College Council

November 17, 2011
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

MINUTES

Present: Bob Kratochvil, Sarah Thompson, Jane McCoy, Bill Eddy, Jacob Park, Amir Salehzadeh, Marge Maloney, Melissa Korber, Renee Pegues, Rajinder Samra, Todd Steffan, Mike Ansell, Jennifer Adams

---

1. **Review & Approval of Minutes**
   The Council members reviewed the minutes from the September 2011 meeting.

   Motion: *To approve the minutes from the meeting held on September 15, 2011.*
   MSC: *Salezadeh/Thompson*
   Vote: *Approved (with one abstention)*

2. **Old Business**
   a. **Institutional Planning & Effectiveness**
      i. **Update on the "Common Tool"**
      Rajinder Samra provided an overview of the "Common Tool" spreadsheet used for Program Review and gave a brief recap about its development. He displayed a blank version of the spreadsheet, and then showed what the document looks like once all of the Program Reviews have been entered. Mr. Samra then shared a presentation that gave a summary of the preliminary "Common Tool" results, noting that it only covered the information identified as "Program Development" (not "Program Maintenance"). The presentation outlined:

      - # and % of objectives by program
      - # and % of Strategic Goals addressed by programs
      - # and % of Strategic Goals by instructional program
      - # and % of Strategic Goals by Student Services
      - # and % of Strategic Goals by non-instructional unit
      - Committees/offices identified to help address objectives

      The Council discussed what had been presented and how this information will be useful going forward. One suggestion was that the list of "committees/groups identified to help address objectives" be revisited/updated, as it may not be comprehensive and/or current.

3. **New Business**
   a. **Review of the Mission Statement**
   Jennifer Adams provided and reviewed a document that outlined the following:
      - Timeline of activities related to last revision of the Mission Statement (Fall 2006 to June 2009)
      - ACCJC Accreditation Standards 1, 1A, and 1A4, as well as the associated LPC Planning Agenda items
      - Excerpt from ACCJC's "Guide to Evaluating Institutions" (related to Standard 1/Institutional Mission)

Sarah Thompson recalled that there had been a discussion (possibly in Fall 2009 or 2010) about committees reviewing the College Mission and Goals each year at their first meeting; any recommended changes were to be sent forward to College Council. It was suggested that there be a communication mechanism to get this information from College Council to all of the committees, and that it be included in the Governance Handbook.

Jane McCoy asked whether Distance Education (DE) had been considered or factored into the development of the current Mission Statement. Ms. Adams stated that she hadn't encountered any such discussions in her review of minutes from College Council and the Planning & Budget Committee, but other committee minutes could be checked; she thought that, because feedback was garnered from the campus community in a variety of venues (Town Meeting, Division Meetings, via email, etc…), there may not be notes on everything that was discussed. Rajinder Samra shared data that shows 1 out of 5 LPC students takes a DE class.

b. Academic Senate Resolution on Strategic Goals

Sarah Thompson distributed copies of the resolution language from the Academic Senate:

On October 12th the LPCAS passed the following Action Item unanimously:

"The Senate requests the College Council review the Institutional Goals for applicability and manageability."

We have identified the following concerns:

1) *The goals overall need to have students as the primary focus*
2) *There is no outlined commitment to student success or completion*
3) *The number of goals is too cumbersome – it makes managing the goals, particularly in the area of strategic planning less practical*
4) *Goals should be as aligned as possible with the mission statement*

Vice President Kratochvil shared with the group a model from Santa Rosa Junior College (Mission, Goals, performance indicators, institutional effectiveness, etc…) that had been presented at the recent ACCJC workshop. The LPC reps who attended the workshop liked the systems, structures, and processes in place at Santa Rosa, and felt certain elements might be useful here.

Ms. Thompson suggested that College Council make a recommendation for moving forward with the review of the Strategic Goals.

Motion: *To recommend the creation of a working group to further explore the model at Santa Rosa Junior College and to revisit (and possibly revise) the LPC Strategic Goals.*
Vote: *Endorsed by consensus*

College Council

November 17, 2011
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

4. Coordination of Information

a. Academic Services
Vice President Maloney is working to schedule an Accreditation/Midterm Report kick-off meeting after the December Town Meeting.

b. Administrative Services
No report.

c. Student Services
No representative present.

d. Academic Senate
Sarah Thompson reported that the recent Flex Day activities were very successful, with good dialogue, ideas and recommendations related to the Student Success Task Force; she thanked Rajinder Samra for his presentation and the students for their participation. On Wednesday, she and Vice President Maloney attended the Student Success Task Force's Town Hall Meeting; while there, Ms. Thompson provided the Task Force with information about the potential impact (costs, staffing, facilities, etc…) of their draft recommendations – specifically 3.4 – at Las Positas College. She also shared that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) put forward recommendations (to the State Chancellor's Office) for changes in repeatability.

Melissa Korber reported that the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee met last week, and will soon be sending out the forms to initiate their process for new faculty positions.

e. Classified Senate
Todd Steffan thanked President Walthers for attending the last Classified Senate meeting, and expressed the Senate's appreciation to Stacey Followill for her presentation on the new waitlist process. Currently, the Senate is working with their counterparts at Chabot on a Classified Exchange Program.

f. Student Senate
Amir Salezadeh reported that several ASLPC reps recently returned from a national conference in Tennessee. One significant issue addressed is the change to Pell Grants; if a student's income exceeds the award, then the grant amount will be cut back.

Based on their own experience or what they've heard from other students, many ASLPC reps felt the new waitlist process wasn't going well and that there are lots of concerns; from their perspective, there hasn't been enough communication to students. Jane McCoy, who served on the Waitlist Task Force, said they repeatedly sought student participation but never had any reps attend meetings. The Council members had considerable dialogue about Zone-Mail, such as issues with the system, challenges in getting the information to students, and how it was designed to make sure students with the highest priority numbers get the classes they need.

Jacob Park provided an update on ASLPC's work to create a website; they have met with various outside companies and have talked with the LPC Foundation about donations.

College Council

November 17, 2011
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

g. College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC)
No representative present. Vice President Kratochvil reported that CEMC has a meeting scheduled for tomorrow (November 18), and his understanding from Vice Chancellor Legaspi is that things are "status quo" going into next semester. The Council briefly discussed the State budget "triggers" that will possibly take effect in January.

h. Facilities Committee
Vice President Kratochvil provided the Facilities Committee update, as Scott Miner was away at a conference: the Science and SSA projects are essentially on schedule; the new photovoltaic installation is underway; work on Campus Boulevard will likely begin in the Spring; the new Isabel Exchange opened on Wednesday, providing a new access point to the campus; and the interior Amphitheater lights are now working.

Sarah Thompson brought forward a question that had been raised in Division Meetings, and thought it could be directed to the Facilities Committee. There had been an inquiry about using empty offices (in Building 2100) for adjunct faculty. Vice President Kratochvil felt it may not be an item for consideration by the Facilities Committee, and suggested that it be explored by the Executive Team; that group can review the existing process and determine next steps.

i. Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)
Rajinder Samra shared that, at the IEC meeting last week, he presented updates on the "Common Tool," the Strategies and KPIs, and the draft Institutional Effectiveness Report.

j. Planning & Budget Committee (PBC)
Vice President Kratochvil reported that PBC reviewed Instructional Equipment Requests.

k. Staff Development Committee
No representative present.

l. Sustainability Committee
Dr. Mike Ansell reminded the Council members about his recent email on the award received by the District. In October, the Sustainability Committee discussed updates to the Climate Action Plan; 44 of the 62 items identified in the Plan have been completed. The Committee is working with the Technology Committee on joint proposals related to electronic signatures for campus forms and the elimination of mailings for pay stub hard copies.

The Council revisited its October discussion about transportation issues between campus and portions of the Tri-Valley. Renee Pegues mentioned that nearby LAM Research previously used buses to shuttle employees between locations, but has eliminated the service due to low ridership; Dr. Ansell shared that a college in San Diego offers such a service to students, but their parking fees (which subsidize the program) are significantly higher than at LPC.

m. Faculty Association (FA)
No report.

n. SEIU
No report.

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council

November 17, 2011
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

5. Next Steps

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…**
The Council felt their discussions about access, student success, and transportation could have an equity impact.

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

The Council talked about the importance of having full representation/participation at these (and other) meetings, particularly in relation to any decision-making; if some groups are not in attendance, then they lose an opportunity to contribute to the process. The group discussed some of the attendance/membership guidelines that will be included in the revised Governance Handbook.

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?**

Not at this time.

7. Adjournment