LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
REGULAR MEETING
Room 4129, Mertes Center for the Arts Building
October 9, 2013 – 2:30 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Mona Abdoun, Rajeev Chopra, Elena Cole, Debbie Fields, Heike Gecox, Cindy Keune, Kevin Lopez (Student Rep), Thomas Orf

GUESTS: Nan Ho, Tina Inzerilla, Barbara Morrissery Janice Noble, Paula Schoenecker

---

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: 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, and then 6.2 after Consent Items 3.0.
MSC: C.Keune / H.Gecox /**APPROVED**

1.3 Approval of Minutes from September 25, 2013
MOTION to **APPROVE** Draft Minutes
MSC: C.Keune / M.Abdoun /**APPROVED**

1.4 Public Comments – Tina Inzerilla was in attendance to express the library's concern that the librarian position not being deemed an "emergency replacement," and asked for the definition of an "emergency replacement." The library program is a critical part of the college and the accreditation process. She then listed what the library faculty do in addition to reference, one-on-one instruction, and library assignment-specific orientations:

~ Library program is cross-disciplinary;
~ New Library catalog management system will be implemented January 2014 – the librarians will be working with faculty to make sure they have the correct links for their courses;
~ Library remodel project;
~ Embedded librarian program/information competency which involves collaborating with faculty;
~ Operate the learning resource center building 50 hours a week;
~ Work closely with classified to operate the library;
~ Manage a budget for library resources;
~ Run library website as an instructional tool;
~ Manage database vendor requirements for student access;

~ Run the integrated library system (similar to Banner);
~ Participate in learning communities such as Puente;
~ Teach research skills classes;
~ Support APA and MLA citation instruction to students and faculty.

She concluded by saying that when a library faculty member retires there is no direct correlation of part-time library faculty hours provided back to the library program to cover the retired librarian's hours.

2.0 ACTION ITEMS – None

3.0 CONSENT ITEMS – None

MOTION made to **REORDER** the Agenda as previously approved and address Agenda Item 4.1 before 6.2.
MSC: R.Chopra / D.Fields /**APPROVED**

4.0 REPORTS

4.1 BaSk Committee – Paula Schoenecker reported that the end of the year report has just been completed, and ready to be sent to the State. It consists of a narrative that outlines what the BaSk Committee has been assessing, what has worked, what has not, and how the committee has been handling the obstacles it has faced. Included is a data analysis of the BaSk program and a budget application with the Committee's plans for the future.

At the end of last year, Paula had announced that she had just been appointed Chair of the BaSk committee and would be reviewing the charge of the committee, the initiative itself, reviewing input from the State, and meeting with Lisa Everett (former Chair of the Bask committee). It came to light that the Committee's focus had been placed on funding mini projects in order to provide the opportunity for faculty to try "new things." This year the focus will be placed on supporting larger projects, one of which will be the Tutorial Center. Meetings have been held with the deans, VP of Academic Services, and others to determine what can be done to better support the Center on a long-range basis without the use of contingency money, and to augment and inundate the services provided by the Center in support of students. The Committee will keep in mind some of the recommendations from the State involving student success that are not mandated, but may become in the future. The BaSk receives the basic amount of funding from the State each year of $90,000.00.

4.2 DE Committee – A DE Report submitted by Scott Vigallon is attached at the end of this set of minutes.

4.3 Staff Development Committee – None

4.4 CEMC – Thomas Orf mentioned that information will be coming soon from LaVaughn Hart regarding starting the process for next year's schedule. The FTES number for the entire District is 16,362, which is a 1.63% increase from the prior year. More information will be known after the CEMC meets this Friday.

4.5 Faculty Association – None

4.6 Student Senate – Kevin Lopez reported that Club Day was held on October 2nd, and the Senate is beginning to prepare for their next event.

4.7 Treasurer – None
4.8 President – None

4.9 DBSG – Thomas Orf reported that the DBSG committee has not yet met, although the Chancellor's Workgroup of about 15 members have met to begin ironing out some items. With the new allocation model in place, policies have to be developed regarding how reallocates will be decided and other issues that may come up that involve the District and the two colleges.

5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS

5.1 College Taskforce – Elena Cole reported that the Taskforce has come up with a charge and committee makeup and has not yet received the final draft. Once received, she will forward it to the Senate for prior review and discussion. She did mention the Taskforce is planning on having the Integrated Planning Committee up and running in Spring 2014.

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

6.0 DISCUSSION – NEW BUSINESS

6.1 Hiring Prioritization Rankings – Nan Ho presented the position rankings of the Hiring Prioritization Committee to the Senate. She went over charge, and the mission the Committee goes through to address the many different requests that are submitted for review to make certain the Committee adheres to following the process.

Nan covered the section referring to Emergency Replacements, which includes retirements. An Emergency Replacement refers to a full-time position that is vacated unexpectedly. The process is the same with having to complete the form and submit to the Committee. There is also a section for an explanation of why the position request is deemed an emergency requiring immediate action. This year the

Committee received a request for an Emergency Replacement and mid-year Retirement Replacement. The information submitted for each request was reviewed and discussed to decide whether to proceed with replacements or place in the general pool. Nan shared the position rankings with those present and mentioned that the Committee had received a request for an Emergency Replacement from Athletics and the Library. Before continuing with the rankings in the general pool, she shared the decision made separately by the Committee, for the two Emergency Replacement requests.

The Committee carefully reviewed the request for an Emergency Replacement for the Men's Head Basketball Coach Tony Castillo, who recently passed away. Considered was the recruiting for this sport based on the season, and other factors. The Committee voted to recommend the position to be an emergency replacement and recommended immediate replacement of this position.

The other request for an emergency replacement was from the Library for the Mid-Year Retirement of Cheryl Warren. The Committee carefully reviewed and discussed if the request constituted an emergency, and how that would compare to other retirements that have also been very devastating on some departments that have lost the ability to run programs, etc. Based on a lot of discussion, the Committee decided that this position would be placed in the general pool.

The process now is to present the rankings to the Senate for their recommendation. Any issues would go back to the Committee who would reconvene to discuss. If there are none, the list moves forward to the President who has the ultimate decision.

About 50% of the requests are replacements for positions vacated by full-time faculty who retired from as far back as 8 years. The rankings and the recommendation for an emergency replacement will now be presented as two separate items at the next division meetings and discussed. Feedback from faculty will be shared at the next Senate meeting, and the Senate will discuss and decide on a recommendation.

Discussion ensued which noted the situation of the Committee having to decide on an emergency replacement. How did the Committee come up with a decision? What guidelines were used? Where is it written? A suggestion to remove the word "retirement" from the section requesting an emergency replacement was made, and to perhaps review the process currently in place.

6.2 Board Policies Requiring Ratification – Mr. Jeff Kingston was in attendance to explain the need to update the Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. Not having been updated since 1996 have made these documents out of compliance and not within the boundaries of Title V, Ed Code, and changes in State Senate Bills. At the last accreditation the outdated polices were mentioned and the District has been working for the past several months moving forward with updating all 7 Chapters.

At this meeting copies with the name and number of the board policies and procedures contained in Chapter 4 (Academic Affairs) and Chapter 5 (Student Services) were distributed, with a tracking chart showing the progress of each document's review. A complete list of these documents is located on the District's website under Educational Planning, on the Internet, and LPC Senate Office who was provided with a binder containing hard copies, and a flash drive. The policies and procedures contained on the flash drive have referenced the laws and codes associated with each document.

The policies will need to be ratified by both the LPC and Chabot Senates to have consistency across the District. The review can be by the Senate as a whole, or by selecting two representatives from each college to be the voice of the "group." Mr. Kingston's suggestion was to ask for two faculty representatives from each college to work with him, and Jane Wright, to review the policies that are connected to 10+1. He explained the color coding to indicate the progress made thus far. Highlighted yellow meant the board policies are related to 10+1, the original language is shown in black lettering, the red lettering is what legally needs to be written in the policy, the green lettering is language that has been added during the administrative review, and suggested that the senates' select their own color to distinguish their changes. The review would be at the District Office and take approximately two to three afternoons, or can be done in 2-3 hour blocks (morning or afternoon).

It is hoped that this process can be completed by the end of this semester to keep with the accreditation track, and begin operating under current board policies and procedures. Thomas Orf has volunteered to assist with the review. One other person is still needed.

6.3 Beginning Information for Accreditation – Dr. Janice Noble attended this meeting to give an update on the College's accreditation, which is two years out. She briefly went over the Mapped Standards and explained that from the previous accreditation, Standards had been identified and linked to a committee or a unit. That list was revised and a cover letter with additional information was sent out on or around September 10th to those committees or units. Later in the semester those groups will be asked to submit a descriptive summary of the progress made for that standard, and include supporting evidence. The information is to be based on the last four years, which was the last accreditation site visit. A total of ten Chairs and/or Co-Chairs will be needed.

A The ACCJC will host a workshop on October 25th at San Joaquin Delta College for colleges preparing for accreditation. New Standards will be introduced, and it is not certain if the colleges' will be expected to write to the current or the new Standards. The time line for Self-Evaluation Report is below:

Fall 2013 – Select Accreditation Chairs
Spring 2014 – Pre-Accreditation Review
Summer 2014 – Begin Writing Self-Accreditation Sections

Summer 2014 – Select Editor
December 2014 – Complete Draft Self-Evaluation Report
Spring 2015 – Editor Review
Spring/Summer 2015 – Vet through Participatory Governance Process
August 2015 – Submit Report to ACCJC

Additional accreditation information will be shared at the next Town Meeting.

6.4 ACCJC Senate Resolution – Thomas Orf presented a resolution that was drawn up by the local senates' related to the action taken by the ACCJC toward City College of San Francisco. The senator's will be presenting this at the division meetings, bring feedback to the next Senate meeting for discussion before voting.

7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER

7.1 Announcements –
~ Talking Points for this meeting will include:
* Senate Resolution
* Hiring Prioritization Committee Rankings
* Board and Administrative Policies

7.2 Meetings – Next meeting October 23, 2013

7.3 Adjournment – 4:40 p.m.
MOTION to **ADJOURN**
MSC: C.Keune / E.Cole / **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.

Distance Education Committee Report

Report from DE meeting on Sept. 27, 2013
Submitted by Scott Vigallon on Sept. 27, 2013

- **Accreditation preparation:** Dr. Noble sent materials for a Pre-Accreditation Review that should begin this year in preparation for writing our Self-Evaluation Report in 2014-15 and site visit in October 2015. Standards have been mapped to relevant committees, and our committee was given Standard section IIA1b, which reads: "The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students." We are being asked to review the standard section, evaluate whether or not the college meets the standard, and note any actions needed for improvements. Later this academic year, we will be asked to provide a Descriptive Summary that reviews what actions LPC has taken to meet the standard based on our review and analysis of compliance to the standard. The Summary will be followed by a Self-Evaluation that states whether or not the college meets the standard, and we are to identify any items that require Action/Improvement Plans. We will need to collect evidence to support our writeup. We are supposed to collaborate with the Curriculum Committee on this project. Scott will complete the Pre-Accreditation Review and present it to the committee at the Oct. meeting.
- **Final DE Waitlist wording:** Last month, we made several changes to the wording. Chabot's COOL committee was fine with the changes, but its members added a brief definition of online/hybrid courses, a note about checking the meeting dates for hybrids, as well as a few other minor wording changes. The committee was fine with Chabot's changes, but added a bit of verbiage to make clearer what the student should send to the instructor in the email query. The additions will be sent back to Chabot for review.
- **Class-Web page for DE students:** The latest version, with Chabot's edits, was demonstrated. Among the features: an explanation at the top, a checkbox to acknowledge the statements, and a Submit button at the bottom. Students will not be able to click Submit without checking the acknowledgement box. If they click Submit without checking the box, they will be prompted with a message that says: "Please check the box below to acknowledge that you have read the above statements, and click Submit." If students exit out of the screen without doing either, they can still register for a DE class. A question was asked about if the page pops up before the student registers for a DE class, or does it just show up afterwards as a link that appears in Class-Web for him? The question will be forwarded to District ITS. If the answer is former, then the committee would like to see the new page implemented for Spring 2014.
- **Bb upgrades:** At our August meeting, we decided to check with Chabot about upgrading to version 9.1 Service Pack 13 between the Fall and Spring semesters before polling our Bb instructors about it. Chabot's COOL Committee is OK with the upgrade at that time. Our committee decided that instead of polling our Bb instructors, we would tell them that we plan to upgrade between semesters, tell them the pros and cons of upgrading, give them information about the new features, give them access to the test server that will have SP13 on it, and ask if they have any concerns. Those concerns will be shared with the committee, and because we still have to offer training this semester, we will try to make a decision before our October meeting. Live training can be conducted in the TLC and online via CCC Confer.
- **DE goals:** At our August meeting, we identified three goals to work on this year: 1. Promote library resources for DE classes; 2. Increase participation in the student survey for course evaluations; and 3. Investigate the offering of MOOCs. Work on the first goal is already underway. For the second, it was mentioned that the upgraded version of Blackboard has a survey tool that might be used. The idea is that if students used Blackboard instead of Class-Web to complete the student survey, participation might be higher. Any changes have to run by the FA first. Discussion about the offering of MOOCs was tabled until the October meeting.
- **Spring success and retention rates:** For the third consecutive year, LPC set a milestone in its retention rates among DE students. For the first time in either a fall or spring semester, the retention rate reached 82% in Spring 2013. The previous high mark was 80% achieved during Spring 2012. The 82% also matched the highest for any semester, including summer sessions. Rates for summer students, which, because they involve different variables than for fall or spring students, tend to be higher, so this makes the achievement even more impressive. The 82% retention mark for summer was set in Summer 2012. The retention and success rates for Fall 2012 were 78% and 60%, respectively, which matched LPC records for a fall semester set in Fall 2011.