LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
REGULAR MEETING
Room 4129, Mertes Arts Building
October 10, 2012 at 2:30 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Jeremiah Bodnar, Elena Cole, Justin Garoupa, Heike Gecox, Teri Henson, Cindy Keune, Melissa Korber, Craig Kutil, Jed Lipp (ASLPC), Ashley McHale, John Ruys, Sarah Thompson

GUEST: Teri Henson

1.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

1.1 Call to Order/Quorum: 2:41 pm

1.2 Approval of Agenda

MOTION to APPROVE agenda
MS: C.Keune / A.McHale
Request to amend the agenda as follows: Combine 6.2 & 4.5
MOTION to APPROVE agenda as amended.
MSC: J.Garoupa / C.Keune / APPROVED

1.3 Approval of Minutes of August 22, 2012 & September 12, 2012

MOTION to APPROVE minutes from August 22, 2012
MS: C. Kutil / A.McHale
MOTION to APPROVE minutes pending clarification on Report 4.10
C: APPROVED

MOTION to APPROVE minutes from September 12, 2012
MSC: C.Kutil / A.McHale / APPROVED

1.4 Public Comments: None

2.0 ACTION ITEMS: None

3.0 CONSENT ITEMS: None

4.0 REPORTS

4.1 Curriculum Committee: Jeremiah Bodnar reported that SLO Chair, Tina Inzerilla, attended the Curriculum Committee (CC) meeting to voice a concern. As new courses are created the percentage of courses that have SLOs are going down. Her proposal to the CC was that a SLO be created before a new course is approved. There was resistance from the committee

due to the fact that the members did not feel they should "police" SLOs since it is not considered part of the course proposal content.

Scott Vigallon attended the CC meeting to address his concern regarding DE courses that could potentially be moved to correspondence courses if not enough evidence is shown that online interaction with students equals the same amount of time as a face to face class. The CC felt they solved most of his concerns and will ensure that it is shown that interaction with online students is robust.

The CC finally managed to meet with all the Deans and VPs to discuss the repetition and repeatability issue. Even though only part of the repetition and repeatability issue falls on the CC, this group is the one creating the policies and are working with Student and Academic Services to make certain the college is in compliance since ultimately it will be up to Student Services to make sure that students are not repeating.

4.2 SLO Committee: None

4.3 BaSk Committee: All of the documents for the BaSk committee have been signed and funding assigned. One of the primary goals for this committee will be to use some of this year's funding to retain first year students. Those who are already in the role of being repeaters, looking into the reasons why and giving those students support in an attempt to retain them more effectively.

4.4 DE Committee: None

4.5 Program Review Committee: Teri Henson reported that discussion continues with VP Diana Rodriguez of Student Services (SS) and her staff on how to incorporate SS into Instructional Program Review (IPR), which will encompass both instructional and non-instructional areas. Incorporating SS would mean significant changes such as the restructure of the committee, the membership, the charge, possibly the reporting structure and dropping "Instructional" from the committee name.

Jill Carbone and Teri Henson submitted a definition of "program" in terms of program review. It's to be discussed at today's IPR meeting, and if approved, presented at the next Senate meeting.

Program review updates from last spring were divided among teams made up of committee members. Each team reviewed approximately six each and collecting summary themes. The three main purposes in doing the program review updates last year was: 1) Collect the SLO information needed for the midterm report; 2) Test out a new format in terms of doing something in the form of program review; 3) See where programs were after a year. The SLO committee will also be looking at the updates and conducting a more rigorous

examination of the SLO status. The smaller programs and single faculty disciplines did not have SLOs for their courses or assessments in place. They concluded that program reviews were affected by faculty not finding the time to work on SLOs or assessments, or finding time to work with adjuncts to get them involved. Other reasons for not completing SLOs or assessments were thought to be related to the budget cuts that reduced sections, reduced faculty and staff, curriculum changes in general, and State mandates.

The committee realized and will be working on coming up with a way to ask the questions in a clearer fashion and better structure the instructions, which would make everyone working on PR interpret them in the same way. Based on the answers received, it is clear that this is not happening.

Teri Henson then went on to explain how she, Jill Carbone, and Jan Noble met and spoke about the Program Review process and how it ties to Planning and Resource Allocation. The documents include a Proposal to Integrate Institutional Program Review and Planning and another Linking Program Review and Planning. They were written to: 1) Have a firm process in place; 2) That it met ACCJC standards; and to 3) Have something in place that is effective and useful.

There are concerns because the rubric used for evaluating institutional effectiveness at the Proficiency Level for PR reads – *"Results of all Program Reviews are integrated into institutional-wide planning for improvement in informed decision making….Results of Program Reviews are clearly and consistently linked in the planning and resource allocation processes."* The college is not quite there, and this plan was drawn as a way to accomplish getting at that level.

The draft plan is not complete, isn't detailed and needs more work. Sharing this draft with everyone was a way to get people involved, stakeholders, and users need to be weighing in.

The various stages listed in the proposal were briefly reviewed:

Stage One: Each instructional program is to complete a Program Review. The template used will include four resource categories used in ACCJS's Standard 3, and be designed to facilitate completion of allocation request. Language from Standard 3 will be incorporated in the report and include a summary abstract at the end of their report, with a prioritized list of the programs needs using descriptors (i.e.: urgent, critical, nice to have, etc). The IPRC will provide peer-review support, giving program writers the opportunity to modify their materials prior to submitting to the dean.

Stage Two: Deans will review and offer feedback giving writers the opportunity to make modifications before submitting final version to the IPRC

and dean. Independent summaries form the dean and IPRC will be written, most likely using organized resource categories used in ACCJC's Standard 3. The dean's abstract will be presented to the division for discussion for feedback and modification, the IPRC will present to the Academic Senate for approval.

Stage Three: By this stage a shared governance committee should have been formed. The deans and IPRC will send their summaries to the VP of Academic Services who will meet with the IPRC co-chairs and deans, to create an abstract of themes (from ACCJC categories) which reflect the needs from the program reviews. The VP will then relay this information to the Planning committee.

Stage Four: By this stage a shared governance committee should have been formed. The Planning Committee reviews the information from the VP and along with external data, will be used to formulate the College plan for the next year. The Planning Committee should be charged with making recommendations to the President about overarching plans, prioritization, and budget allocation, which will then be publically communicated to the college community and District.

Stage Five: By this stage a shared governance committee should have been formed. The Allocation Committees will use this information, along with their own defined ranking processes, to make informed, justified and transparent recommendations regarding resource allocations. Program review materials can be reviewed by the Allocation Committees to further inform their rankings.

It was not clear in the document where program review and allocations connected. An overarching yearly planning going on that took the input of all program reviews isn't there, and that's the piece that is missing. A disconnect has always been between Instructional, Non-Instructional and SS program review. All three groups work on these documents although there isn't just one where all three groups connect. When evaluations for these groups come from College Council, Allocations Committees, etc. it makes it difficult to make priority type decisions because all three documents were very different and do not make a clear linkage. The question of what non-instructional meant to one IEC member and another was brought up. Non-instructional could mean Deans, President's Office, Business Services, Admin Services, IT groups; whereas it could mean groups within a group such as Financial Aid, counseling, etc. This type of dialogue was what Teri and the others, who wrote these two documents, were hoping to produce.

Another thing to think about is that not all non instructional groups report to a dean. Some report to a VP and others to the President. Stage Three of the proposal seemed to be there SS would integrate into the process, and the

development of the stages and steps as they currently stand will allow (whether there is a dean or not) the deans to work with the VPs.

The way the program review process as currently constituted, does not give the committee the sense of having the expertise to review, evaluate and assess the programs as they should be. Creating a totally different kind of program review community with representative from the instructional, non instructional and the different areas from SS and having this group come together brings that expertise.

The Tasks drafted include:

Step 1: IPRC to establish a definition of "program", which has been drafted that could possibly cover Instructional, Student Services and Non-Instructional areas.
Step 2: Definition of validation, already established.
Step 3: The role of the IPRC in the program review process, to be defined.
Step 4: Determine how Student Services Program Review is folded into Instructional Program Review.
Step 5: Determine the form and nature of the "summarizing" described in Stages Two and Three.
Step 6: Determine the frequency of PR cycle, and role and frequency of the self-study.
Step 7: Determine time line for carrying our program review and planning process.

Steps 6 and 7 connect and relate to the frequency of the cycle. The document suggests an annual (short) program review, or "unit plan" if you will. The idea is to complete a short unit plan every year by all programs that have percolated up after going through the summary stages of the process. An annual unit plan would assist with reviewing resource allocation and after several years that pattern could be reviewed and help with updating program reviews.

Presentations of these documents are being made today at this meeting and at the IPRC, at the IEC meeting tomorrow, and at the Planning Task Force Committee on Friday. The purpose for having all these presentations is to have as any people as possible have the chance to review the documents, and begin dialogue regarding the information contained within. Is the outline found to be feasible, can it work, how do "we" make it work, how would it be implemented, what type of timeline, what type of structures?

When feedback is received from Student Services, the document will be amended since it was written solely from an instructional point of view. Student Services (SS) will be looking at how they would fit SS into the early stages of the proposed steps since they do not have deans or deal with

instruction. The proposal itself outlines steps whereas the Instructional Program Review process and elucidate Program Review's role in planning and resource allocation while ensuring Accreditation Standards are met. Getting this information out to everyone is to get them involved and begin talking about it.

4.6 CEMC: Sarah Thompson began by saying that discussion for an overarching clear process is needed to look at course reductions and additions. The CEMC agreed to have a joint meeting with the senate that includes Christina Lee, Marilyn Flores, and John Ruys.

4.7 Staff Development: None

4.8 Hiring Prioritization: Meeting on October 23rd to prioritize the 9 positions.

4.9 Faculty Association: None

4.10 Student Senate: Efforts to register students continue and keep them informed about Measure I and Prop 30.

In November the Student Senate for California Community Colleges will hold a conference of which 2 ASLPC representatives will attend.

ASLPC representatives will be attending various workshops scheduled during November 2012 and February 2013.

Planning has begun for Club Day.

4.11 Treasurer: Melissa Korber reported that faculty had begun to send in contributions for 2012-13. She did ask that the senators mention at their division meetings that contributions in the suggested amount of $25.00 can be sent to her attention.

4.12 President: SB 1456 (Matriculation Bill) has been signed by the governor and implementation is immediate. Thus far there has been no communication from the District as to how this will be coordinated between the two colleges, since compliance will need to come from the District.

Copies of the current and proposed Board Policy on Rights, Duties and Responsibilities pertaining to Free Speech, and the District's Administrative Rules and Procedures on Time, Space, and Manner were distributed. Primary goal of having an accurate and effective free speech policy is that the college does not want to be sued for violating the first amendment. Senators are to share this information at their division meetings to solicit feedback. This item will be placed as a discussion item on the next senate agenda.

TRAC (Tangible Resource Allocation Committee) has changed their name to RAC (Resource Allocation Committee). Sarah will be attending Area B meetings next week in preparation for plenary meeting where review of all resolutions are expected to take place, which deal with the new matriculation bill SB 1456.

Two interim deans will replace Dr. Neal Ely until a permanent replacement is hired. Along with Craig Kutil, two more faculty members are needed to serve on the interim dean position committee before the process begins.

Planning Task Force will continue to discuss the idea of a Mega Committee, how to implement program review into the planning cycle for this year. The DBSG committee is still having difficulties. The consultant hired to move this committee forward does not seem to have made a difference with the direction this committee is going. He also didn't inspire any confidence that the differences within the committee are going to be resolved. The allocation model that was drawn up at a prior meeting was reviewed and the consultant suggested that an entire new model be draw. Some members of the committee immediately jumped in with issues they had with the allocation. Rather than set this matter aside, the consultant responded with gave validity and creditability to what that group said and things got out of control. The consultant had not prepared and an agenda nor could he control the meeting, which proved to be a wasted 2-1/2 hours. Hopefully, the next meeting will bring a better result. This could have been a result of the absence of strong leadership since the Interim Chancellor was not in attendance at this meeting.

4.13 DBSG: Incorporated in President's report – 4.12.

5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS

5.1 Assessing the Course Prioritization Model and CEME Processes for Course Prioritization, Reduction and Addition: There is no process in place for selecting courses. A list was shown that listed potential ideas of areas to look at that would help when coming up with recommendations. The question of how to prioritize between CTE, Basic skills and transfer courses after all the "fluff" courses have been taken away remains.

The following areas were considered key for drawing up a new prioritization model:

~ Threshold – number of faculty in a discipline area not threaten such as faculty load, the ability of a program to sustain.
~ Backlogs/Fill Rates
~ Pathways – what course for which purpose?
~ Criteria – student populations
~ Support Services Limitations – lab support, etc.
~ Facilities Limitations

~ Proportions – Currently it's done by division. Is that the best way to allocate FTES reductions/additions or envision it by purpose?
~ Temporary Increase of Basic Skills
~ Course Rotation
~ Access – disproportionate impact
~ Availability of Instructors – do certain areas need additional faculty due to increased course work because of demand.

As the group continues to meet and as more students complete SEP, more key areas may be added.

5.2 Charge – Planning and Task Force: The charge of the committee that was approved by the Senate several meetings ago has been modified. The College Council approved the charge although recommendation by members of the committee had not been included in the final draft, and this was noticed. Added to the charge was: *"That each division and program shall be represented by membership of the task force."* This change was not considered radical enough for the Senate to reapprove.

5.3 Mission Statement, Glossary and Deactivation of Goals: All of our planning and budget decisions are suppose to be made by data received showing how closely we are achieving our strategic goals. The institutional goals do not reflect the college's priorities as they currently stand, which poses a problem with our accreditation. There are two choices that can be taken in order to be in compliance 1) Rewrite goals; 2) Temporarily deactivate goals and model our budget, allocation and planning processes from our mission statement. This would keep us in compliance as the institutional goals are being written. Mutual agreement must be made between the President and Senate in order for this to happen. Senators are asked to present this at their division meeting to solicit feedback and approval. The senate will act upon this item at its next meeting, so that we can move forward with the planning and allocation process.

The proposed Mission statement was revealed, which reads as follows: *"Las Positas College is an inclusive, learning-centered institution providing opportunities and support for completion of transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals."*

Further discussion pointed to concerns submitted regarding the proposed Mission statement. So that those individuals were aware that they had been heard, and open letter from the Planning Task Force was suggested was thought to be a good idea.

Senators are asked to present this at their division meeting to solicit feedback and approval. The senate will act upon this item at its next meeting.

5.4 Response to Leadership Crisis: The Senate's Executive Board met with President Walthers who shared with them the fact that he is actively seeking a position elsewhere. Initially the senate had discussed composing a letter, which no longer serves a purpose and has postponed any further action until the senate deems it necessary to brought back.

6.0 DISCUSSION –NEW BUSINESS

6.1 Accreditation Midterm Response 3 – Program Review – 3B: The midterm report was presented in draft form to the board and will be approved in form and is a reflection of what it is we are doing to reach compliance.
MOTION made to TABLE 6.1 until next meeting.
MSC: C. Kutil / M.Korber / APPROVED

6.2 Reviewing Our Committee Structure: Sarah Thompson began by stating that the discussion related to the PR (Program Review) proposal shared by Teri Henson would be integrated into the general discussion of rethinking our overall committee structure, and how to make it more streamline, efficient and in compliant with ACCJC. She mentioned that the various stages flowed very well and that the steps were clearly defined since identifying the different tasks for the different level is going to be critical.

Santa Rosa followed a similar pattern and captured feedback from the dean. If tension results between a dean and a department and not see eye to eye - how would that be resolved? With LPC experiencing a number of new administrators it's realistic that something like this might happen. New individuals come with new ideas, yet there's department history. PR not only captures what's happened in the past but also captures what's planned for the future. The deans provide a different prospective with the understanding that the programs are owning and be given a chance to respond.

Teri Henson mentioned that built into the draft proposal is that the dean's summary goes out to the entire division for review and discussion giving across disciplines the opportunity to comment as well. The deans and VPs could use Town Meeting time for further discussion, and hold a moderated meeting facilitated by the PR committee that could let everyone know what themes were coming up. Everyone would be aware of the progress of the PR committee, the planning process and how that ties in with allocations, but also gives an understanding and broader perspective of the different programs.

Sarah picked up the discussion and said that the Planning Task Force was looking at how PR would be used this year. We are in the process of implementing a much more sophisticated and stable plan and with the need to know now if we are in compliance this year, looking at PR in general will help as we move forward with our planning allocation cycle. There are lots of tasks to be done that have been assigned to the Planning Tack Force, which is not a real committee but a stopgap committee. This shows that need for a

committee that does something akin to what the task force committee is doing, so the idea of moving toward a Mega committee structure is being considered. The responsibility of this shared governance committee would be to meet weekly and oversee the Mission, Values and Goals of the institution, oversee the Strategic Plan, set priorities for the year, go over all of the assessments and evaluate all the data, engaging n active planning and evaluating our goal achievement. The College Council, Institutional Effectiveness Committee and Planning Task Force would no longer be necessary. This committee would look at our accreditation compliance of linking assessment with planning with allocation. Currently, pieces of this process have been delegated to so many different committees and the outcome has been that this process has not been efficient. This committee would meet weekly requiring a large commitment from those who would serve as members, and would receive reassigned time with some sort of compensation for classified. The first meeting would be with the data source groups (researcher, Basic Skills, Program Review and SLO) who would meet with the Mega committee and report out. The second and third week would be the "work" of the committee, and the fourth week would be meeting with the Chairs of the allocating committees.

Reason for moving to this structure is that there are not enough people to serve on the many committees that already exist, and classified staff and faculty continue to shrink; 70% of the people serving on committees are the same ones with only 30% rotating. This would allow people to be on committees with very specific tasks resulting in productivity.

The long needed reorganizing of committees was brought out during the discussion. Written into the charge is the flexibility for change of some members of not having to meet each week but perhaps every other week, or however the chair deems necessary. The compensation and release portion for all who serve on the committee is very important considering the demand of the work. The stumbling block is to make sure that classified are not over burdened, and to come up with a way to compensate them. Members are to remain consistent, although may not need to meet each week.

At the moment, proposed composition includes students, classified, faculty, all VPs, and college's researcher (does not preclude deans from being on this committee).

There was a concern with communication and whether it would become a problem, and a monthly musings report was suggested.

6.3 Next Year's President: Sarah Thompson has been the Academic Senate President for 3.5 years. She expressed interest of stepping down and discussion ensued regarding the history of the Senate that she has built upon while in this role. There was concern of how to move forward with a replacement while still ensuring that the history of the Senate stay intact.

Also, the Senate's Constitution prevents replacement of executive officers during mid-year and revising the Constitution is not an option. Ideas of how to informally replace Ms. Thompson for the remainder of the year and mentoring a new president on an informal basis will continue.

6.4 Moving the Senate Fund to the Foundation: Senate Treasurer, Melissa Korber wanted to discuss moving the Senate's account over to the Foundation. She went on to explain that finding the time to make deposits and other transactions at the bank has not been convenient, and a location on campus would make things run more smoothly. It was mentioned that Chabot Federal Credit Union was to have an on-campus location in the new SS & A building once it was finished. Sarah Thompson will check with the credit union as to whether this is to happen, and report back at the next meeting.

6.5 Repetition and Repeatability District Policy: Jeremiah Bodnar distributed a draft of the local policy on repetition and repeatability and one for the District. The District policy was not in compliance so he took what was related in Title V regarding repetition and repeatability, and incorporated that into the District policy to bring it up to compliance.

Heike Gecox stated that the counselors are working together to make the transition a smooth and uniform so there is no guess work as who can or cannot repeat a course. Chabot and LPC have different rubrics that Banner does not recognize. A list exists that was put in place that links all cross-listed courses that will go out to everyone to review.

After a brief discussion the amended District Policy will be presented as an Action Item at the next meeting.

6.6 Visions and Values Statement: Sarah Thompson shared that the next step after developing a Mission statement is coming up with a Visions and Values statements. The Planning Task Force would like to amend that and has suggested that the two statements be combined making things more concise and come up with one Visions/Values statement. Immediate feedback was not received.

7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER

7.1 Announcements: None

7.2 2011 Meetings: 2nd and 4th Wednesdays – Next Meeting: October 24, 2012

7.3 Adjournment:
MOTION to Adjourn – 4:41 pm
MSC: E.Cole / A.McHale / APPROVED

* * * *

EXECUTIVE OFICERS

Senate President:	Sarah Thompson
Senate VP:	Elena Cole
Senate Secretary:	Justin Garoupa
Senate Treasurer:	Melissa Korber
Senate Admin Assist:	Carmen McCauley

ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

ALSS:	Vacant
STEMPS:	Cindy Keune, Craig Kutil, Ashley McHale, Eric Harpell
BSBA:	John Ruys, Geoff Smyth
Counseling:	Heike Gecox
ASLPC Rep:	Ignacio Petrasic

Public Notice—Nondiscrimination: Las Positas College does not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, color or disability in any of its programs or activities. Las Positas College is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Upon request this publication will be made available in alternate formats.