LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
REGULAR MEETING
Room 4129, Mertes Arts Building
September 26, 2012 – 2:30 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Toby Bielawski, Jeremiah Bodnar, Cherry Bogue (ASLPC), Lisa Everett, Elena Cole, Debbie Fields, Heidi Gecox, Justin Garoupa, Ron Johansen, Melissa Korber, Craig Kutil, Ashley McHale, Tom Orf, Cynthia Ross, John Ruys, Mike Sato, Jeff Smyth, Karin Sprin, Sarah Thompson

GUESTS: Open Meeting attended by various members of the Campus Community

---

1.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

1.1 Call to Order/Quorum: 2:35 p.m.

1.2 Approval of Agenda
MOTION to APPROVE the agenda
MS: M.Korber / J.Garoupa
MOTION to REORDER the agenda as follows: Begin with 6.7 followed by 6.4, 6.3 then on to 3.0 Consent Items
MSC: J.Ruys / E.Cole / APPROVED

1.3 Approval of Minutes of August 22 and September 12, 2012
Minutes unavailable MOTION to TABLE until next meeting.
MSC: A.McHale / E.Cole / APPROVED

1.4 Public Comments: None

2.0 ACTION ITEMS

None

3.0 CONSENT ITEMS

3.1 The Senate Approves the Faculty Appointees to College Wide Committees:
MOTION to APPROVE appointees to college-wide committees and any amendments will be brought back to the senate.
MSC: C.Kutil / G.Smyth / APPROVED

3.2 The Senate Approves the Changes to the Faculty Prioritization Forms:
MOTION to APPROVE changes to the Faculty Prioritization forms.
MSC: C.Kutil / E.Cole / APPROVED

4.0 REPORTS

4.1 Curriculum Committee: None

4.2 SLO Committee: None

4.3 BaSk Committee – Ms. Lisa Everett reported that the BaSk committee met on Monday to review data and analysis conducted using the Basic Skills Cohort Tracking Tool. This information is just part of what will be submitted the to the State Chancellor's Office in the committee's 2012-2013 Basic Skills Allocation Goals/Action Plan and Expenditure Plan, which is due by October 10th. This tool maps the progress of students as they move through the basic skills sequence.

This data was collected using three cohorts of students who were followed for three years through basic skills courses into transferable coursework for English and Math. The data was analyzed for disproportionate impact by gender and race/ethnicity. The conclusion showed that students beginning at a lower level basic skills sequence the lower, the lower their rate of completing the college level or transfer-level courses. In English, improving successful completion rates in all courses remains a priority. In Math, getting students to reach college-level math and transferable-level math course must be a priority.

4.4 DE Committee: None

4.5 Program Review Committee – Elena Cole presented a written report on behalf of Teri Henson for the Program Review Committee, which she read, *"At the last meeting held September 12th, invited guest VP of Student Services, Diana Rodriguez and other members of Student Services, began discussions with the Instructional Program Review Committee(IPRC) about incorporation of Student Services into IPR. VP Rodriguez will discuss this with her staff and report back to the IPRC today and their analyses will be summarized in a report to the Academic Senate on October 10th. Dr. Kevin Walthers joined the IPRC for a portion of its meeting. He has requested that the IPRC move swiftly to define what we mean by a program. The committee will begin its discussions today."*

4.6 CEME: Incorporated in Academic Senate President's report.

4.7 Staff Development Committee: Mr. Mike Sato reported that the Staff Development committee has funding of $10,000.00 for this year, and will fund up to $300.00 to qualified staff and faculty for attending conferences and workshops. Full-time faculty do have two variable flex days, or twelve hours, of professional development activity to account for by the end of the academic year next summer.

4.8 Hiring Prioritization – Ms. Melissa Korber reported that the committee met and is in the process of prioritizing. Presentations by the deans will be made at the October 23rd meeting, and one more meeting may possibly be scheduled in November.

4.9 Faculty Association – Mr. Debbie Fields stated that an email and Faculty Newsletter had been was distributed that contains current information regarding the Faculty Association.

4.10 Student Senate – Ms. Cherry Bogue, ASLPC President, reported that at the moment the student government's main goal is to register as many students up until the last day, which is October 22nd. Focus will then turn to Measure I and Proposition 30. A voter registration table and informational flyers covering the pros and cons of Prop 30 and a rundown of scenarios are being made available to students. Ms. Bogue has already visited about 25 classes hoping to inspire students to vote. Survey shows that out of about 500 students polled a little less then ½ are registered with the remainder are not registered, not interested in voting, do not care about voting and others have since changed their mind after knowing more about the issues. She will continue to visit classes to make students aware of the importance of Measure I and Prop 30.

4.11 Treasurer – Ms. Melissa Korber reported that approximately $1,400 was currently in the account. The effort to collect dues has slowed down because moving the Senate funds over to the LPC Foundation is being considered. Ms. Korber is asking for feedback as to whether the funds should be transferred over to the Foundation or left where they currently are held.

4.12 President – The District Budget Study Group has been known to progress slowly, although now it has actually finished its first stage of prioritization. Interim Chancellor, Dr. Judy Walter is pleased with the progress that this committee will be taking a break from having to meet, for a short while anyway. The model selected includes a web of functions stemming from a core that includes accreditation, solvency, legal matters and payroll. From there almost every group is identified and looks at the most critical services to the most expendables with allocation as the next step.

As far as committee structures, there are too many committees. A proposal to eliminate some of the committees and create a mega committee has been put forward. The responsibility of this shared governance committee would be to meet weekly and oversee the Mission, Values and Goals of the institution, oversee the Strategic Plan, set priorities for the year, go over all of the assessments and evaluate all the data, engaging n active planning and evaluating our goal achievement. The College Council, Institutional Effectiveness Committee and Planning Task Force would no longer be necessary. The first meeting would be with the data source groups (researcher, Basic Skills, Program Review and SLO) who would meet with the Mega committee and report out. The second and third week would be the "work" of the committee, and the fourth week would be meeting with the Chairs of the allocating committees. The structure of the Mega committee would be more efficient, since the IE committee is not saying that of the DBSG.

The President has made a suggestion to the College Council that the topic of creating Free Speech Zones be discussed.

4.13 DBSG – Incorporated in Senate President's report.

4.14 New Items Only – Division Reports: None

5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS

5.1 Assessing the Course Prioritization Model:

5.2 Charge – Planning Task Force

MOTION to TABLE 5.1; 5.2
MSC: C.Kutil / M.Korber /APPROVED

6.0 DISCUSSSION – NEW BUSINESS

6.1 Accreditation Midterm Response 3

6.2 Reviewing Our Committee Structure

MOTION to TABLE 6.1; 6.2
MSC: C.Kutil / M. Korber / APPROVED

6.3 Mission Statement, Glossary and Deactivation of Goals: At the last Planning Task Force meeting the committee took the task of creating a draft mission statement that will be shared at the next Town Meeting. Until the college has a clear mission statement that will guide us into the direction of very clear goals, it will be very difficult to set institutional priorities that are going to guide the allocation plan.

The former Mission Statement – *Las Positas College is an inclusive, learning-centered institution providing educational opportunities that meet the academic intellectual, career-technical, creative, and personal development goals of its diverse students. Students develop the knowledge, skills, values, and abilities to become engaged and contributing members of the community.*

The college is not meeting its mission, as it's written. After a lot of thought process the committee came up with . . .

Proposed Mission Statement - *Las Positas College is an inclusive, student-centered institution providing learning opportunities and support for completion of transfer, degree, basic skills, career, career-technical, and retraining goals.*

At the Town Meeting, feedback from the campus community defining the key words in the proposed mission statement will be collected in order to move on with creating goals for the institution.

6.4 CEMC Processes for Course Prioritization, Reduction and Addition – Ms. Sarah Thompson began by stating that the college was at a point where enrollment management is in need of a clear strategy and a collaborative plan, and

was evident in the most recent round of proposed cuts. One faculty member was asked to identify two courses and the next day increase that number to five. When asked about the process the dean explained, although additional questions related to enrollment management had been e-mailed to the dean who had not yet responded. Meanwhile, others present at this meeting had already received information back related to their courses. The faculty felt that being involved in a larger discussion group that engages in discussing what is prioritized and makes the process more transparent would avoid lack of information and miscommunication for those who cannot attend CEMC meetings.

The Senate does have some responsibility related to CEMC as noted in Title V, as part of its professional and academic matters are institutional planning and budget development. The Statewide Senate website has multiple papers which point to the Senate having a voice in one way or another. District Board polices for processes for institutional planning and budget development is in the realms of a mutual agreement that is something that comes between the Board and the Senate. It might be beneficial to create a sub-committee between the senate and the CEMC to create a structure or a process to identify those priorities so it is managed more from above then from the ground up. Course are being significantly reduced that one department can have a tremendous impact on other disciplines as there is no structure in place where there is communication between the different faculty groups. The structure should include criteria for reducing courses as well as adding, since things change as circumstances evolve.

The primary goal of the Planning Task Force is to create a mechanism by which we assess what we are doing, identify how well we are meeting our institutional goals through this assessment, identify priorities, allocate to those priorities, and then assess how those allocations impacted our achievement of those goals.

6.5 Next Year's President – Ms. Sarah Thompson clearly stated that the Academic Senate should begin actively seeking a Senate President for next year.

6.6 Moving the Senate Fund to the Foundation:
MOTION to TABLE
MSC: C.Kutil / M. Korber /APPROVED

6.7 Response to Leadership Crisis – Ms. Sarah Thompson opened the discussion regarding the role of faculty as stewards of the college. Specifically, there have been a number of different complaints regarding the College President from classified personnel, administrative personnel and from faculty who have shared with her three types of stories that she capsulated in the following manner:

* Stories of belittling or unprofessional conduct by our College President, particularly to individuals who work directly with him.
* Complaints of interference with jobs in various amount of functions.

* Complaints of lack of following up by the president that has caused projects to slow down or shimmed different processes.

The opportunity for presenting feedback from the divisions and anyone else wanting to be more specific or give an opinion, at this meeting, was opened.

Complaint was that since the budget cuts occurred has felt that the college and the college's budget were not protected. Felt that a strong objective should have been made by our President since it seemed extremely unfair. For LPC to have given 1.5 in equal share to a campus double in size, meant that we took the bigger hit.

There was concern with layoff process. People with 15, 16, and 17 years of service at this campus who applied for those positions were not considered. Voiced were the concerns and the significant impact it would have on this campus regarding layoffs fell on deaf ears. The divisions have increased in size and so has the work.

There was concern with the mass exodus of our established leadership. Why are they leaving in such a rapid pace? This leaves us with no institutional history and sees lines already being drawn in the sand among the voc programs, academic programs, divisions, and disciplines. This is distracting all of us from the real issues of what we need to do with building the type of corporative effect that we need because we don't have the leadership helping us do that.

Recently learned that a dean, who is a retired Colonel with Ph.D., is one of the strongest deans at this campus and very supportive of all his programs was berated in an open forum. Why the sudden desire to leave? Faculty members very upset and concerned The President's prioritization for the 4th of July event, community events and all others are good, but believes that there is a lot more important things to focus on right here and now.

This individual wanted to express his professional opinion about the President regarding his lack of safety for this campus. Feels that the President is out of touch with what is happening and lacks sound judgment regarding safety issues on campus. President has made his job more difficult but more importantly, his directives have been dangerous, which there have been several. One instance occurred at the beginning of this month. A student in a classroom was behaving in a manner that was considered dangerous, and the faculty member reported it to security. During that time the English department called security directly stated that the student would be on campus at 4 pm the next day and that they were concerned for their safety and wanted officers present, although it's not usual for faculty to contact security directly unless they are concerned for their safety. The VP was being sought by security on that day to apprise her of the situation, and when she was located the President and another administrator were present. Security began briefing the VP about the situation, and their concern for wanting to "head off" the student. The President overhearing, cut him off and stuck this

hand out and told him not to get involved that it was not a campus safety role, and that a counselor should be sent in. It was not known how dangerous this student would be if he were allowed back in the classroom that security argued their point with the President. The President was made to look a little foolish and back peddled a bit and said that perhaps the VP should handle it. Security explained that he would be there as the department head to make an emergency evaluation and give his recommendation to the VP. Security left extremely upset and ready to take what occurred to another level, but the situation with this student in this particular incident was resolved.

This is just one example as there have been many others. The presence of Security at this meeting is not one of a personal vendetta, but only to voice a professional opinion of the President. Having spoken with department heads and others around campus, many share and understand Security's frustrations. With 9 years at this campus, and having many years of law enforcement experience, his idea is not to go around pointing a finger at the CEO, but only to be heard by giving an example of his opinion of the President's lack of sound judgment and unsafe directives.

A faculty member involved with the kiosks around the campus felt singled out when the President demonstrated unprofessionalism at a College Council meeting by arriving and slamming a stack of papers on a desk because he was obviously upset at the kiosks around the campus. This faculty member stated that the President is a micro manager and unable to draw a matter to a conclusion. She received several lengthy emails from the President about the kiosks where he made suggestions and gave other ideas of what to do, which resulted spending way too much time on this one subject. The matter was taken to a Facilities meeting without the knowledge of this faculty member, and eventually resolved.

When the Child Development Center celebrated the last day of school and held its graduation the President took this opportunity to gather all the parents who were to continue the following year to let them know that the program was not going to continue. His faculty member felt that this was the worst possible time to make an announcement of this type. Totally inappropriate and causing outrage among the parents, who were visibility upset. Seeing this he turned to the faculty member present and suggested the parents respond to her. This particular faculty member, who the long short of it, started a parent group, meet all summer found a way to make the center solvent, presented the idea to the Board and the center is currently operating.

Believes that this could have been handled differently and the information conveyed in a different manner or another time. The situation needed more thought processing, how it should have been presented and when communicated. The way it was dealt with certainly did not make a good impression on members of our community.

The President's behavior has been noted not just at the college but also at the district and Chabot. After a BDSG meeting at Chabot, a classified representative asked this faculty member if the VP is always treated by the President in the way she observed at this meeting. What happened was that the VP was cut off by the President during her presentation and brushed off and he basically telling the group that she was wrong, without a follow up afterwards. He demonstrated an impulsive, rude and unprofessional behavior. This faculty member was embarrassed when asked, and knew it must have been just as embarrassing for the VP to have this happen to her at the meeting.

There have been a multitude number of complaints regarding this type of behavior from classified. Complaints beyond hurt feelings, feeling fearful, job interference and the inability of getting projects and work completed and moving forward due to lack of follow up and follow through by the President.

The Staff Development committee mentioned that the President was asked twice about information the committee needed to move forward with their business. Two requests were made within a reasonable period of time, and the information was never received. The committee had no choice but to cancel the meeting due to the lack of information. Areas that require information from the President have become frustrated because planning processes become stalled causing more work.

The President mentioned at an Administrative Council meeting, that he recognized his issues and needing to make changes. That same afternoon he met with an administrator and noticed a sign on a door which said "forensics" and told the administrator to remove it. A 30 minute discussion followed with the why and why not the sign should be removed. Every day the President seems to find small issues to point out – signs, kiosks, etc. rather than looking at building a planning task force and doing his job. He said he will change and things will be better but some don't believe it, and find him to be a micro manager.

President seems to be more concerned about the mascot, birthday recognition for the mascot, and changing the name of the school colors from red and black to crimson and onyx.

A faculty member mentioned that they were on an accreditation standard that had been meeting since December, which the President was a part of and never showed up. Repeated attempts were made through the Vice Chancellor to get him to help form the committee, and assist with the work involved in creating a response. He never became involved until the committee went to College Council for a brief presentation. No further participation resulted, never really became involved so the district and the Chancellor had to take over the response. Perhaps that's why the college is at the state it's in, we haven't had the leadership that this college needs.

It's not possible for classified to step into the light and say what's been happening. The classified are not protected and do not have tenured like faculty. With the budget cuts coming we can be easily be gotten rid, but not doing anything about the situation at the college will mean seeing more people leave.

The abusive behavior towards classified staff has become a concern. The option of a Vote of No Confidence was discussed by one division. It is not wise to proceed in this manner because at this point asking for money from the voters would appear as a mutiny – not a good idea. While concerns have been brought to the President on an individual basis, no formal notification has ever been drawn. In the spirit of our college it would be wise not to jump and show an aggressive behavior so the consequences of the group was to have the Senate write a letter voicing the concerns. Formally bringing these concerns to his attention and diplomatically presenting the document was this group's suggestion. If this did not result in changes or improvements then consideration could be given for a Vote of No Confidence and delay this until after the election. Faculty and classified personnel are extremely concerned about the loss of more good people. There is much concern regarding the college losing more key classified personnel.

Complaints about him have not stopped, and real issues are not being addressed. The letter needs to identify broader issues, and identify problems in a diplomatic way.

Some faculty stated that they were unaware of the issues until this meeting, so they were against moving towards a Vote of No Confidence.

There are people who are not suited to jobs at the particular time they are in them. The culture may be different here then what he's use to and perhaps that's why it's not working. There's usually time to nurture but at the present there is no time for second and third chances. Many people have already devoted lots of time to this issue and there have been no changes.

We don't want to give the impression this was not thought out. The letter component means that the college has taken action which shows we're progressive and very proactive. The college is doing their part to insure strong leadership through consolation and communication. A Vote of No Confidence sends the wrong message to the accreditation, and tax payers especially before the election. Whether or not changes will occur is not known, but at least the college has done its part.

Conclusion:
Draft letter responding to president

Executive Senate committee to draft letter for Senate discussion and have divisions discuss at division meeting, bring back feedback then finalized letter by end of October.

Suggestions
Speak to the President individually about safety issues and his interference with standard processes?
Write letter to the board rather then president?
Send letter to Board?
More discussion needed before Senate can conduct a formal vote since not all areas were represented or feel the same way as how to proceed.

7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER

7.1 Announcements: None

7.2 2012 Meetings – 2nd and 4th Wednesdays – Next Meeting: October 10, 2012

7.3 Adjournment:
MOTION to Adjourn
MSC: H.Gecox / J.Ruys / APPROVED

* * * * *

ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

EXECUTIVE OFICERS		ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER	
Senate President:	Sarah Thompson	**ALSS:**	Vacant
Senate VP:	Elena Cole	**STEMPS:**	Cindy Keune, Craig Kutil, Ashley McHale, Eric Harpell
Senate Secretary:	Justin Garoupa		
Senate Treasurer:	Melissa Korber	**BSBA:**	John Ruys, Geoff Smyth
Senate Admin Assist:	Carmen McCauley	**Counseling:**	Angella Ven John, Heike Gecox
		ASLPC Rep:	Ignacio Petrasic

* * * * *

Public Notice—Nondiscrimination: Las Positas College does not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, color or disability in any of its programs or activities. Las Positas College is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Upon request this publication will be made available in alternate formats.