LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
REGULAR MEETING
Room 4130, Mertes Center for the Arts Building
December 12, 2012, 2:30 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Rafi Ansaria, Jeremiah Bodnar, Jill Carbone, Elena Cole, Debbie Fields, J Justin Garoupa, Heike Gecox, Cindy Keune, Melissa Korber, Craig Kutil, Ashley McHale, John Ruys, Mike Sato, Geoff Smyth, Sarah Thompson

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

---

1.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

1.1 Call to Order/Quorum: 2:38 p.m.

1.2 Approval of Agenda
MOTION to **APPROVE** Agenda
MSC: J.Garoupa / A.McHale /APPROVED

1.3 Approval of Minutes of October 24, 2012
MOTION to **APPROVE** Minutes
MSC: A.McHale / C.Kutil / APPROVED

1.4 Public Comments: None

2.0 ACTION ITEMS

2.1 The LPCAS approves the new Program Review Committee Charge
MOTION to **APPROVE** Program Review Committee Charge
MSC: C.Keune / J.Garoupa / APPROVED

2.2 The LPCAS approves the Program Review Committee's Resolution regarding the Definition of Validation for Purposes of Program Review
MOTION to **APPROVE** Program Review Committee's Resolution
MSC: A.McHale / C.Kutil / APPROVED

2.3 The LPSAC approves the Program Review Committee's Resolution regarding the Definition of a Program for Purposes of Program Review
MOTION to **APPROVE** Program Review Committee's Resolution
MSC: C.Keune / J.Garoupa / APPROVED

3.0 CONSENT ITEMS: None

4.0 REPORTS

4.1 Curriculum Committee – None

4.2 SLO Committee – None

4.3 BaSk Committee – None

4.4 DE Committee – None

4.5 Program Review Committee – Jill Carbone reported that the committee was still working on their timeline in terms of what steps need to be in place in order for the Planning Committee to be ready to receive program reviews from faculty in the Spring. A template form is being developed for both an Annual Program Review and Tri-Annual Program Review that Jill and Teri Henson plan to present to the Academic Senate in February 2013. If approved in March by the Senate, the template will be distributed to faculty to begin the process of filling out their annual program review. In April the committee is planning to submit a request for a Variable Flex Day to assist faculty with the template, and Rajinder Samra will be available to answer questions, receive requests for data, and interpret the reports. The committee would ideally like to have materials into the Planning Committee in early February but due to the late start this year it has been pushed back to early March.

4.6 CEMC/Senate Subcommittee – Tom Orf asked that Sarah Thompson communicate some items at this meeting. The DEMC came to a conclusion e conclusion to add 17.2 FTEF to the schedules for the district with 10 going to Chabot and 7.2 to LPC. CEMC is meeting this week to decide which classes add back into the schedule for the Spring and Summer semesters.

The concerns mentioned at the last meeting were not as critical as initially thought, and largely a miscommunication from an email sent. A positive outcome from that miscommunication was the realization that there is not a very effective method of communication between the FA and the college senates so a meeting was held with the FA and the members of the DBSG, with another planned for January.

John Ruys reported that the Senate Sub-committee are finalizing their recommendations and are set to meet next week. Melissa Korber added that the committee is also working on the philosophy, a matrix, history data, and next steps.

4.7 Staff Development – Report to be heard later during the meeting.

4.8 Hiring Prioritization – None

4.9 Faculty Association – Debbie Fields reported that the FA will soon occupy office 2111, and the move will occur during the break.

4.10 Student Senate – Rafi Ansaria reported at the last meeting that the ASLPC had plans to host a spontaneous Student Appreciation Day before finals week on December 5. Due to rain the event was not held.

The Prep to Pass Finals Tutoring event is scheduled to be held this evening and tomorrow (December 13) in Room 2401from 6-10 p.m. Some instructors will be giving extra credit to students in their class.

Tony Costello, men's basketball coach, will be presented with a large poster card signed by members of the ASLPC, and the team players will award the coach a signed custom made monogrammed basketball

4.11 Treasurer – Melissa Korber reported that while discussions of whether to move Senate funds over to the Foundation were taking place (here), a policy was passed by the Foundation where 5% maintenance fee will now apply to all new accounts. Still in limbo as to what to do, this item will be placed on the January agenda.

4.12 President: Sarah Thompson stated that the Planning Task Force has begun looking at committee structures and have made progress in terms of creating a framework as to how things will move forward in identifying the criteria for having a committee, the criteria for having a task force, and things that are typically done that do not fit in any of the categories, and are there ways to conceptualize them or getting rid of them all together. Another meeting is set for this Friday where discussion on this topic will continue.

At the Chancellor's Council a new board policy will be presented for approval regarding the Group Medical Insurance for Retirees. This is being pushed through quickly so that it can reflect what is in the current Faculty Contract.

The District is relocating to the Dublin Hub and occupying the entire third floor. The revenue from the Franklin location will be placed in the General Fund and is anticipated to be around $500, 000 a year. The move will take place during the President's Holiday weekend to cause the least disruption.

The search for the new VP of Administrative Services is winding down and that individual is expected to be in place by the third week of January 2013.

MOTION to **REORDER** the agenda as follows: Discussion-New Business 6.6, Discussion-Old Business 5.4 & 5.5, Discussion-New Business 6.6, 6.5 & 6.10.
MSC: E.Cole / G.Smyth / APPROVED

4.13 DBSG – Justin Garoupa reported that general conversations continue discussing and describing the expense side of the revenue based allocation model. At the next DBSG meeting the committee is going to be presented with several models of how expenses can be taken from of the top and revenue allocated to the colleges.

5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS

5.1 Reviewing Our Committee Structure
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: E.Cole / G.Smyth / APPROVED

5.2 Mission, Visions and Values Statement
The sub-committee will not be meeting until this Friday and if the Mission Statement has not changed it will be an Action Item on the next agenda. If it has changed, it will be brought back as a discussion under Old Business.

MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: E.Cole / G.Smyth / APPROVED

5.3 Automatic Awarding of Degrees
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting.
MSC: E.Cole / G.Smyth / APPROVED

5.4 Deadlines for AA-T and AS-T Degrees – At the last meeting Jeremiah Bodnar and Sarah Thompson presented detailed information related to the goals set by the State Chancellor's Office, the penalties involved for not meeting the deadline dates. This information was sent by email to give everyone a more in-depth explanation and clearer understand of the importance of deciding which courses LPC should place on the "list" to comply with the deadline for AA-T and AS-T degrees, and for better understanding of the questions that came up at the last Senate meeting.

Below are three options drawn from the various sets of memos circulating involving creating AA-T and AS-T degrees for our programs. The information is based on the different interpretations taken from the various sets of memos and has been e-mailed to all faculty. A decision now needs to be made as to which option to select because the due late for submitting our planned outline to the state is January 31st. Whichever is selected will be our commitment for the next year and a half.

Option 1: Submit a total of 12 degrees we plan to create.

Advantages	Disadvantages
This is the minimum number of degrees that the State will allow us to create, under any reasonable interpretation of the Chancellor's guidelines.	The State has consistently said that **every** program at our college that offers an AA/AS degree will also have to offer an AA-T or AS-T degree, if a Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) has been made for that degree by the State.

This would allow programs that currently have an AA/AS degree, but for which the AA-T/AS-T is not a good fit, to have their degree substituted by an AA-T/AS-T in a program without an AA/AS degree.	If we don't include all disciplines that currently have an AA/AS degree in our plan for created degrees, we may be planning for a false target.
This option requires the least amount of work over the next two years – curriculum process is more manageable within our current committee structure.	Generating a plan with fewer degrees than we ultimately will need means that several disciplines will be left out of the planning process, including discipline planning, enrollment management planning, scheduling, and approval planning that will go into meeting these deadlines. This option limits students' choices. Students may desire AS-Ts or AA-Ts which are not offered.

Option 2: Present a more comprehensive plan and list those disciplines the college would like to have AA-T and AS-T Degrees.

Advantages	Disadvantages
The State has consistently said that ultimately this is what we must do.	Some programs may have to create degrees and courses that significantly impact their ability to serve their current students and meet current programmatic goals.
We can create a more thorough and inclusive planning and implementation strategy relative to program development, discipline planning, enrollment management, scheduling and approval processes needed to meet the State demands.	Possible effects on students from creation of AA-T/AS-T degrees include: the imposition of new prerequisites which may exclude students from certain classes; the creation of new courses that require additional FTEF and may not meet the needs of current students.
Students will have faster access to AA-T/ AS-T degrees we ultimately plan to offer.	Intense workload increase for the curriculum committee. This may result in reduced efficacy in responding to non-degree related curriculum.

Option 3: This option was written under the sense the Chancellor's Office is leaning towards requiring that colleges offer an AA-T or AS-T Degree in any program offered that has a transfer model curriculum, which would include all disciplines and not offering the option of whether to or not.

Advantages	Disadvantages
Some of the language given out by the State says that we will be required to do this, so there is good reason to think that ultimately it will be required.	Even more pressure on disciplines to create degrees and courses that may not best fit the needs of students they are currently serving, or current discipline planning goals. This option changes the implementation of all transfer degrees from a choice to a requirement. While this may be the State's intention eventually, we would be mandating ahead of the State.
This would allow for a very comprehensive college planning approach as we devote the intensive college resources need to meet the State mandate for the creation of AA-T/AS-T degrees.	Intense workload increase for the curriculum committee. This may result in reduced efficacy in responding to non-degree related curriculum.
This would offer most systematic opportunity to reorient college degrees in a way that is consistent and thorough. Students will have faster access to AA-T/ AS-T degrees we ultimately plan to offer.	

Discussion centered on briefly reviewing each of the advantages and disadvantages for each of the options. Senators are asked to go over this information with the faculty in their disciplines, and provide feedback as to the Senate, which option seems favorable. No matter which option is selected

there will be lots of work for the faculty. Some degrees will be easily written, some programs may have to create courses to match the Transfer Model Curriculum, and the Curriculum committee will be kept busy.

This item will be placed as an Action Item on the next agenda and an option will be selected based on feedback from all of the disciplines.

5.5 Credit by Exam – Jeremiah Bodnar reported that all the District polices will be rewritten in a new legal format, which involves two sets, the Board Policy and Administrative Procedure. From this point on, every process will involve two processes – for every Board Policy an Administrative Procedure will be created that need to be passed by the Senate(s). The Board Policy for Credit by Exam Policy was presented today and not the Administrative Procedure. The Board Policy will be placed as an Action Item on the next meeting agenda.

6.0 DISCUSSION –NEW BUSINESS

6.1 New IEC Charge
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: E.Cole / G.Smyth / APPROVED

6.2 Student Success Task Force Focus for 2013
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: E.Cole / G.Smyth / APPROVED

6.3 Instruction Materials Laws – Before the start of the new semester, Sarah Thompson wanted to make faculty aware that a new law will be in effect beginning in January regarding on-line instructional materials. It states that if students are required to purchase on-line textbooks, software or access codes, they must have access to this material for a period of two years. Also, students cannot be charged extra for electronic resources for ease of access (related to course).

Also, new senate bills have mandated the State Chancellor's Office and Statewide Senate to put into effect the following two bills. SB 1052 is the Open Educational Resources that will require publishers to provide free copies of textbooks to campus libraries to be placed on reserve. The second bill, SB 1053, will create the California Digital Open Source Library, which will serve as a source for digital textbooks. At the moment use of the open library is being promoted as free, although that may change.

The idea sounds great and will help students with textbook costs, although the law actually stipulated the number of courses that have open resource test, and that number is 50.

Instructional Materials Law will be placed on the next agenda for further discussion.

6.4 New ARCC Reports – An Opportunity for Improved PR:
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: C.Keune / G.Smyth / APPROVED

6.5 College Prerequisite Policy – This policy has been discussed and related information distributed at a previous Senate meeting. Jeremiah Bodnar reviewed what changes the document has had since it last was seen, and mentioned that the Curriculum Committee has voted on this policy. The Basic Skills Task Force suggested adding a preamble regarding the implications that may occur with delaying a students' progress if a prerequisite is added, and a modified preamble has been added. One other change was establishing a statistical validation at 39%, although there are still courses that will not make the 39% mark and will instead have a content validation. Another change was defining "highly unlikely to succeed", which was set at less than 50% success rate.

A digital copy will be sent out to all for final review, and this item will be placed as an Action Item on the next agenda.

6.6 Matching Equivalent Course Work with Chabot – Jeremiah Bodnar explained that many years ago Chabot and LPC had the same courses, and at some point things began to divert by changes in course numbers, rubrics, and content in courses. Since then it has become confusing as to which course (theirs or ours) should count as the same course for purposes of intra-articulation and relative to the new Title 5 guidelines with the strict repeatability rules, which are District Wide. A list was generated without faculty involvement, that was thought to be matching courses and upon review turned out to not be accurate. A process now needs to take place with faculty involvement, to determine which courses ARE equivalent. A Banner report was created which lists courses that were considered equivalent, and the report now needs to be reviewed by the faculty. The report has drop down lists that allow faculty to select whether the course is or is not equivalent; adding comments; and how communication was made with Chabot. Another list should have been already received by the faculty that courses not originally considered equivalent can be added. There is also a worksheet listing principles to use that will help with making the decision of whether courses are equivalent. The worksheets will be submitted by faculty first and when returned to their divisions will be reviewed by articulation, student services and other areas. The goal is to get this through the process before the next round of enrollments, and form a basis as a starting point for setting the restrictions for repeatability and also build a consistent system of intra-articulation and intra-transfer between the colleges.

6.7 Hiring Prioritization Ranking – No discussion.

6.8 Senate Role in Flex Day Planning – Mike Sato explained that Staff Development was tasked with finding out whether the Senate would like to have a role in the planning for next year's flex calendar. A decision would establish a process and avoid having to discuss this each year. Those days include the Variable Flex Day, designated Flex Days and Convocation. Last year the Staff Development committee included input from the Academic Senate and from discussions at division meetings. There are several choices: 1) the same process as last year can be followed; 2) the Staff Development committee can present their recommendation to the Academic Senate; or 3) the Staff Development committee can decide and present their recommendation directly to the College Council. Whatever is decided, the committee must send their report to the State Chancellor's Office no later than early Spring.

Discussion ensued regarding the required number of days for faculty per academic year minus flex days and convocation (175 days), the definition of "variable" and "mandatory" flex days, content of flex day activities, and steering away from evening mandatory flex days.

It was agreed that the Staff Development committee present their recommendations to the Senate as activities for flex days are discussed to keep the Senate updated to their progress.

6.9 Evaluation of the Efficiency of Efficacy of our Current Senate Structure
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: C.Kutil / G.Smyth / APPROVED

6.10 Board Repeater Policy – Jeremiah Bodnar explained that the Administrative Procedure AP 4227 had been developed and was ready for presentation to the Board. A change was made to the Board Policy BP4235, states that there will be some cases where a student can fail a course and still repeat it and other cases where Title V will allow repeating a course that has already been passed. The Administrative Procedure was held back to "match" the Board Policy and is approved first.

The policy and procedure will first go through the Senates individually and then presented to the Board in February for the first reading, under the expectation that approval will be at the March Board.

Both AP and BP items will be placed as Action Items on the next agenda.

7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER

7.1 Announcements – Today's date is 12/12/12 and will not occur again in "our" lifetime.

7.2 2012 Meetings: 2nd and 4th Wednesday – Next Meeting: January 23, 2013

7.3 Adjournment: 4:26 p.m.
MOTION to **ADJOURN**
MSC: A.McHale / H.Gecox / 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:	Heike Gecox
		ASLPC Rep:	Rafi Ansaria

* * * * *

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.