Dear Chancellor Jackson,

As you are aware, the Las Positas College Academic Senate has discussed its response to the Chabot Academic Senate's vote of no confidence. After polling faculty, the LPC Senate has decided to invite you to a special meeting to discuss our concerns. The goals will be to improve communications and to address those concerns, some of which are impacting our ability to serve students.

This will confirm that you are available to meet with us on Wednesday, January 31, 2018 at 3 p.m. We will let you know the meeting room soon.

So that you can be prepared for the discussion, we have outlined some of the concerns below.

Although this action is instead of joining in Chabot's vote of no confidence or drafting our own, we view these concerns as serious and as in need of your immediate attention.

1. Stewardship of the District Office

The Issue: This fall, we learned that Chabot College spent $2.5 million over its allotted budget. This impacts both colleges' ability to offer classes and to serve students. Both Chabot and the District Office are responsible for this, and both Chabot and the District Office must help to address this shortfall. Further, this should not negatively impact Las Positas College, which through its administrators, faculty leaders, and committees has exercised fiscal responsibility.

Proposed Outcomes: This should impact future budgeting decisions, especially related to Enrollment Management and the Budget Allocation Model. Through fiscal responsibility, Las Positas College has earned the right to a fair and equitable allocation of funding.

2. Shared Governance

The Issue: The District does not welcome input from the colleges, and in fact seeks to ignore input from the colleges at multiple junctures. There are many examples of this, but a few notable ones are

- On December 20, 2017, and January 9, 2018, I emailed you about setting up a meeting with the Senate. I did not receive a response to the email, although on Friday, January 26, 2018, Guiselle Nunez contacted me about setting up a meeting. Faculty at Las Positas College want to move forward in a positive way, and this meeting could be the start of that. Good communication is essential.
- In 2017, the Integrated Plan was completed at Las Positas College. The District executive staff were asked if they had input in August 2017 but did not provide any. The LPC Academic Senate approved the plan in fall 2017. After this occurred, the District provided late feedback, asking the College to

revise the plan to align it with the Vision for Success, creating additional work and a secondary approval process. Although input and feedback are desirable, timeliness is essential.

- In 2017, the District did not consult with the colleges on the District's Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative, did not present the full plan to the colleges, and ignored input from the colleges at Chancellor's Council. This was especially a concern related to the plan to explore institutional research at the District level.
- The Facilities Master Plan originated from the District. It should have a more clearly defined process using shared governance and a procedure that ensures that College needs are being planned for and met.
- In 2016, the District created for approval by the Board of Trustees a new District policy on the student grievances without any collegial consultation or vetting. The new policy, BP 5530, has created problems with this process, directly impacting students and faculty.
- In 2015, the District asked for feedback on the District-wide Strategic Plan and then ignored our feedback. At LPC, a task force worked many hours and provided substantial feedback, striving to align the District plan with the Educational Master Plans adopted by LPC and Chabot. We also pointed out some factual errors in the plan. Our suggestions were not integrated into the final plan adopted by the District.

Proposed Outcomes: We need more timely and effective communication methods. Our shared governance structures give faculty a strong voice in the work of the District, and this needs to be acknowledged and respected. In return, we hope to build relationships so that the work done by the District office and by our sister College is also acknowledged and respected. We cannot emphasize enough how important open communication is as we move forward.

3. Leadership

The Issue: As set forth in more detail in the Chabot Resolution, under the Chancellor's leadership, the Chancellor often makes unilateral decisions regarding the allocation of resources to the sites, and this has a negative impact on the colleges. Most noteworthy:

- **Planning and Budget Recommendations:** The well-considered recommendations of the Planning and Budget Committee are often not followed, which serves to negate the idea that the Budget Allocation Model is the mechanism by which State General Apportionment dollars are allocated to the four sites. Specifically, the chancellor and the District have refused recommendations that significant portions of (a) Base Increase dollars, (b) Unfunded Mandate dollars, and (c) "Rolled back" FTES dollars flow through the BAM to the sites.
- **Classroom Productivity Expectations:** When the BAM was implemented in 2013, FTEF was "allocated" to the campuses at 530 WSCH/FTEF. There should be a clear recognition that 530 WSCH/FTEF is not realistic unless

there is a recession. Standard productivity is in the realm of 480 to 490 WSCH/FTEF. As set forth in Chabot's resolution, the District needs to respond to changing economic conditions in a timely manner. A failure to respond strains College budgets and creates an inability to fund the additional class sections required to meet enrollment targets.

- **Professionalism:** In fall 2017, the Chancellor asked LPC Student Government leaders to meet her at DMV instead of holding the scheduled meeting in her office. Although this doesn't impact the Academic Senate directly, it doesn't convey respect for students or professionalism.
- **Support and Staffing:** Here are a few examples of concerns.
    - Even though Las Positas College is growing, the funding and staffing allocated to the College often does not fairly reflect that growth. This is especially true with respect to the Faculty Obligation Number and with staffing. After the recession, Las Positas College did not hire any new faculty in response to fiscal concerns about the District. This inequity has been carried forward over the years rather than addressed. Las Positas College's Faculty Obligation Number should directly correspond with the students it serves.
    - In addition, a common response from the District Office when the College wants to hire someone to provide necessary support is that the two colleges' structures must be the same. This occurred in 2016-17 when Las Positas College sought to hire someone to support the Academic Senate, a contractually required obligation of the District. Despite the best efforts of Las Positas College administrators and faculty, this could not be accomplished until November 2017, approximately 17 months after the classified professional who previously provided support to the Academic Senate retired.
    - Better District-level facilitation of grants and allowing the colleges flexibility in grant administration would benefit students and programs.

Proposed Outcomes: As with the other issues, the goal is to raise awareness and to improve communication. Of course, some processes may need to be improved as well, but we need to begin to talk about the issues so that we can move forward productively.

Thank you for your time and attention. We look forward to meeting with you.

Melissa Korber
Academic Senate President
Mass Communications Faculty and Program Coordinator
Adviser to the Express Newspaper, Naked Magazine, and the LPC Literary Anthology
Las Positas College

3000 Campus Hill Drive
Livermore, CA 94551

(925) 424-1242
mkorber@laspositascollege.edu