



**Integrated Planning Committee**  
**Friday, April 17, 2015**  
**9:00 AM – 1:00 PM | Room 1687**

**LPC 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.



**LPC Focus Goals**

- ❖ Equity
- ❖ Excellence
- ❖ Completion

**LPC Planning Priorities**

- ❖ Support for the curriculum process
- ❖ Technology utilization with an emphasis on staff development
- ❖ Success and persistence through the Basic Skills sequence
- ❖ Accreditation

**Voting Members: 10**

**Quorum: 0 \*(Chairs do not count)**

Name	Representation	Present	Name	Representation	Present
Diana Rodriguez	Vice President	*Chair	Mike Sato	Faculty, Student Services	X
Rajinder Samra	Researcher		Colin Schatz	Faculty, Academic Div.	
Jeff Kingston	Admin. Svc. Administrator		John Ruys	Faculty, Academic Div.	X
Dr. Lisa Everett	Dean		Scott Miner	Faculty, Academic Div.	X
Frances DeNisco	Classified Senate		Rafi Ansari	Faculty, CTE Discipline	X
Todd Steffan	Classified Senate	X	Eric Pineda	Student Senate	
	Classified Senate			Student Senate	
	Classified Senate				

**Non-voting Members:**

Name	Representation	Present	Name	Representation	Present
Dr. Barry Russell	President		Dr. Thomas Orf	Academic Senate President*	
Rajinder Samra	Co-Chair	X	Rafi Ansari	Student Senate President*	X
Sarah Thompson	Co-Chair	X	Frances DeNisco	Classified Senate President*	X
Name	Faculty Association				
Name	SEIU Representative				

**Other(s) present:**

Donna Alaoen, AA President's Office (minutes)  
 Karin Spirn – Program Review Committee Representative  
 David Rodriguez – Research Analyst

**Minutes**

<b>1. Welcome</b>	Rajinder opened the meeting at 9:15 a.m.
<b>2. Review and Approval of Agenda</b>	The agenda was <b>NOT</b> approved.... <b>Quorum not met</b> Moved / <b>N/A</b> / Seconded / <b>N/A</b> / All in favor
<b>3. Review and Approval of Minutes</b>	The <b>JANUARY</b> minutes were <b>NOT</b> approved... <b>Quorum not met</b> Moved / <b>N/A</b> / Seconded / <b>N/A</b> / All in favor

	<p>The <b>FEBRUARY</b> minutes were <b>NOT</b> approved... <i>Quorum not met</i>  Moved / <u>N/A</u> / Seconded / <u>N/A</u> / All in favor</p> <p>The <b>MARCH</b> minutes were <b>NOT</b> approved... <i>Quorum not met</i>  Moved / <u>N/A</u> / Seconded / <u>N/A</u> / All in favor</p>
<p><b>4. New Business</b></p>	
<p><b>A. Presentations to inform 2015 – 16 college planning priorities</b></p>	<p>i. <b>Student Learning Outcomes</b> – The meeting begins by reviewing a report of College-wide Achievement of Student Learning Outcomes by Core Competency for academic year 2013 -2014. The report shows that creativity has the highest mastery and communication had the lowest mastery. The committee also acknowledged that critical thinking was assessed most often and creativity and aesthetics was assessed least often. Given that information Rajinder asks the question: how do we use this information; can we use this information; and in what way can we use this information in forming our planning priorities. Sara expresses her concern of the challenges of how the information is interpreted and defined. The committee further clarifies how the categories relate to the ranking system. Scott Miner comments that in his industry there is either a pass or fail. Sara expresses that the survey is a disservice to the reporting structure because there are definitely more core competencies and by having to select one it means that we are looking at underrepresentation and skewed numbers in terms of mastery and lack of achievement. The committee was in agreement that the demonstrated numbers in this report vary from course to course. Sara suggested that these values need to be attached to actual students and actual graduates and create an exit pie chart demonstrating whether we touched all of the core competencies. Rajinder states that there is a self-report survey of graduates assessing how much progress they made in these core competencies.</p> <p>ii. <b>Environmental Scan, Status of Institution-Set Standards, Student Success Scorecard</b> – Rajinder presents the data presented the environmental scan and pointed out that during 2009 – 2011 the enrollment rate for women decreased tremendously. Frances DeNisco raised the question if there were any changes with the state funding and CalWorks that could have possibility affected enrollment during 2009 - 2011. Rajinder explains that the affect was minimal to the change of enrollment for females. He later explains that the data revealed that 4,900 fewer seats filled coming from 3 subjects: Physical Education, Health and Psychology Counseling. Both the Health and Psychology Counseling had women enrolled in majority. In Physical Education, women enrollment was the majority prior to 2009 and by 2011 the men took the majority of the enrollment in those classes. Sara explains how cuts to the PE/Health department occurred during the hard times of the financial crisis. The subjects of physical education and health both fell into the outer circle of the priority list in relation to UC/CSU transferable courses, basic skills competency, GE requirement, etc. Rajinder commented that the requirement for physical education or wellness was removed from the required courses for graduation.</p> <p>Rajinder continues to present that the city of Tracy has had a huge number of student enroll at Las Positas College. Rafi Ansari was asked to elaborate what the students were saying about this trend. Rafi stated that students suggested that the students from Tracy found it hard to get into classes at San Joaquin Delta Community College and that the school was in an “unsafe” area. Students from Pleasanton were more likely going to Diablo Valley College. The population in Pleasanton has grown through 2012 to 2014 but the numbers of enrollment have dropped. Karin</p>

expressed her concern on the numbers of Pleasanton enrollees where they have dropped but seem to continue to drop with no sight of significant growth in enrollment from Pleasanton students. David elaborated that Dublin appears to have more options as far as where the students can attend versus Pleasanton. Sara asked if Tracy is in the build to service area and states that this would be a great area to expand into. Scott Miner comments that Tracy lies in the San Joaquin jurisdiction and will not allow us to expand. This proposes a problem in our district because we service a big portion of Tracy students and are unable to request bond support since the jurisdictions are not within our reach. Sara Thompson mentions the possibility of changes in acceptance of concurrent enrollment could have had an effect on Pleasanton enrollment numbers. Rajinder states that we meet all of the institutional set standards but lack of certificates awarded.

Rajinder continues discussion of the student success scorecard. He goes on to explain that they are very few students that are shown reported when it comes to the scorecard. There are definitely challenges in English and Math. The audience of the Student Success Scorecard are Board of Trustees, parents, students, legislators, etc. as clarified by Rajinder. He explains that the term "prepared" is defined by course-taking pattern versus using assessment tests.

- iii. **State Required Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness** – Rajinder explains we have been asked to report on the following categories for state required indicators: course completion rate; accreditation status; fund and balance; and overall auditing. Rajinder expressed his concern that both categories of fund and balance and overall auditing are should be reviewed by district wide indicators and our campus cannot assess them and the Chancellor agreed. Sara asked how course completion is measured and Rajinder responds that it is measured in percentages and is annualized at any time of the year. The data needs to entered by June 15 and posted by June 30 as required by registration. The data will be going to the May Board meeting as information only.
- iv. **2014-15 Planning Priorities Survey Results** – Rajinder reports that most survey takers felt that the IPC committee was doing good or excellent progress in which contradicted with those individuals he talked to. Sara commented that this may not be something that affects everyone and there is a disproportion impact on the curriculum committee itself in which they are really the owners of whether or not the process is providing some alleviation. In terms of rating LPC's progress in addressing the planning priorities regarding curriculum, the survey resulted a need in hiring an accreditation officer and a curriculum officer under Academic Services; more faculty, especially in single person disciplines; more staff support such as Assistant Deans; more staff development in regards to curriculum; more support for Academic Services; and more interest from Administrators above the Dean level. In terms of the process of curriculum, the report suggested streamlining the curriculum process would be good but it also suggested that there wasn't much that can be done due to its nature and California rules. The survey results also suggested that the priority was too generic and unclear. The survey also resulted that technology usage was not as aggressive and it did not seem as a priority. Some workshops were offered but based on faculty interested and was not coordinated through the staff development committee with no additional support provided for this priority. There also needs to be staff development support regards to Banner, Degree Works, Outlook, Access, etc. which provides teaching methods and knowledge. Frances suggested that after the goals have been decided, a committee should cross reference what has been completed in regards to those goals. Sara states that College

Council is responsible for performing that. In regards to accreditation, the survey results suggested that most felt that it too long to focus on the process; more engagement from the campus was needed; and technology assistance would have been helpful in collaborating and putting together the report. Rajinder comments that we have not yet set up a process that is effective and sustainable years prior to the accreditation site visit. Sara suggested that when we create the priorities we should already have an understanding of who will be the target individuals will be for helping us understand how much progress was made. Frances suggested maybe having 2 year goals so that there will be enough time to assess what has been completed. Sara confirmed that the goals are 1 -2 year goals so that there was enough time to assess those goals. Sara expresses that there will need to be a discussion about how the district-wide master plan will impact and shape our College Educational Master Plan. Rajinder states that at this time the College Educational Master Plan has nine goals. The college as a whole will need to go through process of feedback to determine which ones the college will focus on.

John Ruys was asked to report on the SLOs update. The SLO committee has been asking faculty to enter their SLO information as soon as possible so that the information can be assessed. At this time, we are at 79% toward our 100% goal. The common ground group came up with some suggestions on how to move the SLO process effectively. Measurable objectives for some courses were found to be similar or the same as SLO data and understand program outcome results and how to use this information in program review planning might encourage faculty to write SLO's. Additional flex days and staff development time is being identified to assist faculty and discuss with them SLO results. A set of recommendations to assist faculty with and moving forward with developing SLO data and measurable objectives will soon be shared. Another recommendation would be to suggest faculty include either SLO or measures objectives on their course syllabi, since this is an accreditation requirement. Program Review Committee, Curriculum Committee and SLO Committee are in agreement that there is a critical need for additional support and will be making a recommendation to hire an individual to help support those committees and their functions. Accreditation Taskforce and the SLO Committee will continue to look at improving the process and make recommendations when necessary.

v. ***Prioritization of Resource Requests Feedback Form Results*** – The results showed that the planning priorities were not clearly defined therefore the committees did not find them useful. The committee did not know what support was needed, how to request support, or how the committee should make the needs known regarding the objectives of the committee. Rajinder suggests that there will need to be an implementation plan where the problem is clearly defined, identify the key holders and ensure that they are aware of the problem; and provide solutions to correct it. Rajinder concludes the discussion with next steps to create an implementation plan and how College Council will implement that plan as well as obtaining feedback from stakeholders. Sara suggests to encourage the Executive Staff team to answer these questions in efforts to gather the information to be able to formulate an implementation plan. Scott suggested the possibility of having an administrator designee to one planning priority. Sara comments and suggests that it should be taken up a level to the administrators who are in charge of making those decisions as the President and Vice Presidents.

vi. ***Program Review Mapping Exercise Results*** – The committee participated in an exercise in order to get the committees feedback on what

	<p>priorities should be for the upcoming year. The committee was instructed to outline each priority for each division and post it under the division planning umbrella. The goals and priorities were gathered from each presentation in the following categories: last year's priorities, accreditation, environmental scan, Student Equity Plan, facilities plan, technology plan and Student Success &amp; Support Program Plan. With the gathered information, Sara suggested forming the language of the planning priorities at the next meeting.</p> <p>The outcome of this exercise lead to four categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student Learning Outcomes – John Ruys</li> <li>2. Processes of Accreditation – Mike Sato</li> <li>3. Support for Curriculum – Sara Thompson</li> <li>4. Basic Skills &amp; Tutorials – Karin Spirn</li> </ol> <p>Rajinder commented that he would like to present this to the President and possibly releasing the information during May Town meeting for the campus to know as well. The committee strongly felt that more research should be done before it is presented to the campus and administrators. They expressed that May Town meeting was too early and that Convocation would be a much suitable time to communicate the information. Rajinder concluded the discussion that a member of the committee be assigned to each of the above categories and present their findings at the next meeting. Rajinder also confirms that the committee should be able to present to the President by the end of May.</p>
<b>B. Recommendation of 2015-16 college planning priorities</b>	N/A
<b>C. Committee tasks for 2015-16</b>	N/A
<b>D. Selection of Co-Chairs for 2015-16</b>	N/A
<b>5. Good of the order</b>	None
<b>6. Adjournment</b>	The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.
<b>Next Regular Meeting:</b> <i>Friday, May 15, 2015</i>	