# LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
## REGULAR MEETING
Room 4130, Mertes Center for the Arts Building
February 27, 2013, 2:30 p.m.

## APPROVED MINUTES

**PRESENT:** Justin Garoupa, Heike Gecox, Michelle Gonzales, Melissa Korber, Cindy Keune, Craig Kutil, Kevin Lopez (Student Rep), Ashley McHale, Steve Navarro, John Ruys, Sarah Thompson

**GUESTS:** Bob D'Elena, Mona Abdoun, Jill Carbone, Debbie Fields, Ron Johanson, Janice Noble, Rajinder Samra, Scott Vigallon, Diana Rodriguez, and other members of the of the Campus Community

---

**1.0 GENERAL BUSINESS**

**1.1 Call to Order/Quorum:** 2:36 p.m.

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

**MOTION** to reorder the **Agenda** and move to 5.2.
**MSC:** S.Navarro / J.Garoupa / **APPROVED**

**1.3 Approval of Minutes for January 23, 2013**
**MOTION** to **APPROVE** draft minutes from January 23, 2013
**MSC:** C.Kutil / A.McHale / **APPROVED**

**1.4 Public Comments -** None

**2.0 ACTION ITEMS**

**2.1 The LPCAS approves the District Administrative Procedures for Credit by Exam**
**MOTION** to **APPROVE** Administrative Procedure
**MSC:** C.Kutil / J.Ruys

**DISCUSSION:** The new procedure states that a student can complete 75% of their units through credit by exam. That was considered a large percentage and the rationale was questioned. Dr. Noble replied that the sub-committee had looked at best practices throughout the state and because this was seen in several places, the sub-committee felt it was something that could be included in our Administrative Procedure.

**VOTE:** 1 Abstention / **APPROVED**

**2.2 That LPCAS approves the Program Review's Committee's 2013-2014 Planning Cycle Timeline, Template, and Program Effectiveness Plan**
**MOTION** to **APPROVE** Program Review Documentation
**MSC:** C.Kutil / A.McHale / **APPROVED**

**2.3 The LPCAS approves the LPC Substantive Change Proposal**
**MOTION** to **APPROVE** Substantive Change Proposal
**MSC:** C.Kutil / J.Ruys / **APPROVED**

**2.4 The LPCAS approves we use our funds to sponsor two student scholarships of $300.00 each**
**MOTION** to **APPROVE** $300.00 Student Scholarships
**MSC:** C.Kutil / M.Gonzales

**DISCUSSION:** Melissa Korber reported that since the last meeting the Senate's balance is now approximately $1700.00.

**VOTE: APPROVED**

## 3.0 CONSENT ITEMS

**3.1 Stuart McElderry and Frances Hui are serving on the Milanese Grant Committee** – This committee awards funding to programs supporting the Performing Arts and Humanities.

**3.2 Sarah Thompson is serving on the Security Guard Hiring Committee**

**3.3 Sarah Thompson is serving on the Chancellor's Hiring Committee**

**MOTION** to **APPROVE** Consent Items 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3
**MSC:** C.Keune / S.Navarro / **APPROVED**

## 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** – This committee is currently meeting and will be pleased to know that Action Item 2.2 was passed by the Senate.

**4.6 CEMC/Senate Subcommittee –** This CEMC will be meeting on Friday and discussing the apportionment of the extra FTES. All disciplines should have been notified that faculty could apply for additional courses.

Melissa Korber reported that the sub-committee met on Monday and worked on a philosophy and goals. A comprehensive document is being put together by Marilyn Flores, and John Ruys will be working on the template, which also includes a timeline. As for the strategic enrollment management, the committee is taking what information they already have and adding a strategic component based on what is currently happening at the State level. The plan is to present all of this information at this Friday's meeting.

**4.7 Staff Development –** None

**4.8 Hiring Prioritization –** Melissa Korber reported that the recommendations from this committee have been presented to the President, and the committee is meeting again in March.

**4.9 Faculty Association –** Debbie Fields reported that elections are in process through March 11th, and ballots have been placed in mailboxes.

**4.10 Student Senate –** Kevin Lopez reported that the ASLPC Outreach Task Force committee visited Granada High School and the group spoke with high school students as to why they should attend LPC.

The Task Force committee has been recruiting students for the blood drive that began yesterday and continues through today. There seem to be a high number of students interested in donating blood, which was thought to be credited to the free movie tickets and snacks being used as an incentive.

**4.11 Treasurer –** Treasurer's report under Action Item 2.4.

**4.12 President –** Sarah Thompson reported that she and Jeremiah Bodnar have been working on a step-by-step guide that will assist faculty who are working on their AA-T, AS-T degrees. This guide will help with evaluating their current curriculum and walk them through what needs to be done based on the State, and their CID status. It will also include pull-down menus that will provide faculty with options for areas requiring narrative responses when completing the degree application forms.

The question of whether Marina Lira had been increased to 75% to provide additional assistance with articulation still remains a question.

The Planning Task Force Sub-committee is trying to gather all of the final plans for the year that include conceptualizing and starting the Integrated Planning and Accreditation Council. The tasks associated with this committee

have been outlined, and meetings with Sarah and Rajinder Samra have begun with individuals having greater knowledge associated with a specific task. For example: meeting with the President to go over the budgeting process, with VP of Academic Services involving accreditation, Chairs of the allocating committees regarding their time line, Program Review's time line and their current status, etc.

One thing the Planning Task Force Sub-committee has been discussing the Mission, Vision, Values statements, college goals, and reviewing committee structure. The Integrated Planning and Accreditation Council task is to build a structure for accreditation and planning, which there is not one in place at the moment, and steer implementation of State mandates, Title 5, planning process, budgeting, etc. The idea being considered is the same type model as the Program Review where mini updates are submitted then a more intense report after three years. Elena Cole has been asked to draw up a proposal on what the Mission Statement and Governance Review Process might look like if the same model as Program Review is used. With her great deal of experience related to Program Review and the process in general, her knowledge will prove to be very valuable.

Robert Shireman, the keynote speaker at the last ACCA Conference, is associated with California Completes. In his keynote speech at the conference, the LPC Academic Senate was used as an example and described as being irrational, and that our senate felt that freedom of speech was not an important enough issue to discuss, and that documentation can be found in our March 23, 2011 senate minutes. Sarah recapped the support of the Senate, which was quite the opposite.

Our Interim Chancellor and President both mentioned to Sarah that a retraction from Mr. Shireman should be demanded. In order to prove his allegations are incorrect and show our Senate's support for this issue, research would involve going back to various meeting minutes (Chancellor's Council, Senate, Board, and related presentations). Sarah contacted Michelle Pilati, the Statewide Academic President, to share what had happened. Michelle responded by telling Sarah to ignore his comments, and not to engage in a discussion.

Sarah would like the Senate to voice in on the decision of whether to move forward with proving proof of support, or just letting this issue go. Agenda Item under Discussion-New Business 6.3 contains more information.

**4.13 DBSG –** Sarah Thompson reported that the Executive Administrators have met twice more to look at the allocation models. They have come up with a tentative proposal that will be presented on Friday, and are looking at Model 1. This model will have each college keeping their foundation monies from the State, LPC pay the FON penalty, and the percentage received by the

District reduced. The Nursing and Dental Hygiene will be taken off the top, and after LPC has paid the FON penalty we will still be $500,000 under budget. Since we will need to build our faculty numbers, the District has agreed to subsidize our budget.

## 5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS

**5.1 Reviewing Our Committee Structure –** Sarah Thompson included this portion in Report Item 4.12, and added that recommendations for the committee structure will be made but not executed this year, and that the proposals made are effective and easy to implement not rushed through with accomplishing them. There'll be lots of discussion to come when something more concrete is presented.

**5.2 Mission, Vision, and Values Statement – Final Draft Proposed by the Planning Task Force –** Bob D'Elena reported that the Planning Task Force had been working on is the Mission, Vision, and Values Statements and Goals because all appeared to be out of date and needed revision. He mentioned that the Mission statement should be able to be recited, and the current one is a bit difficult to memorize; the Vision statement should describe the college in its ideal state, and our current statement doesn't really address that; and the Values statement is what the college holds near and dear and how the college perceives itself, which the current statement covers. The Goals are suppose to be measurable and over time achievable. The current goals are difficult to measure and impossible to achieve and a request has been made to deactivate them for the time being, and new goals would be developed once the Mission, Vision, and Values statements are in place. The statements were presented at a previous Town Meeting and received lots of feedback.

These statements have already been presented to the College Council and are now going through the shared governance process. Bob presented the proposed statement, which read as follows: *"Las Positas College is an inclusive learning-centered institution providing educational opportunities and support for completion of student's transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals."* The LPC Mission statement was written according to the way the state government defines what community colleges do in today's environment. A glossary of terms was developed to define: Inclusive, Learning-centered, Educational opportunities, and support - as used the in the Mission statement. The committee hopes to move the Mission and glossary of terms forward as a package. During discussion all areas were found to be included except Athletics, which will be added.

The Vision statement was presented and was said to include part of what was in the old Mission statement. It was found to be more of how LPC sees itself as being, and what LPC is striving towards. The Vision statement follows: *"Las Positas College strives to be California's premier Community College,*

*setting the standard through opportunities for developing, knowledge, skills, values, and abilities that foster engaged and contributing members of the society."*

The Values statement reads very much like the old statement with just a few tweaks: "*Las Positas College thrives as a collaborative teaching and learning community committed to integrity and excellence by:*

1. *Encouraging and celebrating lifelong teaching;*
2. *Responding to the needs of the ever-changing workplace;*
3. *Demonstrating civic, social and environmental responsibility;*
4. *Promoting ethical behavior, tolerance and mutual respect in a diverse community;*
5. *Fostering a climate of discovery, creativity and personal development;*
6. *Holding firm to the belief that each of us makes an astonishing difference.*

Discussed was each of the six points listed above. Once the Mission, Vision, and Values statements are approve the next step will be to redevelop the college goals. The goals will be written using the SMART model, which stands for Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time Related. Following this model will ensure that when accreditation rolls around the college can present some measurements and data that can be shared against the goals. The question was asked if when developing time related goals the committee will be looking at short, mid-range and long-term goals. The response was that the goals could be set to be achieved in a semester, year or perhaps longer, and associating a time in which a goal is to be achieved would prove whether it had been accomplished or not. This document is a living document and will be reviewed periodically. If something is passed now that is found not to be useful or it needs to be tweaked, it can be changed.

Discussion turned back to the Mission statement. There was a concern that students taking courses for personal enrichment did not stand out in the statement, although transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical and students with retraining goals were covered. The response was that stating students taking courses for personal enrichment in the Mission would involve tracking and measuring that information and including it in the Goals. Students attending for personal enrichment are covered under the Values statement, which fits better than in the Mission. The comment was made that in reality, the college needs to focus and maintain an awareness that this Mission statement is to allow us to meet what the state desires in a community college, and meet our accreditation process. As long as we stay with that as our focus we'll be ok.

After a pause in the discussion, Sarah added that the statement was a group decision and not made by one person. The Planning Task Force has worked long and hard, and has struggled with this for months. The Senate has gone

through the same conversations with trying to deal with state mandates, accreditation, the purpose of the Mission statement, how it's going to be used in our functionality, where the spirit of the college comes in and how to best express that and at what point. Discussions have been extremely flushed out and in her opinion the committee has tried exceedingly hard to bring in as much community input as possible while at the same time dealing with all the constraints and State realities. This topic is one that is most likely dealt with at other community colleges, and as at LPC, not everyone is agreeable.

During the last call for questions, Scott Vigallon asked if the original Mission statement, prior to being shown at the Town Meeting included consideration for Distance Education while it was being written? The answer was yes, it is listed in the glossary of terms under #1 Inclusive: "Welcoming a diverse group of students including but not limited DSPS,EOPS, Cal Works, International, Multicultural, various Economic Backgrounds, ***Distance Education***, and Life Long Learners; all with varying skill levels, and learning styles", and #3 Education opportunities: include but are not limited to classroom instruction, ***Distance Education instruction***, field trips, guest speakers, student government cultural opportunities, clubs, labs, internships, tutorial services, workshops, library research and mentoring.

Bob stated that the next step in the process is for the Senate's approval. The Planning Task Force has been working on this document for some time and are hoping that the approval and full process can be completed before the end of this semester.

The Mission, Vision, Values statements will be sent out for final comments to all faculty by the Senators, and placed as an action item on the next agenda.

**5.3 Staff Appreciation –** Michelle Gonzales reported that the Academic Senate is on the Classified Senate's agenda to speak about the Staff Appreciation event. Since the next meeting of the classified was found to be too far away for planning purposes, it was suggested that perhaps the classified co-presidents be contacted to help get the word out to the entire classified staff to solicit ideas for the event.

## 6.0 DISCUSSION –NEW BUSINESS

**6.1 New ARCC Reports** – Before Rajinder Samra's presentation, Sarah Thompson explained that the ARCC report is generated by the Researcher and given to the Board of Trustees to let them know how the college is doing with transfer rates, basic skills success, etc. The current ARCC report is a complicated and difficult to understand. The information we report is not compared with every college across the state but with colleges that have similar characteristic rates, and each category is in a different cohort.

There are some changes with the new ARCC reports. One is that the information will be posted on the Chancellor's Office website and able to be viewed by anyone. A concern is that posting this information and how those particular areas are measured will suddenly take on a different meaning since legislators have made changes (with regard to community colleges) using only very little information and plenty of funding to back a bill. Also, the media could make assumptions based on what is available without having the full story.

Rajinder began by first defining the acronym ARCC, which actually stands for Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges and going over the State's new definitions and measurements for student success. The outline of the new accountability framework for 2012-13 has been revised and now includes a "scorecard." This scorecard provides stakeholders with student progress and success metrics that will assist the college with improving its performance. Comparisons using cohorts will no longer be made between colleges. Some of the metrics have changed and recommendations from the Student Success Task Force have been incorporated into the new ARCC report.

After logging onto the ARCC secured website the college's "scorecard," was displayed, and the preliminary data shown in each category was explained in detail. The categories covered Profile (student demographics), Persistence Rates (data generated from tracking first time students for three consecutive semesters), SPAR (Student Progress Achievement Rate) (students who earned a certificate, AA degree, transferred to a 4-year university, or became transferred prepared), Basic Skills (students who are enrolled in remedial Math, English or ESL and completed a college level course in the same discipline), 30 Units (students who have become employed, increased their wage, etc. after having completed 30 units), and CTE (percentage of first time CTE students completing with certificate, award or transfer related outcomes). Reference was made to the sample size of the groups that the data was based on, which could make a substantial difference in what is reported since it is not known if the information was based on 10 or 50 students and can be misinterpreted.

Sarah added that a problem is foreseen with this snapshot data since it does not come with the other type of data that is so important for understanding how the numbers and percentages were derived. Eventually, these numbers will provide longitudinal data with measurements, and 5 years out 5 year trends could be available. Areas such as counselor-student radio, fulltime-part time ratio, funding trends, etc. give context to the measurements and what is provided may be based on only a small section and not longitudinal presentation. The concerns are how this data is going to be used and if it might also be used against us as a college. We will need to find and create

proactive ways of how to explain our data to our local communities since everyone will have access to this information.

**6.2 Evaluation of the Efficiency or Efficacy of our Current Senate Structure –** Sarah Thompson mentioned if the college is looking at making improvements and ways of looking at how well the college functions, perhaps evaluating how committee members are selected would make a good starting place. The selection of committee members has generally been on a voluntary basis. The fact is that the amount of work differs from one committee to another and in some cases has been grossly underestimated. Other committees are suffering from extreme absenteeism with one chair stating that their absent rate averages around 75%. Feedback is necessary from not only faculty, but from those who are trying to help these committees become functional to figure ways of improving the process. Sarah mentioned not knowing how widespread the problem really is, and if there were to be a change she would want to know that there was broad support in favor of this.

The contractual commitment of fulfilling the required number of hours per year can be made up in other areas not related to serving on committees. Also, there has not been any rehiring of faculty and not enough faculty left to serve on the various committees. Also, there is too much work to be done for the few people that are left, which might be one of the reasons for the high absenteeism rate. Starting with all the committees and looking at the time spent by a typical person would provide an idea of how much time is really spent.

Discussion continued with first filling in the membership on the more crucial committees then working down to those easily filled. Chabot's model was mentioned and is one where meetings are held at a set time, and classes do not meet so that faculty can attend. The consensus was to have the Planning Task Force look into assigning hours to committees.

**6.3 The LPC Senate and California Competes –** Do not respond to Robert Shireman. His reputation is known by many.

## 7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER

**7.1 Announcements –** None

**7.2 2013 Meetings:** 2nd and 4th Wednesday – Next Meeting: March 13, 2013

**7.3 Adjournment:** 4:30 p.m.
**MOTION** to **ADJOURN**
**MSC:** C.Kutil / J.Garoupa / **APPROVED**

* * * * *

## ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

| EXECUTIVE OFICERS | | ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Senate President: | Sarah Thompson | ALSS: | Michelle Gonzales |
| Senate Vice President: | Elena Cole | STEMPS: | Cindy Keune, Craig Kutil, Ashley McHale, Eric Harpell |
| Senate Secretary: | Justin Garoupa | | |
| Senate Treasurer: | Melissa Korber | BSBA: | John Ruys, Steve Navarro |
| Senate Admin Assist: | Carmen McCauley | Counseling: | Heike Gecox |
| | | ASLPC Rep: | Kevin Lopez |

* * * * *

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.