LAS POSITAS COLLEGE	**College Council Minutes** **Thursday, February 26, 2015** **2:30 – 4:30 p.m. – 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.

EEC	***LPC Focus Goals*** ❖ *Equity* ❖ *Completion* ❖ *Excellence*	***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: Quorum = 9

Position	Name			Position	Name	
President (Chair)	Barry Russell	X		**Academic Senate President**	Tom Orf	X
VP Academic Services, Interim	*Vacant*			**Academic Senate Vice President**	Greg Daubenmire	X
VP Student Services	Diana Rodriguez	X		**Classified Senate Co-Presidents**	Heidi Ulrech (rep.)	X
VP Administrative Services	Jeffrey Kingston	X		**Student Senate President**	Rafi Ansari	X
Institutional Planning Comm. Chair	Rajinder Samra/ Sarah Thompson	X		**Student Senate Vice President**	Paulina Reynoso	
Resource Alloc. Comm. Chair	Gerry Gire	X		**Facilities / Sustain. Comm. Chair**	Mike Ansell	
Inst. Effectiveness Comm. Chair	Rajinder Samra	X		**Staff Development Comm. Chair**	Greg Daubenmire	X
CEMC Chair	LaVaughn Hart	X		**LPC SEIU Rep.**	William Eddy	X
CLP FA Site VP	LaVaughn Hart	X		**Program Review Cte.**	Karin Spirn	X

1. **Call to Order** – Dr**.** Russell called the meeting to order at 2:34 PM. A quorum was present.

2. **Review and Approval of Agenda** – Dr. Russell added Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative and a Board Meeting discussion to the agenda. Under Student Senate, Resolution 1406 was added. The agenda was approved with additions. **(Hart / Orf**).

3. **Review and Approval of Minutes** – The minutes were reviewed and voted to approve with the following changes**:** on the 2nd page, under Administrative Services, Instructional Equipment, "Equipment being used for administrative or non-instructional purposes is not allowed. The following equipment is not allowed:" was added. **(Hart / Orf). Ulrech abstained.**

4. **Action Items**

   a. **Proposed Institution-Set Standard: Fall-to-Fall Retention Rates of New First-time College Students.** Mr. Samra proposed a sixth institution set standard metric to be approved. This metric would look at Fall to Fall retention rates for first time college students. Dr. Russell asked if this would be broken down in standard 2. The I.E.C. thinks that it is important to make this a standard and not a

sub-set of standard 2. It is important to make it separate to disaggregate further. Ms. Hart asked if the timeframe is from Fall to Fall and are there some things that do not fall into this? Mr. Samra mentioned that the younger students are, the longer their timelines are for earning a degree. Dr. Russell mentioned that if we set this as one of our standards, it defines an emphasis on first year students and is not sure that we do anything with this information. Mr. Samra stated that the group should not be ignored and we may find that this information is helpful. The council voted on adding a sixth standard: Fall-to-Fall Retention Rates of New first-time College Students. **(Orf/Ulrech). All in favor.**

b. **Title V Grant.** Dr. Russell added this to the agenda to give an update on the grant process because it has moved so fast. LPC sought to be identified and we have been. We are waiting for the Federal Government to push out the grant announcement and they have not done so yet. At this time, we do not know what the application looks like, but we are going on past processes and already doing some strategizing with Hanover. Hanover has been meeting with a group of folks at LPC, including Ms. Rodriguez. We need as much internal dialogue about what is going into the document so that there is an understanding of what we are agreeing to.

   Ms. Rodriguez gave an update. When we originally met with different areas, we discussed what the grant would look like. What came to the top was something in the STEM area, primarily because there is a lot of opportunity for dollars. In the research we looked at, there is not much opportunity for other areas. There are a lot of STEM grants out there, so what can we do differently. We discussed having a professional's track, which would include pre-med, pre-dentistry, etc. This would be a Pre-Pre professionals program. The group put together a logic map and identified the challenges and goals, different methodologies, stakeholders and the milestones. Once this was complete, the group drilled down even further. The next step is a draft of the project goals, objectives, activities, and outcomes.

   Mr. Daubenmire asked why English was crossed off the list. An English jam was mentioned. Ms. Spirn discussed that LPC has a math jam program, but it wouldn't translate well to English. It is found that students do not have the same anxiety with English as they do with Math. They also wouldn't be able to jam out of a particular class. It has been heard from the Sciences that English needs to be taught more contextually for textbooks. This would support students in their content work instead. It was also found that it is not necessarily the case that Latino students are struggling more in their classes. Dr. Russell saw a presentation in the learning community between a reading and math class. They learned that it was more of a reading issue for word problems and not necessarily a math issue.

   Ms. Rodriguez mentioned the second goal is to increase the number of Latino students in STEMs majors. The third is to increase rates of retention and matriculation among Hispanic students. This is a pretty significant area where Student Services is involved. The fourth goal is to partner with the Tri-Valley Collaborative and other partners. The document shown represents about 50 pages of notes of trying to figure out how to best market ourselves with this grant. The grant is $2.5 million over 5 years and it is easy to see how that money can go very quickly. It is important to have no negative impacts on the general fund, but also balance that with student success.

   Ms. Gire asked when the money would come in. Dr. Russell mentioned that it coincides with the Federal calendar, so that would be in October.

5. Information Items

a. President

- **Vice President, Academic Services Update.** An Interim has been identified and all the paperwork has been submitted. The recommendation will go to the Board on March 17th. Once approved, he will start on March 18th. His name is Jim Wright and he is a retired Vice President

from Ohlone College. The plan is that he will work until we have a new full-time person here, which will hopefully not be longer than June 30th.

The recruitment committee has set up interviews and hopefully that will move forward. It is up in the air when the Interim will leave and when the full-time Vice President will come.

- **Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative.** Dr. Russell brought up the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative and one of the things that the task force identified is that the Chancellor's Office needs to be strong and more proactive in providing support for struggling districts and colleges. The state needs to be able to send people in and help. College of the Canyons in Santa Clarita has the grant to do this. They are identifying people who can serve on teams and identifying colleges that need this kind of support.

  A college can get up to $1000 of help with this. There has been some discussion earlier in the week, but Dr. Russell asked if there is anything that pops out with regard to everyone's work around campus. He is willing to write a request if we could have a team come in and do something. Ms. Ulrech asked if this is the same team as the one going around to the colleges and checking if they are having trouble with accreditation. This is the same team, they cover governance problems, enrollment, accreditation and finance.

  Ms. Spirn mentioned that program review could be something that needs support. It is hard to find best practices for it. Ideally, program review should take care of allocation requests. How do you get from the input to the allocation?

  Mr. Samra mentioned SLOs as an idea. Ms. Spirn said that they could probably use some help but some of the problems have to do with mandating so many people to complete it. We will have to find incentives, such as professional development opportunities. Dr. Russell mentioned that there are colleges that have already figured that out.

  Ms. Spirn mentioned the topic of administrative turnover.

  Ms. Hart said enrollment is an idea. We need a plan, marketing, etc. Once the student gets here, how do we keep them?

  Dr. Russell will follow up with them and see if this is a one shot chance or is it as needed. He will get clarification.

- **Academic Calendar –** Dr. Russell stated that an email came out about a slight correction on the 2014-15 calendars. They originally approved Spring Break as Monday through Friday, but it is now Monday through Saturday. Ms. Ulrech asked if the parameters in Banner have been looked at. Ms. Rodriguez will check with Sylvia Rodriguez.

- **March 3rd Board Meeting –** Dr. Russell mentioned the Board retreat on March 3rd that is open to the public. They are going to be updating the District FTES goals and discuss how apportionment works. These are self-identified from the Board. Vice Chancellor Celia Esposito-Noy is going to do the presentation. The Chancellor will lead a discussion on the Brown Act and Robert's Rules of Order. There will be senior leadership updates from the Vice Chancellors and the Presidents. The meeting will begin at 5:30 p.m. at the District Office.

b. Academic Services – No news to report.

c. Student Services –

- **SSSP.** Ms. Rodriguez discussed SSSP. The following numbers are how we look from fall 2013 to fall 2014.
  - Ed Plans complete: 954 in 2013 & 3700 in 2014
  - Online Orientations: 2953 in 2013 & 4981 in 2014

- Program Planning (in-person orientation): 891 in 2013 & 1631 in 2014
- Assessments: 3038 in 2013 & 3743 in 2014

This is a snapshot of some of the numbers. We are pulling together a report that identifies all of the activities that we have been doing. Ms. Ulrech asked if the numbers will stay consistent or where we playing catch up. Ms. Rodriguez said that she thinks we will see a steady incline. Mr. Samra asked if the education plans have to be face to face. Environmental scanning is being done right now that is showing that a lot of students are taking online classes.

d. Administrative Services – No news to report.

e. Integrated Planning Committee (IPC)

- **New Planning and Budget Cycle Flowchart.** Mr. Samra presented the new planning and budget cycle flowchart. The IPC spent a good amount of time revising it and have had great feedback. There will be a narrative attached to this.

  The document shows four processes:

  1. Program review process – The college mission, goals and priorities feed into the program review process and the outcome are Deans' summaries.
  2. College planning process – The Deans' summaries come to the Integrated Planning Committee. The IPC takes the program review summaries and other institutional planning documents and recommends college priorities to the President. The President reviews and finalizes the priorities and then presents it at Town Meeting in May.
  3. Resource allocation process – Resource requests go to RAC. RAC reviews and prioritizes the requests. RAC recommends to the President and Executive Staff, where they review alignment with the college priorities and finally approve resource allocations.
  4. Budget development process – Resource prioritization informs the tentative budget. College Council will review the budget and current year's allocations for integration with planning priorities. This charge was added to the Council. The President and Executive Team then finalize the budget and submit for adoption by the Board of Trustees.

  Throughout this process is an assessment component. The IEC will do ongoing assessments. Is this format clearer than the circular model? Mr. Daubenmire mentioned that it is not clear that the top is year one and the bottom is year two. Ms. Spirn suggested maybe having an alternative view of this and accompany it with the narrative.

  Mr. Kingston asked to change "Resource Request" to "Resource Requests from Program Reviews." Mr. Samra stated that program review is where your program needs are reflected. Ms. Rodriguez asked if there are any negative repercussions if requests are not coming from program review. Ms. Spirn said that with the ACCJC, program review needs to be used in planning and allocation. It is used to develop the priorities. SLOs are noticeably missing from this document. SLOs will be included in the program review.

  Dr. Russell mentioned that the document is understandable. The accreditation team will ask what happens to this process if something is out of cycle. This is the standard way that the majority of things happen on campus. Ms. Ulrech asked if this format works in the lean years. Mr. Samra mentioned that these are good questions and we can make sure it is located in the narrative.

  Mr. Samra handed out a committee feedback form regarding prioritization of resources in 2014-15 for the Chairs of the prioritization committees to complete. He would like these turned in by March 18th. A question came up of the meaning of resources on the form. Even if your committee does not allocate money, it does allocate resources. Mr. Samra will get this out to everyone. Ms. Ulrech mentioned that it may be hard for the committees to get this back in time.

f. **Program review –** No news to report.

g. **Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) –** No news to report.

h. **Facilities and Sustainability Committee –** No news to report.

i. **Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)**

- **Status of Institution Set Standards. Mr. Samra discussed the status of the Institution Set Standards. The definition of the set standards is: meet or exceed 95% of a five-year rolling average on the adopted metrics. The status of each standard is as follows:**
    - Successful course completion rates – we are doing well.
    - Fall to fall retention rates – we are doing well.
    - Fall to fall retention rates for first time students – we met it but had a drop.
    - The number of degrees awarded – we are doing well. We extended the timeline for the students, so when you do the comparisons, they are not exactly equal. Ms. Spirn asked what if we do not meet it. Dr. Russell said it is a wakeup call but these are just indicators.
    - Certificates – we are below the average. The reason for this is that during the 2012-13 year we really tried to get students to go after their certificates. We may grant a degree and a student not ask for it, but that is easier said than done. This is a red flag for us and we need to do something about it. Ms. Gire mentioned that the big focus was on transferring and getting moved out.
    - Transfers to CSU and UC – we are doing well.

j. **College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC) –** No news to report.

k. **Staff Development Committee –** No news to report.

l. **Academic Senate –** Dr. Orf mentioned that the Academic Senate discussed reassign time for different kinds of committees. Discussion is in the preliminary phase, but they are starting with every 2.5 hours beyond regular committee work and building something from there. This would only be for committees that are answerable to the Senate. Money may or may not be available. The Senate wanted some feedback from the Council. Ms. Ulrech asked if there is some way that this could be considered college-wide. This has been an issue for years. Dr. Orf mentioned that each of the committee chairs is trying to keep track of their hours now, but they do change from semester to semester. Dr. Russell mentioned that the average may be 1.5 hours, but you might have one month that you worked extra. We have to look at the average for the year.

m. **Classified Senate –** No news to report.

n. **Student Senate**

- **Student Senate Projects.** Mr. Ansari said that students were sent out surveys and they had to write in what they wanted ASLPC to take on for the next semester. Over 500 surveys were gathered and 6 projects came out of them. The six projects include:

    1. Freshman Orientation – The committee laid out a detailed plan and will present to Barbara Morrissey. The media officers are recording a virtual tour of the campus.

    2. Providing internships to students – a list of internships and volunteer opportunities have been put together and will be categorized by subject and major. This list will be advertised through the 32 clubs on campus. There are possible plans to have a table event once or twice a month to pass out these flyers.

3. A game room – ASLPC discussed what they would like to have in the game room, but the major issue is space. They will go to Dr. Ansell to get on the facilities committee agenda. Ms. Ulrech mentioned that they should put in their consideration for campus safety. There was a game room previously and there were some issues.

4. Having a way to showcase student talent on campus – A mural was discussed that the students could work on. A canned food drive, like the one that Bill Paskewitz did, is an idea. They are also discussing pulling together a talent show.

5. Cheaper lunches in the cafeteria

6. Open gym

Dr. Russell mentioned that Mr. Ansari came to the Administrative Staff Meeting to discuss these ideas. Ms. Rodriguez mentioned that those six items came up in a meeting she had as well.

- **Resolution 1406.** ASLPC voted on a resolution in December of 2014. There are a lot of problems with the bulletin boards and having enough space. ASLPC advocated that the flyers are made into a half sheet and want to make this permanent. This is not a problem in Building 2400. Ms. Hart mentioned that it may be hard for some people to read a half sheet flyer. The line that mentions the word "authorized" should be changed to "suggested." Who polices this? Scott Miner signs off on the flyers. Dr. Russell said the idea is a good one, but how we implement it and follow up on it is a challenge to figure out. We can push it out and talk about how to implement it.

o. Faculty Association – No news to report

p. SEIU – No news to report.

6. Good of the Order – No news to report.

7. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at **4:35** p.m.

Kelly Abad
Executive Assistant to the President

Next Regular Meeting: ***March 26, 2015***
Room - 1687
2:30 -4:30 p.m.