Approved
12/12/13

LAS POSITAS
COLLEGE

# College Council

**Thursday, November 14, 2013 | 2:30 -4:30 PM | Room 1687**

**Voting Members Present:** Quorum = 9

| Position | Name | Present | | Position | Name | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **President, Interim fs** (Chair, Non-Voting) | Janice Noble | X | | **VP Academic Services, Interim** | Diana Rodriguez | X |
| **VP Administrative Services** | Janice Noble | X | | **VP Student Services** | Diana Rodriguez | X |
| **Academic Senate President** | Thomas Orf | X | | **Academic Senate Vice President** | Elena Cole | |
| **Classified Senate Co-Presidents** | Frances DeNisco<br>Todd Steffan | X | | **Inst. Effectiveness Comm. Chair** | Rajinder Samra | X |
| **Student Senate President** | Christopher Southorn | X | | **Student Senate Vice President, Acting** | Shanan Sahota | X |
| **Planning&Budget Comm. Chair** | Scott Miner | | | **Facilities Comm. Chair** | Catherine Eagan | |
| **CEMC Chair** | LaVaughn Hart<br>(T. Orf, substitute) | X | | **Staff Development Comm. Chair** | Gregory Daubenmire | X |
| **Sustainability Comm. Co- Chairs** | Rita Carson<br>Colin Schatz | | | **LPC SEIU VP** | William Eddy | X |
| **CLP FA Site VP** | LaVaughn Hart | X | | | | |

Others Present: Barbara Morrissey, Dean of Student Services; Sharon Gach, Interim Executive Assistant to the President.

1. **Call to Order -** The meeting was called to order at 2:32 PM by Dr. Noble. It was noted that a quorum was present.

2. **Review and Approval of Agenda –** It was motioned and seconded to approve the agenda, which was approved unanimously. (Orf/Sahota)

3. **Review and Approval of Minutes – October 24, 2013 -** The minutes of October 24, 2013 were approved with several changes. (Samra/Orf).

4. **Old Business**
   a. **Accreditation Update / Continue Discussion of Standards Mapped to College Council / Assigning Responsibilities** – Dr. Noble continued the discussion of Accreditation Standards mapped to the College Council's responsibilities. The summary of this discussion is appended to these minutes.
   b. **Improvement Plans (formerly Planning Agendas) for Comprehensive Self Evaluation** – Mr. Samra reminded the Council that in the 2012 Accreditation Midterm

Report included our Planning Agendas for improvements. (Planning Agendas are now called Improvement Plans by ACCJC.)

The Improvement Plans will be reviewed by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. He opened a discussion of our Improvement Plans referring to the chart of our Plans in this meeting packet.

i. Item 1A – Completed. We will also add an additional comment, "Reviewed and revised the College Mission Statement and Values Statement in April 2013. These statements are reviewed on an annual basis."

ii. Item IB, regarding "Workshops …", it was mentioned that in past years the President trained every committee chair, and this would be a good idea in the future also.

iii. The phrase "In Progress" means it was in progress at the time of the Midterm Report, 2012.

iv. After all Plans are reviewed, re-done, and assessed, the IEC will bring this bak to the College Council for final review. Then the Improvement Plans will be folded into our next Self Evaluation Report as a summary authored by Dr. Noble, ALO, and Faculty Accreditation Lead, Ms. Cole.

c. **Governance Worksheets/ Received/Review –** There were none available for review.

## 5. New Business

a. **Building Proposal Update -** Dr. Noble recapped that at the November 6th Town Meeting there were many questions about the proposal for a new classroom and/or lab building (in the area where current buildings 100, 200, 300 are). Attending Town Meeting were Vice Chancellor Jeffrey Kingston, Dir. of Facilities/Bond Program, Mr. Douglas Horner, and Chancellor Jackson, who each addressed some of the concerns.

Dr. Noble reported that the Chancellor is looking at this proposal with the help of a Chancellor's advisory group in the context of the District needing to spend all the Bond funds (for both colleges) within 3 years. They are considering the expected growth of the LPC service area among . After a five hour meeting on November 12th, the Chancellor's advisory group came up with the following guiding concepts. Please note that there are no definite numbers at this time.

1. We cannot stop the cycle of technology on the campuses, including items that cannot be seen, i.e., routers, cabling, new telecom system (we are out of phone lines). As these are expensive projects and the technology grows so quickly we waited until the end of the bond program so the latest technology would be bought to be current and last as many years as possible. The concept has been proposed to use a global agreement whereby IT throughout the district will continue, along with some funds put toward small projects and instructional equipment

2. The question is: How can we keep the technology projects whole while addressing the need for a new classroom building, and also have enough funds left for the needed instructional equipment and most of the 'small projects'?

3. The Library funding is not in jeopardy in this discussion, its funding is separate and secure. In addition, gradually we will let the General Fund take over Library completion.

4. The way the bond program played out was that there was a smaller net gain of classroom space than planned in 2005. Thus, to decide who and what usage will go into the proposed new building LPC will organize a User Group in the next few months.

Dr. Noble gave the history of why that proposed building is in the Facilities Master Plan. It was listed as "Applied Science" only for a name for the State level, and to be eligible in case State matching funds were available. Per our Facilities Master Plan, it is the building we stated we would build next. However, State matching funds do not seem to be available due to the State's poor economic situation. Thus, the building would be self-funded, and it can be built for any whatever purpose and in any size that the College and District decide.

**Question regarding a new District Facilities Committee** – Ms. Hart asked if there is a new District Facilities Committee. Dr. Noble replied that this is being discussed, and it was mentioned at Chancellor's Council and in a sub-committee of the Chancellor's Working Group (CWG). Those present at Chancellor's Council thought this was a good idea as the two colleges were not informed about the other's activities. Mr. Samra shared that a CWG sub-committee met last weekend and discussed drafts of these facilities committees, which are in a very early stage. It will next be discussed by the CWG again before going through the Participatory Governance Process. The District-Wide Committee is envisioned to be a coordinating committee. Concern was voiced about prioritizing from the District, to the Colleges, and that is not the intention with this proposed committee.

**Question about the Chancellor's Working Group Goals** – It was asked what it the goal of the new Chancellor's Working Group. Mr. Samra shared that this is about Accreditation Standard III (Resources) and speaks to the district wide need for integrated planning and budgeting. Because the district has three separate planning committees, we need to address the District-wide integrated planning process.

Several faculty members stated that they hope the process works like the DEMC/CEMC processes, however if the District Planning or CWG have 'total power' that would be problematic. If these are coordinating bodies this would be good, however if decisions are given from District and a campus disagrees, that would be a model that would not be acceptable. Mr. Samra shares these concerns and has voiced them in the CWG meetings.

## 6. Area Reports

a. **Academic Services –** VP Rodriguez reported on position hiring for the STEMPS Dean to be announced later in the month, and replacing the Student Life Coordinator with the retirement of Cynthia Ross next June. Catalogue updates will be done by next week, and the department is responding to some internal audit findings positively.

b. **Administrative Services** – Dr. Noble stated that the VP of Administrative Services position recruiting closes on December 2nd. President Russell will begin November 25th, and a Meet and Greet will be held before Town Meeting on December 4th.

c. **Student Services** – VP Rodriguez mentioned that there was a very high number of student discipline cases in the last month, and she will be analyzing for trends at a later date. There was a successful Veterans Day Program with a speaker about use of dogs in the military and demonstration with a working dog.

   Dean Morrissey and she are working on how to free up time on the desk of the Articulation Officer, who also serves the Puente Program. The few hours allotted to each program are not enough; and Dean Morrissey is speaking with the Puente offices to see about re-organizing our program for better coverage.

d. **College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC) -** Ms. Hart reported that discipline plans are due November 15th and will be reviewed the next week. Beginning discussions have been held on developing documentation as we are able to add FTES back on the Schedule. There was not a quorum last meeting, however quorums will be needed for future important discussions.

e. **Facilities Committee -** No representative present.

f. **Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) -** Mr. Samra reported that the committee has not yet met.

g. **Resource Allocation Committee (RAC)-** Mr. Miner stated that nine instructional equipment requests were received and all were funded.

h. **Staff Development Committee** – Mr. Daubenmire presented a written report attached to the minutes, however had to depart to teach a class before his presentation time.

i. **Sustainability Committee -** No representative present.

j. **Academic Senate** – Dr. Orf said that no votes were taken at the last meeting, and in the next Division meetings the Integrated Budget and Planning Process will be discussed, then brought back to the Senate. That vote will be on "whether to continue with the current integrated budget and planning process", which is what we have done for a number of years, with only a few changes in timing.

   He and Ms. Hart spoke about feedback from the Senate on the recent Articulation bottleneck being a problem for Curriculum Committee and State requirements. We are at a point that the Curriculum deadlines cannot be met, with over 40 proposals and several degrees and transfer degrees at a standstill on one desk. Ms. Hart stated this

affects the whole campus and she would like the College Council to realize we will miss the March 31st Catalog date. We can get a digital version online, and we do print in-house now within just 1 extra day.

Dean Morrissey shared that the bottleneck on one desk is created by an untenable workload for the desk that includes the duties of Articulation, Counseling and the Puente Program.

It was mentioned that this is a good example for documentation of a situation and evaluation process for improvements, which the ACCJC would like to see.

k. **Classified Senate** – Ms. DeNisco said that she presented the Integrated Planning and Budget presentation at the October Senate meeting. The Senate also heard the presentation at Town Meeting. Classified Senate is now taking yes or no vote, and she will report back to College Council on this vote in December. Classified Senate will not meet in November due to the holiday.

In addition, because the Senate has approved a new Constitution and Bylaws, the Senate now has Ambassadors rather than Senators. Elections are now being held for the Ambassadors and the Secretary.

l. **Student Senate** - Mr. Southorn related that two major events will be held in February, a Masquerade Ball, and a Talent Show. The Student Senate has donated money to the online tutoring program to fund tutoring during weekends this semester. They are working on online voting for the Spring Student Government elections. Club Day was held today with a nice turnout with the theme 'Cities Around the World.'

Mr. Southorn has become aware of the changes from Chabot in Priority Registration for Fall 2014. The Senate is considering a Legislative Committee resolution to the State Assembly regarding SEPs (Student Educational Plans). In addition, in future the ZoneMail emails may not be able to be forwarded to personal emails, which the Senate has related to IT would be difficult for student, however no changes have been made on that yet.

m. **Faculty Association** – Ms. Hart reported that at the FA general meeting in October there was a video made of the presentation by Jonathan Lightman of FACCT. David Bella-Hopkins, of CCI, may come to the January 30th FA meeting. He is a grassroots/ lobbyist trainer, and he may present legislative updates if any are available. The FA Contract is now online and hard copies are available from Ms. Hart.

**n. SEIU** – Mr. Eddy said that the recent elections resulted in: President – Linda Wilson (DO), and the 3 LPC representatives: Bill Eddy-VP, James Weston - Secretary, and Ginger Ripplinger - Representative to the SEIU Executive Board.

7. **Adjournment** - The meeting was adjourned at 4:41 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
*Sharon Gach*
Sharon Gach, Interim Executive Assistant

# # #

**<u>Summary of 4. a.</u> – Discussion of Accreditation Standards mapped to College Council – Assigning Responsibilities**

**Standard Number/Question (Bold):** Discussion (non-bold)

**1 B 4**: We have collected data in surveys in past. We collect data in RAC. Processes used to assess effectiveness? Surveys, PR surveys, PR itself,

- Ac senate appears to support moving forward on Inst. Planning and Budgeting cycle.
- Way wording to Divisions, not yes or no, but let's send it forward and let the committees begin to do their work.

**How effective is college's planning processes in changing effectiveness?** Unknown, still in a cycle to assess.

**II A 2 f:** Program Review is in all we do, everyone is required to do it. We haven't integrated our assessments yet. Are we good at SLO assessments, and integrating into what faculty teach? We believe we are better than other colleges, are we good enough to not get a warning? No. Discussed SLOs and then assessing how --- but are we documenting this? "If we didn't document it, we didn't do it.". We are fantastic at doing first level SLO's, but beyond that, we need to document more, assess more.

Our evidence is in Program Review, because we have to write to that in the SLO box on the Program Review form. Also, evidence is if someone changed their course outline, text, syllabus because of SLO data, and we have to document this.

**Is there a formal planning process in place?** Will be in place in Dec 2013. Our Researcher documents things very very well. Data to back this up in a recent survey.

**III D 1:** It is in the circular planning/budget chart, and we will w/ new process.

**Goals for achievement?** Yes, we have this in the planning/budget chart/cycle.

**Establish priorities?** Yes, we discuss priorities in all committees and administration and DO / College discussions.

**Are Institutional Plans linked to financial goals?** Yes, they exist. Strategic Plan, and Technology Plan, and etc., and all Plans will be linked to financial plan.

Institutional Plans do rely on timelines, because our process is based on an August to July Academic Year. And content put in due to where tasks need to be done.

**Do past fiscal expenditures support Institutional Plans?** Yes, thru the Facilities Master plan. Human resources? We have no HR plan in the District. The fiscal expenditures are in the Program Reviews.

For instance, in the Resource Allocation Cte., when equipment is awarded, is there a followup assessment? Not yet, we will have to put that into RAC.

**Did it make a difference? And did hiring new faculty or staff make a difference?**

Have to answer for faculty hiring too; the current 5 faculty hired for Fall 2013 are based on replacements.

Lots of discussion on this question. Did the benefits materialize? That's what we have to ask.

**III D 1 b: Do our plans reflect the reality of what money we have? Do they reflect the financial resources, partnership and expenditure requirements?**

With Bond and Prop 30 coming to end, financial resources will become critical. Do people understand that a lot of our Instructional Equipment came from bond funds?

**Do staff/faculty receive information about the available funds?** Yes when funds are in our control. But sometimes the State doesn't give us information ahead of time regarding funds available or funds being withheld, i.e., The February Surprise.

With our new allocation model we should have a better handle on it going forward.

**If we have new software**, the budget would be visible for 10 months of each year (except for 2 months at closing). This is an item proposed for use/ they are giving it to us for FREE. It's from College of the Canyons Program Review, and is an integrated Planning and Budget software. It is easy to operate. The next step is to discuss with our new Chancellor. Both colleges saw the software last Friday at a District Administrator's meeting.

**Do we have funding priorities based on things that help the institution achieve its goals?**

Yes, last year used Key Performance indicators. We have 10 goals, but no way to review them. But Program Review is asking people to link each of their tasks to the college goals.

**Are Student Learning items given appropriate priority?**

Yes, i.e., the proposed new classroom/lab building is prioritizing student learning.

# # #