LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
REGULAR MEETING
Room 4129, Mertes Center for the Arts Building
October 23, 2013 – 2:30 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Rajeev Chopra, Elena Cole, Michelle Gonzales, Heike Gecox, Cindy Keune, Kevin Lopez (Student Rep), Thomas Orf, John Ruys

GUESTS: Frances DeNisco, Natasha Lang, Janice Noble

1.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

1.1 Call to Order/Quorum – 2:35 p.m.

1.2 Approval of Agenda
MOTION to REORDER Agenda. Present Items: 6.2 then 6.1
MSC: C.Keune / M.Gonzales /**APPROVED**

1.3 Approval of Minutes from October 9, 2013
MOTION to **APPROVE** Draft Minutes
MSC: C.Keune / M.Gonzales /1 Abstention /**APPROVED**

1.4 Public Comments – None

2.0 ACTION ITEMS

2.1 Hiring Prioritization – Senators were asked at the last meeting to present the hiring prioritization list and decision for the emergency hiring requests at their next division meeting. The Senators reported back the following:

ALSS Michelle Gonzales - The hire for a men's basketball head coach was rejected by the faculty. They did not agree with what was interpreted as an emergency hire, and voted to have the position placed on the regular ranking list. Not because the position was considered unnecessary, but because it superseded a retirement that was also seen as an emergency. There were concerns regarding consistency with the process, and what constitutes an emergency. If a death constitutes an emergency why were previous positions related to a death placed in with the general rankings? Some felt that retirements should be replaced first, and faculty should not have to keep begging to have those positions filled. The division recommended that the process be made clearer, and that emergency replacement criteria should not be selective. Assuming that retirements cannot be replaced, all vacated positions no matter what the reason, should be equitably considered and ranked according.

The faculty did agree with the hiring prioritization list of ranked positions.

BSBA Rajeev Chopra – Faculty were concerned as to whether there should be emergency hiring, what were the requirements, what was the rational, and why was a men's head basketball coach needed to be filled mid-year? If this position was not filled now it would still be included on next year's list.

The faculty agreed with how the positions were ranked on the hiring prioritization list.

Student Services Heike Gecox –The faculty questioned what constitutes an emergency hire, and did not have a clear understand of the rational. There needs to be some rethinking with emergency hires due to retirements versus a death. Previous deaths have not resulted in requests for an emergency replacement.

The faculty had no issues with the rankings as shown on the hiring prioritization list.

STEMPS LaVaughn Hart – Faculty had the same concerns as all the other divisions and felt that deaths and retirements do not necessarily constitute an emergency. A rational such as having a detrimental impact on students, a program, etc. would have made understanding the decision much clearer. The consensus of this division was to send back to the Hiring Committee a request for a clearer explanation.

The faculty agreed with the rankings submitted on the prioritization list.

The Senate agreed that a letter addressing the decision made by the Hiring Prioritization Committee be written, asking for a clearer explanation of the process, the criteria used in making the decision, and that the process that be consistent, and equitable. Thomas Orf will meet with Barbara Morrissey, the Chair of the Hiring Prioritization Committee before drawing up the letter. A request to place the men's basketball head coach position back on the regular list and re-rank the positions, may be recommended based on the response and explanation of why this position was considered an emergency hire.

This item has been tabled until the next Senate meeting.

2.2 ACCJC Resolution – At the last Senate meeting a resolution was shared that was drawn by the local senates' regarding the Western region and the ACCJC. The Western region consists of 112 public community colleges, and states that the relationship with the ACCJC has become contentious, and antagonistic. It asks that the Western region senates join in showing support by expressing concern over the adversarial nature of the relationships between ACCJA and many of California's community colleges. The senator's were asked to present the resolution at their division meetings and bring back any feedback. The following comments were heard prior to the Senate voting at the end of this discussion.

* ALSS Michelle Gonzales reported that the majority of the faculty voted to support the resolution.

* BSBA Rajeev Chopra reported that faculty was in support of the resolution.

* Student Services Heike Gecox reported that there was support for the resolution, although faculty were interested in knowing how other colleges had responded with support.

* STEMPS LaVaughn Hart reported that faculty strongly supported the resolution.

Thomas Orf attended the last Area Senate meeting held at DeAnza College and mentioned that representatives from three other colleges knew of the resolution. He asked the senators for their thoughts on going forward with support after sharing the fact that not very many other colleges in the area were even aware this was being passed around. There was concern of retribution from ACCJC, but discussion lead to the fact that the ACCJC seemed to be "bullying" the colleges and that should not happen any longer. The colleges have reason to have a voice, and it was stated that the ACCJC seems to have gotten out of control with all the recommendations and requirements that have filtered down. The Western region is the only one of six accrediting regions of the U.S. where a separate commission exists for the purpose of accrediting 2-year institutions. LPC has participated in a group that has voiced their opinion on other matters, so stepping forward in support of this resolution should not stand in the way of how we feel.

A **MOTION** was made to pass the resolution and forward to the AFT (American Federation of Teachers) LPCs support.
MSC: R.Chopra / L.Hart /**APPROVED**

3.0 CONSENT ITEMS – None

4.0 REPORTS

4.1 Curriculum Committee – LaVaughn Hart reported that the process for preparing the new catalog is progressing. Courses that have not been taught since Spring of 2008 amounted to slightly more than 60. Most of the faculty have been notified and asked to go through the deactivation process if they are not planning on offering those classes within the next year. She added that courses can be reactivated at the State level without having to go through the entire new course process, if reactivated within three years.

The process of changing proposals that have gone through the CurricUNET system within the last two years that still show a pending status to active, has begun and should be completely resolved within the next two weeks. If a faculty member needs to access a course that is pending, they should contact Kristie Woods or LaVaughn Hart for assistance. The Committee continues to work with trying to resolve bottlenecks associated with curriculum moving through the approval process. With limited time for inputting curriculum, the Committee has supported moving forward

curriculum requiring minor changes so that paperwork is not held back. Faculty are made aware of what needs to be corrected, and asked to do so in a timely manner.

A section with an example has been added to the Distance Education portion of CurricUNET where an explanation must now be provided as to why a discipline has chosen to offer a course as Distance Education. Also in the GE area is a tracking mechanism for CID courses.

A list of ongoing issues that will be forwarded to Governet, the agency which CurricUNET is derived from, asking for resolutions.

The Committee will meet on October 28th and not again until November 25th, which is the last day to present. With lots of curriculum moving forward everyone is asked to adhere to the tight timeframes. Kristie Woods continues to hold CurricUNET workshops for those who are interested.

4.2 Program Review Committee – A report submitted by Jill Carbone and Teri Henson is attached at the end of this set of minutes.

4.3 Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee – A report submitted by Tina Inzerilla is attached at the end of this set of minutes.

4.4 CEMC – LaVaughn Hart reported that this Committee will meet on November 8th. The deans will be sending the Committee each discipline's most current plan, and the disciplines will receive their FTEF number to give them a starting point. There will be additional FTEF although more conversation will need to take place before that exact amount of additional FTEF can be determined.

A small group of Committee members have begun discussing how to add back courses, due to the anticipated additional FTEF. This brought up the subject of the Sheriff's Department, which the college has a contract to offer two academies each year. Due to the shortage of FTEF in the past, the college has not been able to comply with offering two, and the Sheriff's Department has never insisted. However, with the extra FTEF this year offering both academy classes would not take away from the other disciplines. The estimated amount of FTEF for the academy is 3.5, and although the amount is large it would generate a large number of FTES that would benefit the entire campus. The flip side is that the academy classes are not held on campus, classes run over multiple semesters, is a six month program, and the tracking is not easy. The money the college receives for offering academy classes is not received until after the six month cycle has ended. There are upfront costs involved, and other matters that would need to be resolved. The distribution of the additional allocation has not been decided and discussion has only begun.

Discussion then switched to the "other" programs on campus that require FTEF that are not considered part of a discipline, or a division's program although they are considered learning communities. Should they be grouped into their own "discipline" and have to write discipline plans of their own? Often these programs are recruited

for a group and the outcomes are dependent on a blend of classes that are specific to a particular learning community. If the college does decide to invest in a program it should consider future funding, otherwise departments and students dependent on a particular program as a pathway may be placed in a vulnerable situation. A lot of effort is placed with starting programs that are constantly influx and the role of the CEMC goes only so far. The Committee has the responsibility to look at everything to see if FTEF is being used effectively in order to make the goals. It is difficult when the Committee looks at whether FTEFs are being used reasonably, and not see where an effort has been made to market a program to help bring in monetary support. It was mentioned that most of these programs are brought on campus through an administrator. When the administrative support goes away the responsibility generally lands on others to find ways to continue supporting the program. A comment was made that perhaps now would be the time to look at whether learning community programs could be placed under one umbrella so that they can establish more legitimacy, and somehow establish continuous funding, or become institutionalized.

4.5 Hiring Prioritization – Covered in 2.1.

4.6 Faculty Association – LaVaughn Hart reported that a general meeting is scheduled for October 30th at 3 p.m. in Room 1620B. Jonathan Lightman from the Faculty Association of California community Colleges will be the guest speaker. She also mentioned recently attending a conference hosted by the California Community College Independents, an association of independent faculty unions representing more than 12,000 community college faculty.

4.7 Student Senate – Kevin Lopez reported that on October 16th the ASLPC hosted Associated Student Night, an event drawing evening students who are not able to participate in daytime events.

Planning is underway for Club Day scheduled for November 14th, and the major event that happens in the Spring during Welcome Week.

The Legislative Committee has been reviewing the Board Policies and Administrative Procedures.

4.8 Treasurer– None

4.9 President – The State Academic Senate meeting for Area B was held on October 18th at De Anza College. The meeting covered a report from the Statewide President and what was happening at the State level, a number of resolutions from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC), information about the many still unknowns with the budget situation, and other items.

The March 21, 2014 Area B meeting will be held at LPC. The Plenary meeting in the Fall is scheduled for November 7-9, 2013 in Irvine, and in the Spring during April 10-12, 2014 in San Francisco.

4.10 DBSG – Thomas Orf reported that the DBSG committee has not yet met, although the Chancellor's Workgroup has and will meet again on October 25th. The group is working on is a District planning process that will feed into the planning processes at each college. Once something is in place it is hoped that questions surrounding the function of the Budget Allocation Model will be answered. An independent group will be meeting with District and campus personnel to assist with determining an appropriate budget spending amount for the District Office.

5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS

5.1 Input from Divisions on Equivalencies – Thomas Orf has not heard from Chabot's Senate President, Kathy Kelly. This item will remain on the agenda as a discussion item until word is received.

5.2 Board Policies – Thomas Orf and Jane McCoy are the two faculty representatives from LPC who have been reviewing 10+1, regular Board Policies, and Administrative Procedures through CCC Confer. Left for review are five policies in Chapter 4 and all of Chapter 5, which will likely take another two sessions. Once all are completed the policies will move forward for Board approval in small groups.

6.0 DISCUSSION – NEW BUSINESS

6.1 Budget Cycle and Planning – Dr. Janice Noble and Frances DeNisco were present to introduce the Integrated Planning and Budget Cycle, and the Integrated Planning Committee.

Dr. Noble began with explaining the 10 Steps of the Annual Budget Process, which is currently begin used to plan for the 2014-15 year.

1) September – Plan Ongoing Budget – This planning process for next year's budget begins in August/September. The operating budget allocations are sent to all departments for the current year and are set as the guaranteed base for the following year. The budget is revised annually to include any prior year additions.

2) October - Annual Allocation Requests – Requests for additional allocations occur at this stage, and need to be identified as being one time or ongoing. Requests have to be prioritized, derived from the department program review, and linked to strategic goals.

3) November – Deans – The deans review the prioritized requests from the departments, and information is presented at division meetings and for each department to have an opportunity to present their rational. After discussing the then ranks the requests as the faculty have prioritized them. If there are any questions s/he will ask for more clarification. The requests are sent to the VP's for review.

4) November/December – Vice Presidents – The requests are then reviewed by the VPs with the dean's participation. A prioritized list then moves forward to the President.

5) January/February – President – By February word on the budget proposal from the State should have already been received. With the participation of the VPs, the budget amount from the State is used to create a college wide priority list, establish annual revenues, using District FTES allocation, to create recommendation for RAC and Planning Committee.

6) March/April – Resource Allocation Committee – The RAC and Planning Committee review the revenue projections, cost of ongoing budget, college wide priority list, and create a recommendation to College Council.

7) May – College Council – After the CC receives the recommendations from RAC and Planning Committee they review what has been submitted to make certain that what has been recommended is within the budget, and submit the final budget recommendations back to the President.

8) August – President – The recommended budget is reviewed with the participation of the VP of Administrative Services. If any changes are made the College Council is informed, and the finalized annual budget is forwarded the DO Vice Chancellor.

9) September – VP Administrative Services – After the budget is adopted by the Board it is input into the BANNER, expenditures and transfers are monitored year round by the VP Administrative Services.

10) September - The Institutional Effectiveness – This Committee evaluates the process and recommends changes, if any, that should be implemented the following year – and the cycle begins once again.

A comment was made in reference to using a department's program review as the basis for requesting an annual allocation. If additional faculty are written in and listed as a priority, how does that affect the function of the Hiring Prioritization Committee? If part of the cycle includes one group reviewing priorities and another group already having gone through the process how would this cycle work when there are overlapping processes? Dr. Noble explained that this question would fall under some of the details that still need to be worked out. At the end of this cycle the IEC will be evaluating the process as an independent check and balance to determine what might have been left out of the cycle, if there should be changes made to the process, and where. She appreciated this point being brought forth, and that the cycle was not intended to undermine what is already in place or implement a new process.

Frances DeNisco began by saying that at the last College Council meeting the Integrated Planning Taskforce (IPC) presented recommendations for an Integrated Planning Committee. At this meeting copies of the Charge and Composition were distributed. What has gone into these documents has been from input provided by the

many areas throughout the campus, and have been reviewed extensively. When the Taskforce was initially formed the goal was to create an overarching committee that has now been dismantled.

The Charge of the IPC reads: *"The IPC will provide institutional level planning priorities to the College President by using the Mission, Vision, and Values Statements, Strategic Plans, Program Reviews, SLOs, institutional research data and analysis, and accreditation documents as its focus. The IPC will be informed by a variety of sources including district priorities, and State, Federal, and ACCJC mandates as required."* The Charge also included a list of 7 detailed responsibilities.

The Composition consists of 15 voting members, and 8 non-voting members. In order to establish continuity and learn the processes of this committee, during the first year terms shall be chosen by lottery. One-half of the members shall serve a 2-year term, and the other half a 3-year term. The responsibilities of this Committee are seen as complex, and learning the inter-relationships and requirements of the many mandates and agencies will take some time.

Due to the complexity and volume of work the need for two Co-Chairs seems necessary. Applications to co-chair may be submitted by staff, faculty or administrator during May of the previous academic year.

This information will also be presented at the November Town Hall Meeting.

6.2 Naming of Basketball Courts – Many different entities across the campus have been asked to write a letter of support for renaming of the basketball court. Interim President, Dr. Janice Noble spoke on this earlier in the meeting. She has already received letters from other groups on campus and is working on completing a packet to have this item placed on the November Board Agenda. If in support, she's asking for a letter from the Senate by next week.

The discussion was opened and a comment of whether naming the basketball court would lead to groups wanting to rename other areas on campus. After much discussion it was evident that it difficult for everyone to agree. The consensus was to have the Senate President speak with Dr. Noble, and let her know that a letter of support from the entire Senate would have to wait until the proposal was presented at each of the division meetings, whereas a letter of support from the Senate President showing support would not. The outcome will be known at the next meeting.

7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER

7.1 Announcements –

~ Talking Points for this meeting will include:

* Hiring Prioritization
* Resolution Passed
* Adding FTEF Back

7.2 Meetings – Next meeting November 13, 2013

7.3 Adjournment – 4:31 p.m.
MOTION to **ADJOURN**
MSC: R.Chopra / M.Gonzales / **APPROVED**

* * * * *

ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

EXECUTIVE OFICERS

Senate President:	Thomas Orf
Senate Vice President:	Elena Cole
Senate Secretary:	Cindy Keune (Fall)
Senate Treasurer:	Rajeev Chopra
Senate Admin Assist:	Carmen McCauley

ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

ALSS:	Michelle Gonzales
STEMPS:	Debbie Fields
BSBA:	John Ruys
Counseling:	Heike Gecox
PT Faculty:	Mona Abdoun
ASLPC Rep:	Kevin Lopez, K.C. Singh

* * * * *

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.

4.2

Program Review Report

Meeting of September 25

The committee completed the development of the summary forms that will be used by program review reading teams to write program review summaries.
Rajinder Samra presented the draft survey designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the program review process. The committee discussed and edited the survey (which was sent out Monday, Sept. 30). The survey was sent out to the campus and was due Friday, Oct. 11.

Meeting of October 9

The committee considered how to structure the program review reading/summarization teams. The decision was to make the teams as diverse as possible by pairing team members from different programs and divisions as much as possible and to assign teams to divisions different from their own, when feasible. The faculty members of the PRC will be joined 7 volunteers: one dean (Justin Garoupa), two full-time faculty (Mark Tarte and Elizabeth Hopkins) and four classified staff (Peter Cardin, James Weston, Michelle Zapata, and William Eddy). Each team is assigned a collection of annual program reviews from a specific Division. The team will read and summarize each program review it reads, then work with the Dean of that Division to write a divisional summary which will go to Vice President who oversees that Division.
In September Dr. Noble distributed to the committees her mapped accreditation standards (mapping how the various sections of the accreditation self-evaluation map to committees on campus). The committee spent a portion of the meeting reviewing the mapped standards with respect to program review and discussing how the standard might be connected to the work and charge of the committee. There will be more to do later in the year.

PRC Co-Chair Jill Carbone gave an update on the Planning Task Force, which is developing recommendations for integrated planning and budgeting.

Future Plans: The PRC is going to be receiving all programs' Annual Program Reviews on Oct 31. PRC teams will be reading them through the month of November and working with the appropriate Dean to summarize the content and themes. The PRC is beginning to collect evidence for mapping to Accreditation Standards. We will be reviewing our charge and membership. In January and/or early February, we will be reviewing the data summary from the Program Review surveys.

Submitted by: Jill Carbone and Teri Henson

4.3

SLO Update
October 7, 2013

The SLO Committee is going to assign committee members to faculty that have not completed their SLOs, assessments, and degree/certificate outcomes.

The SLO Committee discussed the frequency of assessing SLOs and decided to stay at every 2 years. Disciplines may assess 25 percent of their courses each semester over a 2 year period.

The SLO Committee is discussing the LPC Assessment Process and has begun working a draft of this document.

If you have any questions let me know. I will not be at Senate because I have to be at Program Review for the training.

Submitted by: Tina Inzerilla