LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
REGULAR MEETING
Room 4129, Mertes Arts Building
August 22, 2012 – 2:30 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Jeremiah Bodnar, Elena Cole, Lisa Everett, Debbie Fields, Justin Garoupa, Heidi Gecox, Eric Harpell, Cindy Keune, Melissa Korber, Craig Kutil, Ashley McHale, John Ruys, Rajinder Samra, Sarah Thompson, Angella VenJohn

---

1.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

1.1 Call to Order/Quorum: 2:38 pm

1.2 Approval of Agenda:
MSC: J. Garoupa / Cindy Keune

1.3 Approval of Minutes of May 23, 2012:
MOTION to TABLE approval of last meeting minutes.
MSC: C.Kutil / J.Garoupa

1.4 Public Comments: (None)

2.0 ACTION ITEMS: (None)

3.0 CONSENT ITEMS

3.1 That Tom Orf serve on the Curriculum Specialist hiring committee as our Senate appointee.
MSC: C.Kutil / C.Keune

3.2 That the Senate approve the faculty appointees to college wide committees.
Not finalized is the representative list. MOTION made to TABLE item 3.2.
MSC: C.Kutil / E.Cole

4.0 REPORTS

4.1 Curriculum Committee:
Mr. Bodnar reported that changes from the State regarding moving students through more effectively will be moving forward. A draft Prerequisite District Policy will be making its way to the divisions for discussion, and be presented at the next Senate meeting.

Senate Bill 1440 relates to AST and AAT degrees and written to develop and vet the transfer model curriculum (TMC) in each of the most common transfer majors. To access the CSU courses that have been identified by campuses as comparable to C-ID descriptors go to **http://www.c-id.net/course_compare.html** for a list of courses by discipline or CSU campus.

CurricUNET is up and running and a training schedule will be sent out soon. The Curriculum committee will be meeting on Monday, August 27.

4.2 SLO Committee:
The Chair of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) committee for this year is Tina Inzerilla.

4.3 BaSK Committee:
Ms. Everett reported that BaSK committee will be meeting on the 4th Monday of each month from 2:30-4:30 p.m. This committee funded 11 projects last Spring for a total of $85,000.00. An allocation from the State for 2012-13 of $90,000.00 is expected soon. The expenditure report for 2011-12 is due to the State in October and is in the process of being completed. This semester the BaSK committee will be reviewing the Prerequisite Policy and announcing the opening of the committee chair position. A suggestion for the committee to consider discussing the Course Prioritization Model and SB 1456 was brought up at the end of this report.

4.4 DE Committee: (None)

4.5 Program Review Committee:
The Chairs of the Program Review committee for this year are Teresa Henson and Jill Carbone.

4.6 CEMC:
Ms. Thompson will incorporate what occurred at the DEMC in her President's Report.

4.7 Staff Development: (None)

4.8 Hiring Prioritization:
Ms. Korber reported that Faculty Request Forms have been sent out and the process remains the same as last Fall. Faculty are encouraged to submit requests even though funding may not be available for new faculty.

Related to the charge of the sub-committee, two changes are being recommended: 1) Adding a sentence that reads, "If the President chooses a different prioritization, the committee requests that the President meet with the committee before moving forward with the new prioritization." 2) Because of the different processes used for mid and end semester leaves, the sub-committee is recommending that the language for mid-semester leaves be removed since the same forms for hiring are used and little or no hiring has occurred.

The recommendations will be presented at the next Senate meeting for discussion.

4.9 Faculty Association:

Ms. Fields stated that Faculty Association (FA) continues to negotiate with the District on non-economic issues. One refers to the Free Speech Article, which an unfair labor practice has been filed. The other refers to discipline action and incorporating the verbiage that came out of the unfair labor practice into the faculty contract. It's hoped that this will be taken care of and signed off by Dr. Cota before she leaves at the end of this month.

Explained a little more was the reason the FA is negotiating the Free Speech Article. The previous administration did not feel the need to include the Free Speech Article in the contract as part of Academic Freedom, and Dr. Cota seems to feel it should. She is reviewing the Board Polices to see how out-of-date they are, and also working on the student and community side regarding free speech on campus through Board Policy.

4.10 Student Senate: (None)

4.11 Treasurer:

Ms. Korber reported a balance of $1,769.00 as of August 14, and collections from faculty for this academic year are beginning to come in. She also is in the process of drawing up the budget for this year.

4.12 President:

Ms. Thompson stated that she would be merging 4.12 (President) with 4.13 (DBSG) into her President's Report. Bob D'Elena, Justin Garoupa and she are the Senate appointees on that committee.

At the Board meeting held August 21, Dr. Judy E. Walters was appointed Interim Chancellor. She will begin September 1 and serve through June 30, 2013, or until a permanent replacement is hired.

Dr. Cota announced at the first DBSG meeting that this committee would be making the recommendations for all the reductions because they are the most functional, and that the planning committees would feed into DBSG. Since PBC at LPC does not actually function as a planning committee it was decided that everyone on the DBSG from LPC will serve on the Planning Task Force. The difference of opinions amongst the membership was obvious to Dr. Cota who felt that the committee needed an outside mediator and consultant to get the group refocused and to guide them back to making budget recommendations for the District. Mike Hill was hired and will assist with going through creating strategies for potential reductions. Strategies for the following will be developed: If both measures pass; if Prop 30 passes and Prop 38 fails; If Prop 30 fails and Prop 38 passes; if both fail. The committee will start with working on the worst case scenario and up. If both fail permanent cuts of $5.2 million will have to be decided on by January 2013. The college will receive off sets of $400K back from the State for mandated costs, and save $600K on classified furloughs. The remaining 4.2 million will have to come from two categories -

workload reductions and non-instructional funding. Strongly opposed was reduction of classified staff. The $7.5 million reductions seems too high and deciding the percentage between these two categories will be a difficult decision. Already in place is a process for deactivation of programs, although it is not likely that will be discussed this year. There also is a 2-year discontinuance process that can only be expedited is if the Senate agrees. Board Policy can override this is if the Board of Trustees decided that the college is in a fiscal emergency.

Recommendation from DEMC: The chair of the CEMC at Chabot already serves on the DBSG as a FA appointee and Dr. Cota has asked that Tom Orf, chair of the CEMC from LPC be part of DBSG in order to have more representatives from DEMC. DEMC will be meeting on Friday and Mike Hill will be there to assist keeping the committee of about 30 members keep focused, as discussion will include reductions.

At two of the Board meetings held this Summer, it was evident that the demeanor of the Board members has changed. Initial cuts to staff at both campus and the District Office were presented and were to be voted upon. Public comments from the LPC community resulted in the Board tabling their vote until the next meeting due to the overwhelming show of support from the public. At the following meeting the Board voted to approve the staffing cuts, which included additional cuts at the District and keeping the LPC Child Development Center open.

Thanks to Dr. Cota, the Faculty Hiring document, which began in 2006, may finally be on its way to being approved. Wyman Fong will soon be working on updating the Administrative Evaluation Policies since the practices have changed and the policies remained the same.

Ms. Thompson stated that she has been in the process of writing the Accreditation Midterm responses and having them reviewed by Dr. Janice Noble and the individual areas that are mentioned in the accreditation responses (SLO, Program Review, etc.). Having had “pointed” conversations with many of the individuals reviewing these writings has helped with trying to find out what “things” worked and why, and what didn’t work and coming up with those reasons.

Writing a response to Recommendation #1 – Institutional Effectiveness (IE) – has been difficult as this is the second time an accreditation team has added this to their list of recommendations. All community colleges are suppose to be in a continuously assessment cycle and creating a process and incorporating it into the IE model has been a challenge. The IE committee was initially created in the Common Ground committee which included assigning tasks to the College Council, PBC and the IE committees. Not taken into account was how currently those committees functioned, and how difficult it is to change that function once it’s been established. With both the College Council and PBC having committee responsibilities of their own, there was little time left to work on what they had been tasked with by the Common Ground committee. That in turn left very little or nothing for the IE committee to

oversee making certain the other two committees were functioning and coming along with the tasks assigned. The college's IE model was stalled due to its many goals that are not interconnected and have never been prioritized.

LPC's researcher, Rajinder Samar, has managed to quadruple the amount of data coming from his office in one semester, and Scott Vigallon and Jeff Sperry have trained faculty on how to do some of their own research by using less sophisticated measurement systems, but this is not enough. A recommendation to hire a Director of Planning was made by Ms. Thompson. She explained that Mr. Samar is technically "The Office of Research and Planning" and doesn't have enough time to do all of the research asked of him and the planning portion is sometimes pushed to the side. With the college having reorganized and eliminated a dean position, the priority seems to point to hiring an administrator for a position of this type. This individual would oversee the IE process and would be responsible for communicating the college's priorities to the different allocation committees. On the academic side, the college does not have a firm process in place for validating program reviews and verifying the information. This individual could also be responsible for reviewing program reviews, and possibly serve as the college's Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO).

The membership was reminded to review the remaining six draft Recommendations and to share with their divisions. Feedback regarding the drafts will be included in the final draft, which will be placed on the wiki for everyone to view.
MOTION to move to 6.3 before 5.1
MSC: C.Kutil / J.Garoupa

4.13 DBSG:
See above

5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS

5.1 Adjunct Office Space:
With the number of vacant offices throughout the campus a suggestion of assigning specific disciplines to use this space as adjunct offices was brought up at a division meeting, and brought to the Senate for discussion. The Science, Technology, Engineering, Math and Public Safety (STEMPS) division already have a designated adjunct office for the Math department, and others asked how to go about establishing one. A brief discussion ensued and the consensus of the group was that this was worth pursuing.

6.0 DISCUSSION –NEW BUSINESS

6.1 Budget Woes and Reduction Plans:
It's been decided that those on the DBSG committee will serve on the College Planning Task Force committee looking at budget reductions. Those on the committee tend to have longevity, expertise in an area (enrollment management or finance) or have a specific skills set. Since there has to be a mutual agreement from both Senates and the District it was stated that not all divisions have representation, and not all deans serve on this committee. The question was raise as to how will

input be given to the committee and how will information from the committee be communicated out to the community? There are only two division meetings left before the November election, and the Town Meetings came up as another suggestion.

Discussion continued as to who should be included as a member on the College Planning Committee so that all areas on campus are represented.

6.2 Assessing the Course Prioritization Model:
Re-assessing the Course Prioritization Model was considered important since there is a chance that significant reductions might occur in the Spring, and a gross error was overlooked by Ms. Thompson related to the models submitted to the CEMC. In the Spring with having only a short amount of time, the Senate was tasked with forming various focus groups (Math, English, Student Services, CTE, CEMC, and all transfer areas) to map out priorities, and using that information to create the Course Prioritization Model. The model was brought to the Senate for discussion and the Senate presented the model to the CEME. The CEMC used them and Ms. Thompson stated to that committee that the Senate would ratify the model at their next meeting. Upon review of all Spring Senate Agendas, the Course Prioritization Model was listed as a discussion item and never as an action item so technically this model is not Senate approved.

The Senate's dual purpose for re-assessing the Model is to assist CEMC with a model of priorities, and also to get it ratified as an official Senate communiqué to CEMC. This item is to be included as an Action Item on the next Senate meeting agenda.

6.3 Accreditation Midterm Response 1A/1B – Institutional Effectiveness
The recommendation to hire an administrator, and in this case a Director of Planning, has seldom been brought forward by faculty. Proposals for hiring administrators are generally brought forward at the Chancellor's Cabinet meeting and approval is made at the District level. The recommendation to hire a Director of Planning was considered a good solution because the college has a number of accreditation issues, focusing on streamlining our processes, complete the Governance Handbook, evaluating our committee structure just to name a few. When a committee has other charges and is handed another, not everyone wants to take the lead because of no time or not interested in becoming involved. Everyone has their own idea or interpretation of how things should work that adds to confusion, and the fact that things are stalled and not completed. Over a short period of time the college has also experienced a number of turnovers within the administrative team. The college has a lot of needs to meet and having one person oversee the planning would be beneficial.

Discussion continued about the pros and cons of presenting the proposal to hire an administrator, especially during this time when layoffs are taking place and the budget is being looked at very closely.

The accreditation timeline was discussed. There will only be one Board held in September. The Chabot Academic Senate will be evaluating and voting on their midterm report and presenting it to the Board in September. Our midterm report will need to be reviewed by the Board at their September 18 meeting so that the Senate can review the remarks received from the Board at the Senate's September 26 meeting. This will allow time to implement any changes and have it ready for presentation to the Board at their October 2 meeting, receive their final remarks, make corrections and present it for their vote by our due date of October 15.

Presented today for review by the Senate were responses to recommendations: 1A, 1B, 2, 3B, 4 and 5. Up for review at the September 12 Senate meeting will be responses to 3A, District and College Recommendations 1and 2, and the template rubric being created to look at the remaining planning agendas.

6.3 Accreditation Midterm Response 1A/1B – Institutional Effectiveness
6.4 Accreditation Midterm Response 2 – SLOs
6.5 Accreditation Midterm Response 3 – Program Review
6.6 Accreditation Midterm Response 4 – information Competency
6.7 Accreditation Midterm Response 5 – Ethics Code
6.8 Accreditation Midterm Response DC1 – Functional Map and Effectiveness
6.9 Accreditation Midterm Response DC2 – Allocation Model

Ms. Thompson distributed draft materials for items 6.3 through 6.9 and asked the membership to review for discussion at the September 12 meeting. Discussion to continue for item 6.3.
MOTION made to TABLE items 6.3 through 6.9.
MSC: C.Keune / J.Ruys

6.10 SB 1456 – Initial Reaction:

Fourteen pieces of legislation have left the Appropriations committee and nine are being held. A lot of new laws to operate under with most dealing with minutia. Some of the legislation deals with particular groups of students and that the college will need to demonstrate how they have made outreach to this group of students. The documentation and the assessing alone will become a lot more. SB 1456 also would affect the budget, and defines matriculation in a much more detail.

6.11 Goals for the 2012-13 Academic Year:

Goals should be to get things in place, finish up accreditation, and not push things off. Consider looking at committee structures, what they are charged with and take into account the shrinking number of people and how much they already all do. Take a realistic look at each committee, what they do, and what they are supposed to be doing with regard to meeting the goals of that particular committee.

There was discussion about the how some faculty do not participate on committees due to participation in other areas as outlined in the Contact. As the FA representative, Ms. Fields will provide an interpretation as the Contract defines professional hours and what those hours equate to per week.

7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER: (None)

7.1 Announcements: (None)

7.2 2011 Meetings – 2nd and 4th Wednesdays – Next Meeting: September 12, 2012

7.3 Adjournment: Adjourned at 4:34 p.m.
MSC: C. Kutil / J.Garoupa

12Aug22
C.McCauley