2013 POSITION DISCUSSION  
MEETING MINUTES OF**

Wednesday, December 4, 2013  
2:10 – 4:00 pm  
Building 2, Room 10

**Present:** Sarah Harmon, Jenny Castello, Kim Lopez, Regina Blok, Maria Huning, Lina Mira, Leonore Cabrera, Sandra Mendez, Kay O’Neill, Supinda Sirihekaphong, Vicki Nunes, Dave Vigo, Jeanne Stalker, Karen Olesen, Erick Gaspar, Janet Stringer, Jonathan MacSwain, Frank Austin, Alicia Aguirre, Margie Carrington, Elizabeth Terzakis, Lorraine Barrales-Ramirez, Gloria Peña, Misha Maggi, Diana Espinoza, David Clay, Joan Tanaka, Debbie Joy.

- Attendees were instructed to sit on a table of five people to discuss the pros and cons for each position, then to place the outcome of the discussion on the paper provided on the wall. Below is the outcome.

Pros	Cons
<b>Workforce Development</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more career tech programs (x2)</li> <li>• Sustainability good topic (x2)</li> <li>• Addresses EMP (x2)</li> <li>• Proven track record</li> <li>• High need for career tech programs (x2)</li> <li>• Flexibility to be teaching and/or grant writing for workforce</li> <li>• Adjunct possibility</li> <li>• Strongly and positively impacts STEM</li> <li>• Need more programs for males</li> <li>• Brings in grant money</li> <li>• Brings in revenue</li> <li>• Needed to maintain and help grow workforce program (without this position, we are cutting capacity in half)</li> <li>• Equity – we need to develop more programs to attract and retain male students of color... workforce is very important for this</li> <li>• Need more career tech programs... understated</li> <li>• Sustainability is part of our strategic vision</li> <li>• <i>No Tier</i></li> <li>• <i>Tier 2 (1)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Position is confusing – not coordinator, role unclear</li> <li>• Should there be two workforce people writing grants?</li> <li>• More strategic to select faculty for workforce based on community need</li> <li>• How much funding generated thus far?</li> <li>• The academic portion of the position should be housed within an academic department (e.g. biology)</li> <li>• The non-academic portion should be a staff position so... no as a faculty position (thank you)</li> <li>• What is the difference between this position and current grant writer under research director?</li> <li>• If this is a grant writing position, let’s call it that</li> <li>• Will this set precedent? 40% teaching = FT tenure track?</li> <li>• Limited data</li> <li>• Lack of partnerships developed</li> <li>• Lack of communication with current</li> </ul>

Pros	Cons
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>position</li> <li>• Definition of teaching percentage poorly defined and discrepancy between presentation and proposal – Environmental vs. Biology</li> <li>• Counts toward faculty member, yet 40% teaching</li> <li>• No pathway to AA/BA; programs already available with Job Train; no job openings; overlapping duties with grant writing</li> <li>• Unclear benefit of split faculty/administrative role vs all administration</li> </ul>
<b>English</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serving lots of students</li> <li>• Need more basic skills classes</li> <li>• Expansion of Word Jam and other programs</li> <li>• Creation of Writing Café (x2)</li> <li>• Need basic skills FT instructor (most taught by adjunct)</li> <li>• Learning communities important</li> <li>• Fill rates are impressive</li> <li>• Will not be big additional cost</li> <li>• Enrollments increasing with these courses</li> <li>• Have been requesting new hire for 8 years; two positions are necessary to make up for lost faculty and fill program review request</li> <li>• Need to increase student contact = more fulltime faculty</li> <li>• English is a requirement for all</li> <li>• Basic skills (70% of students)</li> <li>• Increase learning community capacity</li> <li>• Need fulltime basic skills teachers working with students</li> <li>• Learning communities</li> <li>• Need FT faculty with basic skills certification to met need; 74% of basic skills taught by adjunct</li> <li>• Address SSSP needs for basic skills curriculum</li> <li>• FT faculty ratio to adjunct very low 38%</li> <li>• <i>Tier 1 for one position (x2)</i></li> <li>• <i>Tier 1 (x3)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only one position</li> <li>• Need only one position</li> <li>• FT faculty need to participate more on committees/Word Jam/participatory governance</li> <li>• Only need one position</li> </ul>
<b>Math</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strength on STEM; Math Jam</li> <li>• Growing demands, high loads, more collaboration and projects</li> </ul>	None

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong cohesiveness among math faculty</li> <li>• FT/PT ratio not acceptable</li> <li>• Need for innovative teaching strategies which FT faculty could foster</li> <li>• Helps build enrollment (x2)</li> <li>• Transfer directed (x2)</li> <li>• Can teach basic skills; build to transfer (x2)</li> <li>• Mandatory requirement for students; needs a high FT ratio to maintain student contact</li> <li>• Innovative and creative department needs benefit of another FT</li> <li>• More help in basic skills courses, taught by FT</li> <li>• 86% of students are basic skills</li> <li>• Build on success of Math jam</li> <li>• Less reliance on online classes</li> <li>• Support the neediest students</li> <li>• Build on success</li> <li>• Learning communities</li> <li>• Address basic skills needs</li> <li>• 31% of courses taught by FT</li> <li>• FT faculty benefit outside classroom</li> <li>• Continue to build on success</li> <li>• <i>Tier 1 (x3)</i></li> </ul>	
<b>Kinesiology/Men's Soccer</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growing enrollment and demand on the student side</li> <li>• If we want growth, we need another hire – KINE is an exploding area of our economy (x2)</li> <li>• Less impact on Fund 1</li> <li>• Sports attract full time students</li> <li>• Need strong focus on kinesiology</li> <li>• High school feeder schools have strong athletics</li> <li>• Increased enrollment, high waitlist; need to increase sections</li> <li>• Coaches can network with four-year recruiters</li> <li>• Increase Kinesiology majors</li> <li>• Few full-time coaches – need more</li> <li>• Potential for growth (x2)</li> <li>• Full time coach provides student success support</li> <li>• Can teach fitness</li> <li>• Soccer is the largest team</li> <li>• Combo of athletics and academics gets good results with students</li> <li>• Helps enrollment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coach position reaches fewer students than do other faculty positions</li> <li>• Expertise in two separate fields?</li> </ul>

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need full time coaches</li> <li>• Less impact financially</li> <li>• Great potential as a career path for men</li> <li>• Men's soccer needs a full time person to support team year round</li> <li>• <i>Tier 1 (x4)</i></li> </ul>	
<b>Dean/PSC of Athletics/Kinesiology/Dance, Library and Learning Center (ALL)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All areas need more leadership, coordination and administrative support so that the faculty have time to do their job (x2)</li> <li>• All three areas need a lot of support, leadership and advocacy</li> <li>• Mixing the three is OK since many divisions and programs are weak links</li> <li>• Future growth</li> <li>• Library and Learning Center need leadership and advocacy</li> <li>• Students benefit from direct staff contact, by freeing up administrative time</li> <li>• Streamline procedures and communication</li> <li>• More support for budgeting, purchasing</li> <li>• Leadership is needed in the Library and Learning Center, but could it be a Director?</li> <li>• Only \$4000 difference in salary between PSC and Division Assistant – PSC can handle more responsibilities</li> <li>• Removes duties from VPI</li> <li>• Departments need a direct report</li> <li>• Need a manager for future growth of department</li> <li>• Burning employees out</li> <li>• <i>No Tier votes</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description seems to support Division Assistant, not a PSC (x3)</li> <li>• The combination of duties doesn't seem like a good fit</li> <li>• Weird mix of responsibilities combining KINE, LCTR and Library</li> <li>• Learning Center/Library Director?</li> <li>• One position or the other, not both</li> <li>• Why is athletics in the mix?</li> <li>• Dean OK</li> <li>• PSC position seems more likely a division assistant position equal to other divisions to assist on campus</li> <li>• Need to see breakdown of percentage of time for each area: K, L, and L for the DEAN</li> <li>• Competition with STEM for facility space</li> <li>• Low number of faculty for a dean position</li> <li>• Could a division assistant or director take this role?</li> <li>• Confusion of responsibilities</li> <li>• PS vs Coordinator; job duties do not specify library and learning center support</li> <li>• Why "bundle" two separate positions?</li> <li>• Monetary concerns</li> <li>• Question the need</li> <li>• Can we find a person with all FSAs?</li> </ul>
<b>Financial Aid Technician</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet program growth needs (x2)</li> <li>• Increased complexity (x2)</li> <li>• Staffing for "personal" assistance with special populations (Ab540, Vets, Foster Youth) (x2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear if 300% increase in FAFSA is students served or only applications</li> </ul>

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current understaffing; no growth potential</li> <li>• Make up for position loss due to Measure G funding which is going away</li> <li>• With new requirements/regulations, they need another person to help process and counsel students</li> <li>• Students increasingly need help finding scholarships and financial resources</li> <li>• Changes in Title 5, Dream Act, State Aid; increased volume 400%</li> <li>• Highly technical</li> <li>• Fourth time asking</li> <li>• Increase in types of programs like Dream Act and Veterans (x2)</li> <li>• Over 300% increase in Pell growth</li> <li>• Do more outreach and workshops</li> <li>• Need to serve all students listed above</li> <li>• Possibly losing Measure G (x2)</li> <li>• Yes, there is a need!</li> <li>• Plays big role in enrollment</li> <li>• Helps with new regulations</li> <li>• Big increase in applications</li> <li>• College is now a direct lender</li> <li>• <i>Tier 1 (x2)</i></li> <li>• <i>Tier 2 (1 only)</i></li> </ul>	
<b>Research Analyst</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for additional support</li> <li>• Used by everyone, on every level</li> <li>• Need data for faculty, staff, department decision-making and planning</li> <li>• Compliance with reporting requirements for grants, federal aid, etc.</li> <li>• Data analysis to support student success and completion objectives</li> <li>• Data-based decision-making</li> <li>• Faculty, staff need data</li> <li>• Help with program reviews</li> <li>• Helps analyze student data</li> <li>• With Dean of PRIE taking over accreditation, she needs someone to take over data needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More clarification needed on roles of all positions under research office and grant writing</li> <li>• Overlay with workforce?</li> <li>• Cost? Could this be funded with a grant for instructional improvement?</li> <li>• Addition money devoted to non-faculty position</li> <li>• Additional impact to Cañada budget</li> </ul>

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parity with sister schools</li> <li>• Clear planning needs</li> <li>• Extensive list of needs</li> <li>• Additional data needs: planning, innovative initiatives</li> <li>• In this age of ever increasing need for data and analysis, this is an essential position</li> <li>• <i>Tier 1 (x2)</i></li> </ul>	
<b>Vice President, Administrative Services</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not diminish funding for other positions (x2)</li> <li>• Equal footing with other college administrative structure</li> <li>• Not impacting campus allocation</li> <li>• Balance workload</li> <li>• As long as there is no additional cost</li> <li>• Cost neutral</li> <li>• District paying – good; offload functions for other administrators</li> <li>• Distributes load – safety, emergency, etc</li> <li>• Offload some tasks from VPI and VPSS</li> <li>• We need to have an equal VP vote at the district</li> <li>• <i>No Tier votes</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not sure of “need”</li> <li>• Unsure of support staff needs</li> <li>• Support staff need; don’t want to over burden existing classified staff who already are at maximum capacity</li> <li>• How long district will pay?</li> <li>• Serving two masters – district and Cañada</li> <li>• District politics</li> <li>• Office space for new VPAS</li> <li>• Expense taken off college allocation</li> <li>• Not clear if this is a position that we need</li> <li>• Number of employees does not merit this position</li> <li>• Overlap of duties with President, VPSS, VPI, redundant?</li> <li>• This is the district telling us how to spend our \$\$</li> </ul>

## 2. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm