LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
REGULAR MEETING
Room 4129, Mertes Arts Building
October 24, 2012, 2:30 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Elena Cole, David Everett, Debbie Fields, Eric Harpell, Heike Gecox, LaVaughn Hart, Terry Johnson, Cindy Keune, Melisa Korber, Craig Kutil, Ashley McHale, Scott Miner, Barbara Morrissery, Zina Rosen-Simon, John Ruys, Rajinder Samra, Sarah Thompson, Scott Vigallon, James Weston, Christy Woods

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
MS: M.Korber / C.Kutil

MOTION to move Discussion Item 6.6 after Public Comments 1.4 and before Action Items 2.0
MS: Cindy Keune / A.McHale

MOTION to move Discussion Item 6.1 after 6.6 and before Action Items 2.0
MS: C.Keune / M.Korber

VOTE: Agenda APPROVED as amended

1.3 Approval of Minutes of September 26, 2012

MOTION to APPROVE minutes
MS: M.Korber / A.McHale

Discussion: Correction to Treasurer Report 4.11 – correct amount $1,400.00
VOTE: Minutes APPPROVED – 1 Abstention

1.4 Public Comments

In summary . . . LaVaughn Hart spoke publicly as to whether the college was moving forward on their own for the better of the college and students, or moving forward in a direction dictated by what has been passed down. We seem to be changing our focus and molding ourselves into something other

than what we had set out to do. Let's not forget why we are here and for whom? Let's begin to remember why . . .

2.0 ACTION ITEMS

2.1 The LPCAS recommends the college deactivate its strategic goals for the 2012-13 academic year. The college will then use its mission statement as the primary driving force for planning, budgeting, and allocation for the remainder of the 2012-13 academic year. If the college is unsuccessful at reaching mutual agreement with a new set of goals, the current goals will be reinstated for the 2013-14 academic year.
MOTION made to APPROVE Action Item 2.1
MS: C.Kutil / C.Keune

Discussion: Deactivation of the goals will not affect the accreditation. The Planning committee is wrapping up the Mission Statement and will soon be working on the Visions and Values statements, which goals are derived.
VOTE: Action Item 2.1 APPROVED – 1 Abstention

2.2 The LPCAS recommends we adopt the following statement as our new mission statement: "Las Positas College is an inclusive, learning-centered institution providing educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals."
MOTION made to APPROVE Action Item 2.2
MS: C.Kutil / C.Keune

Discussion: Questions as to whether all divisions had a chance to review and if all feedback had been considered. Based on the feedback from the Town Meeting the Mission statement was rephrased and some suggestions would fit into the Values statement.
MOTION made to TABLE Action Item 2.2 until November 14th meeting.
MS: E.Harpell / E.Cole
VOTE: APPROVED – 1 Abstention

2.3 The LPCAS recommends the approval of the District Policy on Repetition to bring us into compliance with the new Title V language.
MOTION made to APPROVE Action Item 2.3
MSC: M.Korber / J.Ruys / APPROVED (No Discussion)

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 – Scott Vigallon presented a draft for a LPC Regular Effective Contact Policy. During a conference call that included the ACCJC, it was made clear that DE courses have to have regular effective contact within the courses whether they are online or hybrid courses or run the risk of being recalculated as correspondence courses. If the courses are viewed as correspondence courses it would jeopardize federal aid for the college. Although there are different degrees and steps before this would apply, and because of change proposals for DE education, a draft policy was put together that was modeled after Mt. San Jacinto College, which is used by other colleges. This draft has been approved by the DE and Curriculum Committees, and is being brought here for the Senate's approval so that it can be implemented. Regular effective contact hours are already integrated in our DE proposal form for curriculum, and in the evaluation of DE instruction. This is not seen as anything controversial just something that needs to get done. If this is approved, DE instructors will need to be contacted to make certain that the policy is being followed.

The problem may not occur with online courses although a problem may occur with hybrid courses particularly the courses that do not meet online that often. It has always been interpreted that the instructors have had the ability of how to determine the amount of online contact. Proof now needs to be established that off campus contact meet the recommended number of effective hours. Ways of how to meet that requirement is outlined in the draft policy.

Questions followed with Scott providing specific answers, and a digital copy of the draft policy will be e-mailed to all.

4.5 Program Review Committee – None

4.6 CEMC/Senate Subcommittee – Melissa Korber reported that the committee had met and two plans were reviewed, if Prop 30 passes and how to add back 10+ FTEF. The first plan was to look at reports from several years back and the one with the high watermark was from 2009-10 was used as the base. A percentage of FTEF for each area was based on the new division structure. The second model was to devote a Flex Day to map out a long range plan.

Brief discussing followed, and this sub-committee will be reporting to the CEME on Friday.

4.7 Staff Development – None

4.8 Hiring Prioritization – Melissa Korber reported that prioritization has taken place and that she will present her report at the next Senate meeting.

4.9 Faculty Association – Debbie Fields reported that discussions, which include the classified union, have begun with the District regarding a Health Retirement account for new hires. This will not affect anyone already employed.

4.10 Student Senate – None

4.11 Treasurer – Melissa Korber recommended that the initial plan to move to the Foundation be kept and stated several positive points as to why it would be best. The Senate Fund will be placed as an Action Item on the next agenda.

4.12 President – Sarah Thompson shared information about the disciplines list that is created by the Statewide Senate. There are two lists, one is for new programs and the other is programs that exist but the minimum qualifications have changed. Kinesiology is petitioning to move over to the Master's List. What this means is that anyone who teaches Kinesiology will have to have a Masters, which will have a significant impact on adjunct instructors who teach in this discipline. There are 10 community colleges that are binging this forward and there is a very good chance of it passing. Adjunct instructors in this discipline need to be made aware.

Please encouraged faculty to attend the Senate Statewide meetings. There are a multitude of meetings that deal with different topics. If anyone is interested in becoming the faculty accreditation liaison, the VP of Academic Services is willing to work something out so that the faculty member can attend these meetings and represent the college until the next accreditation cycle.

In March, the Vocational Leadership will be meeting and there are usually quite a few scholarships that the Senate can take advantage of. Senate funds can be used for professional development and is available for whoever is interested in attending.

Whoever will be become Senate President next year will need to attend the Faculty Leadership Institute this June being held in Sacramento.

The deadline dates set by the Chancellor's Office for implementing the new SB1440 Transfer Degrees are closing in. By the end of this academic year

(2012-13) the college will have to be 80% in compliance with AAT, AST. What that means is that if there are 25 transfer model curriculums completed and we have 24 of those programs we will to have 21 AAT, AST completed. By the end of next academic year (2013-14) we will have to be at 100% in compliance. Currently, the college has completed 2 for 2012-13. In order to get this accomplished we will have to work quickly which will place a huge burden on the Curriculum Committee. Sarah recommended fast tracking those programs that don't need to introduce new curriculum. Discussion to continue.

4.13 DBSG – Meeting this Friday

4.14 Report out from Divisions – None

5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS

5**.1 Assessing the Course Prioritization Model and CEMC Processes for Course Prioritization, Reduction, and Addition**
MOTION to TABLE 5.1
MSC: C.Keune / C.Kutil /APPROVED (No Discussion)

5.2 Reviewing Our Committee Structure
MOTION to TABLE 5.2
MSC: A.McHale / C.Kutil /APPROVED (No Discussion)

5.3 Next Year's President – Elena Cole stated that a group will be meeting tomorrow to discuss the Senate President's position.

5.4 Senate Fund – Sarah Thompson did speak with the CEO of the Chabot Federal Credit Union who said that the President had mentioned having space in the new building. It has not yet been confirmed, and the credit union CEO will contact the District to see if there are any updates.

5.5 Visions and Values Statement
MOTION to TABLE 5.5
MSC: C.Kutil / E.Cole / APPROVED (No Discussion)

6.0 DISCUSSION –NEW BUSINESS

6.1 Resolutions on Math Education Fall Plenary – Math curriculum has become very politicized at the State Academic level. There has been some concerted effort by several groups, who have wanted the Statewide Senate to take a strong stand on Statsways, which are combined math courses that get students through remedial math much more quickly, and considered a content specific math. At the last meeting there was a move to take a strong positive stance and agree that this is the type of college curriculum that colleges across

the state should be adopting. For the past 3 years of the Exec Board has not taken a positive stand on this issue. Concern is that this type of academic structure has shown statistically not to be successful. There are 3 colleges who brought forth 4 resolutions: 1) To dictate accelerated math and make it the Academic supported statewide curriculum for math across the state. The resolution was too specific and did not move forward; 2) That Black and Latinos students who test 3 levels below, have the highest drop rate, and least completion rate -implement algebra for statistics. The other 2 resolutions did not get addressed and received no support.

Sarah Thompson was brought this topic up to gain feedback on how the faculty felt about supporting this resolution.

Discussion: No statistics available that shows this has been successful. This program is considered toted as accelerated but actually it is not. Only some students may benefit and others do not benefit by taking shortcuts. Faculty seemed hesitant and still not ready for Statsways. Math depart desperate for FTE and if money was available would offer a 1 unit Math X lab class for students can drop in. Would require an instructor, who would be paid at a reduce rate, and lab assistant. Alternative methods are being thought of to assess money for an additional lab. There are accelerated English courses, but then again, it is a different discipline.

Consensus was that there was no support for math mandates.

6.2 Resolution re: Automatic Awarding of Degrees – Sarah Thompson explained that at the next Statewide meeting a resolution to automatically award degrees will be voted upon and brought this to the Senate for discussion.

For: Banner will recognize when a student has earned a degree, certificate, etc. and qualifies for an award. The award will automatically generate without the student having to apply.

Updated data on each student.

Good idea because the student can assess what classes s/he might have left to complete.

Against: Financial aid would automatically cease even if the student is not finished.

Many community college students are not sure what they are doing when they begin and start on one track but may end up on another. Somewhere along the line they may finish the requirements for a degree, which may not be what

they had decided upon. If it were a student receiving financial aid student, their aid would stop when they may not have finished.

Some rubrics between Chabot and LPC are not the same; rubrics from previous courses may have changed and students would have to know the specific catalog year; just because a financial aid student receives a degree doesn't necessarily mean they are finished. Some transfer with an AA but that doesn't necessarily get them into a 4-year institution - they would need to work with someone for an evaluation.

The consensus of the Senate was to vote it down.

6.3 New IEC Charge – Sarah Thompson shared the proposed draft charge of the IEC committee, which has already been discussed at College Council.

"The Institutional Effectiveness Committee provides ongoing and systematic evaluation of key college processes and metrics that lead to recommendations or sharing of information for improving student learning and institutional outcomes."

Discussion: The statement seemed very vague – why? In some cases the IEC will be able to make specific recommendations because of the expertise of the room in terms of the processes, while in other cases the expertise may be outside of the room and the recommendations not so specific.

Three things were considered when drawing up the charge:
1. The IEC needs to follow mandates placed by the accreditation, State Chancellor's Office, Board of Governors, etc. The change is narrow enough so that this committee, which meets eight times a year can a accomplish what it needs to.

2. The charge is useful and has utility.

3. IEC members can explain what charge is and this statement meets all criteria.

Changing the charge of the committee does not change what the committee is set out to do. The reconstruction of the charge is to bring back the focus with the charge and some directives for the year.

Discussion will continue at the next meeting.

6.4 Program Review – Definition of a Program
MOTION to TABLE 6.4
MSC: A.McHale / E.Cole / APPROVED (No Discussion)

6.**5 1440 Update – New Deadlines Set** – Sarah Thompson opened the discussion by asking for recommendations of how to proceed with SB1440 and make the deadlines. One suggestion was to contact our Matriculation Officer and ask for information and documents to assist with beginning the process. Additional administrative support would help, and contacting faculty who have already completed the process. Work on this for Flex Day credit, and have divisions conduct a curriculum audit.

6.6 CTE Nancy Shulock's New Focus – **What to Be Prepared For –** Sarah Thompson explained that Ms. Shulock, a Researcher from Sac State who has made her work by looking at CCCC and how to fix what she believes are their shortcomings. Her foundation is well funded by corporate interests and considered to be the #1 education consultant for the State of California Legislature. The transfer degree legislation bill was initiated by her prodding, driving force behind the Student Success Force, primary consultant for the non-academic participants on that task force, and is thoroughly convinced that CCCC waste money and resources, are broke and she knows how to fix this. She focused on Transfer and Basic Skills as her first tasks to address, and created programs that changed the structure of Transfer and Basic Skills, and now wants to do the same with CTE programs. Her recent presentations point to the shortcoming of CTE programs and is using a similar strategy as previous (Transfer and Basic Skills) although the challenge is that not all of her observations are invalid. Attrition rates are high, which is something that we were aware of but many of the reasons are largely beyond our control. By turning the argument around and blaming "us" of how "we" are organizing our programs it invites the legislature to come in and "fix" us. She is very popular in Sacramento and provides legislators a lot of opportunities to present bills at little or no cost to taxpayers, which drums up a lot of support from those legislators supporting education.

The Statewide Senate in the Voc Ed Leadership Groups are concerned about the direction is going. Ms. Shulock's website (http://www.csus.edu/ihelp *"Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy."*) that states "Looking at Promising CTE Policies." In her eyes "promising" means that her models work more effectively than ours, and very much like the Student Success Force, she's looking at states like Florida and Washington to show there are different ways of running CTE programs, which prove to be better than ours. Although, programs in those states are run totally different then in California The primary argument against her assertions is that our community college system function nothing like in Washington or Florida.

Her primary assertion and goals is to have all CTE model the AATAST structure, pushing all CTE into a transfer degree model. Her justification is the attrition and completion rates, and lack of research that complete what they need to go onto a job. These are all true statistics, there is trouble tracking

students, with our attrition rates, and we do have limited resources to conduct research. The problem is that she's using these numbers and arguing that there is something inherent with how CCCC organize CTE and that's the problem, and if the problem is fixed everything will go away. She has also been courting the CSUs to make comparable degrees for CTE at their schools with discussions still ongoing.

The Statewide Senate has prepared several resolutions for the upcoming plenary in support of current CTE models that points out that that "one size does not fit all." We need to be vigilant in supporting different modes of programs, and also have a resolution asking the Chancellors Office to agree to recognize certifications with less than 12 units to begin creating completers if the requirements can be lowered for what is identified as a certificate and a successful college transition. This issue needs to be taken seriously because Ms. Shulock has been successful each time she taken on an issue and the legislature has embraced, which has lead to 3 new laws since she began her work that has been bring her vision of community colleges into fruition.

As Senate President, Ms. Thompson was willing to entertain any resolutions that the faculty would like to create and bring forward to support the movement across the state to protect our various models of CTE. This would sort of force the hand of our Executive Leadership to take a strong position. At the moment we don't have any resolutions that allow that, and resolutions that are passed at the Statewide Senate don't always end in action but give our Statewide President and VP permission to take strong stands on issues. Without a resolution it's more difficult to make the argument with a lawmaker then the Chancellors Office. Ms. Thompson added that if the Bill is written then the only people we can rely on would be our Senators to have them not let this go through, since Governor's look as if they don't care about education if they VETO an educational bill.

Discussion ensued with CTE faculty present and all shared experiences with their programs. As far as attrition rates, students complete the program and move on to full time jobs. One faculty member mentioned that each program should be looked as a case-by-case basis. The core of the CTE is not about transferring, and the fact that there is trouble with tracking completion rates. It's because the programs have been successful that at some point the students leave and becomes employed. The Automotive program experienced a 92% matriculation rate for students moving into automotive positions. ECD has students with a specific course work path. There are also varying goals that students have that that would be dismissed if things changed.

If faculty are interested in putting together a resolution it must be done now. The plenary is scheduled for November 8th and it would need to be approved before presentation.

Discussion will continue at the next meeting.

7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER

7.1 Announcements – None

7.2 2012 Meetings – 2nd and 4th Wed. – Next Meeting: November 14, 2012

7.3 Adjournment – 4:45 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:	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.