LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council

February 16, 2012
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

MINUTES

Present: Bob Kratochvil, Jeff Baker, Jan Noble, Jacob Park, Amir Salehzadeh, Tom Orf, Tina Inzerilla, Scott Miner, Rajinder Samra, Jane McCoy, Jennifer Adams

---

1. **Review & Approval of Minutes – December 2011**
   The Council members reviewed the minutes from the meeting in December. There was a request to clarify some of the language in agenda item "CCN Memo Re: Campus-wide Emails" (#3a, paragraph 3), so that it reflected the fact that the suggestion to eliminate the "Everyone" email group came from the committee discussion and not a specific committee member.

   Motion: *To approve the minutes, with the noted change, from the December 2011 meeting.*
   MSC: *Salehzadeh/Park*
   Vote: *Approved (with two abstentions; McCoy, Orf)*

2. **Old Business**
   a. **Institutional Planning & Effectiveness**
      i. **Accreditation – Update on the Midterm Report**
      Vice President Noble reported that the College is on track with its timeline for work on the Midterm Report. She provided the Council members with an update on Accreditation and the institution's efforts to date:
      - Accreditation Teams will meet again during the Second Hour Workshops (after Town Meeting). Info will be shared from two recent conferences and teams will have an opportunity to present their progress toward responding to the Midterm Report requirements.
      - Each team has been provided with a worksheet that defines the scope of responses required. Team Leaders will be asked to provide the foundation for the development of the Midterm Report.
      - The Annual Report and Fiscal Report are due for submission to ACCJC/WASC on March 31, 2012 from the President. Information was received on February 24, and several sectors will need to participate in the gathering of this data.
      - As the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), Vice President Noble attended two conferences presented by ACCJC/WASC during February. The first was sponsored by the State-wide Academic Senate Foundation and titled "From Product to Process: Accreditation for the Common Good." This covered such topics as Accreditation 101, The Accreditation Team, Mapping Degree, Certificate and Program Assessment, The Substantive Change Process, Proficiency into Practice, and other relevant topics.

        The second one-day presentation was hosted by LPC for those local community colleges that will enter the Accreditation Visit cycle this year. Presentations focused on expectations of the self-evaluation document. Info from both events will be shared at the March Second Hour Workshops.

        A one-day presentation sponsored by ACCJC/WASC for new ALOs is planned for March 20, 2012 at Diablo Valley College. Dr. Noble is registered to attend.

- The Team Leader for Recommendation #5 (Ethics Statement) received ethics statements from the administrative team, classified, and faculty as of the end of February. Documentation of the process used to develop each document will be requested from each group.
- Planning for the Second Hour Workshop (March Town Meeting) includes representatives from Program Review and SLO Committees to assist faculty in developing their SLO and Program Review documents. Rooms have been identified for working groups and support will be available in the Teaching & Learning Center.
- Little or no progress has been made on the two standards related to the College and the District. There has been one meeting with partial attendance by the team on District/College Recommendation #1 (Resource Allocation). Sarah Thompson has volunteered to write the response for this Recommendation. No meeting has taken place, nor have team members been identified from Chabot or the District.
- The document repository has been set up, and there is a link available online (on the Accreditation webpage).

ii. Review & Discussion of Planning Agenda Items

At the last meeting the Council expressed an interest in reviewing the Planning Agenda items, so Jennifer Adams distributed copies to the group and displayed the document on the screen. The committee discussed the following items:

- Planning Agenda for Standard 1
  The Council members agreed that an annual review of the Mission and Values Statements needs to be incorporated into LPC's planning cycle.
- Planning Agenda for Standard 1A4
  The development of a tracking instrument to link institutional decisions to the Mission has been assigned to Recommendation Team 1A, but is related to the charge of College Council.
- Planning Agenda for Standard 1B
  The "Equity Point Person" can be referenced as part of the institution's efforts to promote the use of dialogue as a tool for continuous improvement, but it is only utilized in certain committees.
- Planning Agenda for Standard 1B1
  Currently, committee outcomes and information are communicated to the campus community via meeting minutes (posted online, but not always in a timely fashion), Division Meetings, and often at Town Meeting.
- Planning Agenda for Standard 1B2
  The Academic Senate has recommended that College Council review/reduce the 10 Goals. What should be process for doing that? Who should be involved? That could happen within College Council, but it was suggested that a more effective approach would be to have a smaller group work on it. Similar to the "Common Ground" ad-hoc session, a representative could be appointed from each constituency group. The sub-committee could meet and then bring their ideas and/or a draft back to College Council. Ms. Adams will send a copy of the 10 Goals to the Council members.
- Planning Agenda for Standard 1B3
  The current Educational Master Plan process was driven/coordinated by the District Office, and does not necessarily address progress on the 10 Goals.

b. Status of Approved Recommendations: Electronic Signatures & Mailing Pay Stubs

At its meeting in December, College Council approved two joint recommendations from the Sustainability and Technology Committees. The respective proposals requested that the College explore the possibility of accepting electronic signatures/approvals on campus forms and that the District stop paper pay stubs to employees. Vice President Kratochvil reported that President Walthers will take those recommendations forward to the Chancellor's Council meeting on February 28 (that group has not met since the last College Council meeting).

c. CCN Recommendation (added to agenda by Jane McCoy)

Jennifer Adams explained that this had not originally been listed on the agenda for a status report because no additional information has been received. The recommendation had been brought forward by Campus Change Network (CCN), but College Council asked that group to draft a "values statement" (related to campus-wide [email] communication) that they could review and endorse.

Jane McCoy stated that she asked for this to be added to the agenda because the Faculty Association (FA) feels it infringes upon free speech. She added that the FA has already brought an unfair labor practice against the District related to free speech violation(s), and referenced leaflets being confiscated at Club Day by the former Vice President of Student Services. Several College Council members commented that they believed there were two separate issues/incidents being referenced in this discussion: one regarding a recommendation to establish guidelines for campus-wide emails/communication, the other dealing with prior/perceived violations of free speech on campus.

3. New Business

a. Budget Update

Vice President Kratochvil displayed a budget handout that was distributed at several District meetings (including DBSG) last Friday, and he reviewed the figures with the group. Current projections for 2011-12 indicate that LPC will be over budget by approximately $400K, and Chabot will be over by about $800K. Because statewide fee collection is down, there is an additional $1.4M shortfall for the entire district. Additionally, there are structural funding issues to address. For some time, the contention has been that the allocation model is "wrong" – that the two colleges are insufficiently funded. Now specific issues, such as the budget for adjunct instructors, have been identified related to these underfunded areas. This seems to be a more constructive approach to use toward reaching some resolution, rather than adopting the mindset that "the District gets too much money" (as some have alleged before). The Council members concluded their budget discussion by talking about Summer Session, including the impact of a 5% workload reduction, potential changes to the class schedule, and significant facilities/construction projects.

b. Priority Registration

Vice President Baker outlined the current structure/list used for priority registration, and then explained the proposed revision. (For the list below, matriculation components include: assessment, orientation, and counseling)

- 09: Title V
- 07: 60+ units and 3 matriculation components
  (This group also includes continuing students with matriculation components – including an SEP – who are "grandfathered" in, as we don't want students to go backwards in their progress)
- 06: 30-59.9 units and 3 matriculation components
- 05: .3-29.9 units and 3 matriculation components
- 04: 60+units without matriculation components
- 03: 30-59.9 units without matriculation components
- 02: .3-29.9 units without matriculation components
- 01: Early Admission
- 00: New & Returning Students

The Council members then discussed a number of items related to the impact of this priority registration change for students:

- SSTF recommendations
- Access for new students
- "Fairness" for continuing students
- Consider changing maximum number of units (currently at 100 units)
- Consider changing length of time student is considered "continuing"
  - May need to be reduced to 1 semester

Dr. Orf asked Vice President to share this priority registration info at the next College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC) meeting; he also invited Vice President Kratochvil to present a budget update to CEMC.

c. Fundraising Guidelines

The discussion of this item was postponed for a future meeting.

4. Coordination of Information

a. Academic Services

Vice President Noble reported that they are working on the 2012-14 Catalog; it will be printed on campus, and she expects to review the "blue line" copy in early March. The Academic Services team is also working on the Class Schedule for Summer/Fall. A training session for CurricUNET will be held on February 22; it will be videotaped for future use.

b. Administrative Services

Vice President Kratochvil informed the Council members that the College Business Office is conducting a mid-year budget review with managers; they will also do a 3rd quarter review in April. The purpose of these sessions is to see how money is being spent and to identify any funds that can be redirected/reallocated.

c. Student Services
Vice President Baker announced that Commencement will be held in the Gym this year. He also reported that they have now scribed DegreeWorks.

d. Academic Senate
Melissa Korber and Tina Inzerilla reported that the Senate wants to get feedback from ASLPC and the Administrative Team about their interest in holding the Olympics again this year. *(The two ASLPC reps in attendance indicated that the students are on board to participate; Vice President Kratochvil deferred to the President to provide a response on behalf of the administrators)* The Academic Senate is working on an ethics statement; some sections are being changed, and they expect to have it ratified at their next meeting. The Senate is also working on an Honesty Policy. The rankings from the Faculty Prioritization Committee have gone to/through the Divisions, and will probably be ratified at the next Academic Senate meeting. On the topic of the budget, the Senate sought feedback from the Divisions about proposing guidelines to be used for making (reduction) recommendations; they emphasized the importance of having really good communication between faculty and their respective Dean.

e. Classified Senate
No representative present.

f. Student Senate
Amir Salezadeh and Jacob Park reminded the Council members that Cynthia Ross, Student Life Advisor, recently sent out a campus-wide email that included the "State of the Student Senate" report. The ASLPC has more than doubled the amount of scholarships they offer. The students are also trying to move forward with their website plans; they want to use online systems for communicating information about their textbook loaner program, scholarships, events, advocacy, etc… Unfortunately, they have encountered some issues and have had a difficult time getting in contact with personnel at the District Office. Today there were anti Planned Parenthood flyers placed on cars in the campus parking lots, and the ASLPC anticipates a presence (opposing the Planned Parenthood services) at the Board Meeting next week.

Vice President Kratochvil added that he will soon be meeting with Mr. Salehzadeh to talk about food services in the Student Services & Administration building, as the ASLPC has inquired about the process and potential vendors.

g. College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC)
Dr. Ofr reported that discipline plans have been approved for 2012-13; in light of the budget news presented today, CEMC will need to revisit that at its meeting next Friday. The District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC) has not held a meeting this semester.

h. Facilities Committee
Vice President Kratochvil explained to the Council that, because of holidays, the Facilities Committee hasn't held a meeting this semester. Soon the District will have an update to share about the Facilities Master Plan, and that information will be presented to the Facilities Committee.

i. Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)
Vice President Kratochvil reported that the IEC talked about the status of Accreditation Recommendation 1A, using Blackboard to develop responses for the Midterm Report, Program Review, and results from a 2010 Strategic Plan survey.

j. Planning & Budget Committee (PBC)
Vice President Kratochvil stated that, at its last meeting, PBC reviewed the results of their rankings for Instructional Equipment Requests. They also discussed the upcoming Classified Position Request process; there is no expectation that funds will be available, but the committee agreed to go forward with reviewing requests and determining how to approach the ranking process.

k. Staff Development Committee
No representative present.

l. Sustainability Committee
No representative present.

m. Faculty Association (FA)
Jane McCoy stated that the Academic Senate has passed a resolution regarding faculty appointments (to committees); the FA has an issue with that, and it has been communicated to Melissa Korber (Acting President of the Academic Senate).

n. SEIU
No representative present.

5. Next Steps
(no items)

6. Equity Perspective & Reflection: CCN Equity Point Person Questions

a. How did the decisions we made impact various members of our community? Consider matters such as equitable distribution of resources, student access to services, barriers related to language, economic status, transportation, and literacy level, etc…

Although no decisions were made during the meeting, the Council members agreed that they certainly engaged in discussions on issues (e.g. academic freedom, free speech, priority registration, etc…) that could impact the campus community.

b. In what ways has the meeting process been equitable? Were all constituencies heard from? Were there voices that were not considered?

The participants felt that the meeting had been equitable. One Council member noted that CCN had not been invited to appoint a representative on the committee, and suggested that it would be valuable to have them participate in the group's discussions. It was explained that, to date, CCN had chosen to operate as an independent entity and not become part of the formal governance structure. In addition, meeting announcements are sent out campus wide and all members of the campus community are invited to attend.

c. Do we need more information or support related to this dialogue? What additional information or support is needed to assist the decision-making process?

The Council members did not feel they needed any information/support at this time.

7. Adjournment