LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
REGULAR MEETING
Room 4129, Mertes Arts Building
November 28, 2012, 2:30 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Rafi Ansaria, John Armstrong, Jeremiah Bodner, Jill Carbone, Elena Cole, Debbie Fields, Heike Gecox, Justin Groupa, Cindy Keune, Melissa Korber, Craig Kutil, Ashley McHale, Barbara Morrissey, Diana Rodriguez, John Ruys, Rajinder Samra, Mike Sato, Geoff Smyth, Sarah Thompson

GUESTS: Open Meeting attended by various member of the Campus Community

---

1.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

1.1 Call to Order/Quorum: 2:34 p.m.

1.2 Approval of Agenda
MOTION to **APPROVE** Agenda
MSC: A.McHale / J.Groupa / APPROVED

MOTION to reorder the **AGENDA** to present the following items in the order listed: Report Item 4.5; Discussion-New Business Item 6.6; Discussion-Old Business Item 5.3
MSC: Cindy Keune / A.McHale / APPROVED

1.3 Approval of Minutes of October 10, 2012
MOTION to **APPROVE** minutes
MSC: M.Korber / A.McHale / APPROVED

1.4 Approval of Minutes of October 24, 2012
MOTION to **TABLE** minutes until next meeting
MSC: A.McHale / J.Groupa / APPROVED

1.5 Public Comments: None

2.0 ACTION ITEMS

2.1 The LPCAS adopts the Distance Education Committee's Regular Effective Contact Policy

MOTION to **APPROVE** Distance Education Contact Policy
MS: J.Groupa / A.McHale

Sarah Thompson shared that at the last meeting this item was tabled. After review by the FA lawyers modifications were made to the original document that were not considered substantial, according to Scott Vigallon. Re-review of this document by the Senate was not necessary.

VOTE: APPROVED

3.0 CONSENT ITEMS: None

4.0 REPORTS

4.1 Curriculum Committee: Jeremiah Bodner reported that the Prerequisite Policy was presented and would like to place it on as an Action Item on the Senate's next meeting agenda. The other item he reported on was the Repeatability response, which he is asking be taken to each division for feedback. Title 5 mandates repeatability of courses of which there are many between LPC and Chabot. Rubric issues and equivalencies are two areas to especially review since repeatability, if not caught, may cause students form enrolling in a course. A list will be made available to area coordinators and faculty are to review and make the necessary corrections. The information should be turned in to Jeremiah before the December division meetings.

4.2 SLO Committee: None

4.3 BaSk Committee: None

4.4 DE Committee: The policy presented and approved under Action Item 2.1 was approved.

4.5 Program Review Committee: Three documents from the Program Review Committee had been previously sent to all and Jill Carbone was at this meeting to review its content. The Mission Statement has been totally revamped to make is short, simple and outline what the committee does and does not do, and reads as follows:

"The Program Review Committee promotes an effective and meaningful process with clear links to institutional planning and resource allocation."

The charge of this committee is to:

"Create, evaluate, and modify (as needed) the forms and processes for Program Review. Mentor program review writers through a peer review process. Work collaboratively with administration, appropriate committees and other College constituencies on the integration of program review into planning and resource allocation processes."

Jill went over the remainder of the information that included the membership, leadership, term and voting structure of this committee. She went on to the next two documents, which were the Definition of Program for purposes of Program Review and the Definition of Validation for purposes of Program Review. She explained how the committee met, discussed and came up with the development of the definition and validation for purposes of program review.

4.6 CEMC/Senate Subcommittee – Tom Orf asked that Sarah Thompson communicate some issues that are coming up at the DEMC. The DEMC meeting that was scheduled to be held the week before Thanksgiving week was canceled because of the many senior administrators attending the league meetings in Southern California. This was considered problematic by both colleges because of Prop 30 passing and having to add courses, and staff back into the schedule. This was seen as something that needed to be done quickly. Not having a DEMC meeting to decide how many FTEF or how many courses each college was going to add back didn't take place. Anger was felt from both colleges and a decision to move ahead and have the colleges make the decisions was made. Unfortunately, the decisions that Chabot made were not agreeable LPC CEMC members. A memo was sent that indicated Chabot was hoping to add 15 FTEF to their schedule. The District's recommendation was that district wide only 13 FTEF be allocated – 10 for Chabot and 3 for LPC. The reason for the inequity was that Chabot needed more courses because of not meeting their base, and their productivity is lower than ours. Tom Orf (CEMC chair) viewed this as a starting point for negotiations, and this also seemed relatively inequitable. Things are beginning to brew and the DEMC does not meet until next week. It's being assumed that a lot of activity will be taking place outside and leading up to the meeting. Tom wanted to make everyone aware that this was happening and that he was going to be aggressive to make sure that LPC doesn't get shut out of the FTEF, and also that the FTEF be equitable because of our growth mood.

John Ruys reported that the Senate Subcommittee is looking at the former prioritization model and adding recommendations using some of what other colleges have done. Los Medanos has a 1 thru 4 tier system for adding and cutting courses that is divided in areas that include General Ed, Transfer, CTE, Basic Skills, Academic Career Success and Counseling. Our course prioritization model is very similar except that our Basic Skills is broken out by ESL, English, Math and Counseling has a separate one. The committee has a set of recommendations about what the next step should be and is looking back at the historical data of where FTEF is allocated based on CTE certificates, AA and AS degree courses, General Ed and transfer, Basic Skills. The committee is currently looking at data from 2009-10 and using it as the starting point to review the current breakdown across the campus.

4.7 Staff Development: Mike Sato reported that the committee has been discussing the Flex Calendar. The number of fixed and variable flex days, and Convocation Day need to be reported to the State Chancellor's Office. The reason for bringing this to the Senate is to find out whether the Senate would like to have a role in making this decision. This item will be placed on the next agenda as a Discussion Item.

4.8 Hiring Prioritization: Melissa Korber reported that this committee met yesterday and discussed the process and next steps. The committee will be sending a recommendation to the president, and is working on revising the form, and clarifying the charge. This item will be on next meeting's agenda as a Discussion Item.

4.9 Faculty Association: None

4.10 Student Senate: Rafi Ansaria reported that the student government will be hosting a Student Appreciation Day on December 5 from 11 a.m. – 2 p.m. in front of the Student Center. A Prep to Pass Finals Tutoring event is also scheduled for December 12 and 13 in Room 2401from 6-10 p.m. Information about these events will be distributed in classes and posted around campus.

4.11 Treasurer: Melissa Korber reported that the Senate funds will be transitioning over to the Foundation in January 2013. The current balance stands at $1,100.00, and a through report will be made available when all accounts have been settled.

4.12 President: Sarah Thompson stated that the college will experience a tremendous amount of transitioning between this and next year. She mentioned that the Senate will have a new president and some new executive board members. Jeremiah Bodnar will be stepping down as Curriculum chair, Lisa Everett as Basic Skills chair, Mike Sato as Staff Development chair, and Tom Orf as CEMC chair.

Going back to the Senate, Sarah suggested looking at an effective way of transitioning the leadership role, and stated whether holding elections earlier than at the end of the academic year be more effective. With a full teaching load already established for the incoming president the time needed to dedicate transition of the new president will be interrupted. Not all senates operate the same and have structures in place for handling transition of leadership roles. Some senate executive boards have a president and president-elect position (a.k.a. VP) allowing the first year to be the transition period. Another way would be to divide the responsibilities between the president and president-elect positions. She'd like for everyone to think of an effective way to transition in the new president to continue with the continuity of the Senate.

The planning committee is wrapping up the Mission, Visions and Values statements in order to begin drawing up proposed college goals.

The focus for the next couple of months focus will be analyzing our committee structure and looking at the program review process. Questions such as for following will be discussed: How are committees formed? Are committees formed unnecessarily? Are committees formed to accomplish tasks or to obtain input? How are meeting times and frequency of meetings decided? Are there committees that duplicate or perform closely related work? What needs to be accomplished to make certain that the necessary tasks to complete the integration of program review, accreditation, planning, budgeting, allocating and assessment are met? What structures would best meet those needs?

4.13 DBSG: Sarah Thompson recapped what was said at the last meeting. The committee decided to move forward with a revenue based allocation model, and discussed the outline and order of the steps to make this model effective. To be determined first is the amount of FTEF funded for both colleges (determined externally), excluding non-resident; and second, aggregate the primary revenues to be allocated, which is to be addressed at the next DBSG meeting. The committee will be looking at the different areas that generate funding and determining whether the funds are to be placed in the "general" or "local" budget. This committee has been and will continue to be a contentious one, although it has made progress.

5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS

5**.1 Reviewing Our Committee Structure:** In Sarah Thompson President's Report she brought up questions regarding committee make-up and asked for feedback during this session of the meeting. Focus will be placed on looking at our processes and whether what's currently in place is effective.

Comments Received:
Some committees do spend too much time gathering input rather than working on action oriented items, tasks or other issues that need to be accomplished. Many times when a consensus is not reached no action is taken and stays on over to the next meeting. Members need to realize that if something is approved and not everyone agrees, it can always be amended later or changed if what was approved isn't working.

Some committees have lots of tasks to do that clearly do not meet enough times to accomplish what have been tasked with.

With several new committee chairs beginning next year, perhaps training should be considered so that they are aware of what they can do such as add additional meetings if necessary, change meeting time, or other things that will help them accomplished what the tasks of the committee. Leadership

training with previous chairs times was suggested that wouldn't require reassigned and meetings would be by mutual agreement.

5.2 Mission, Visions and Values Statement: Justin Garoupa reported that much of the feedback received pertained to the Mission statement and very little for the Visions and Values. The Mission statement was approved although there were suggested word changes and also questioned if some words should remain in the statement such as the word services. It also doesn't mention the word "classes" although it's clear that by the achievement of degrees this would naturally go along, and almost all services are educational endeavors. Perhaps more coordination with Student Services is needed as this was large area of the voices that were heard. Diana Rodriguez was not aware and will take back to her area to find out if this was so.

Rafi Ansaria (Student Rep) reported that the majority of the students approved the Mission statement, and those that did not found some of the words in the statement confusing. A student survey was conducted about campus to familiarize students with the content and the sense was that students felt this was being pushed upon them to approve. The type of feedback the student government was looking for was not what they received, and in general it's been approved by the students.

Discussion concluded with having gone through the process with all interested parties having reviewed the statement, the next step will be to vote on it at first meeting of the Senate in the spring since the Planning Taskforce has done all that it can do with the statement.

5.3 Automatic Awarding of Degrees: At the last meeting it was recommended that more voices be heard from the other departments on campus regarding the automatic awarding of degrees. There was concern with the impact this would have on students participating in CalWorks, Financial Aid, EOPS, and other various programs if this were to be implemented.

PROS: CC are now going to be evaluated on level of completion automatically awarding degrees would provide a more accurate account of what students have accomplished.

CONS: Students shouldn't be forced to automatically receive a degree and have the right to apply or opt out of this option.

Diana Rodriguez began by saying that Student Services had discussed concerns, one being student privacy issues. Automatically awarding a degree would mean "going into" students' academic records. A solution might be identifying students who had 60 or more units and sending a letter notifying them that they were eligible to apply for a degree. Another concern was the

increased workload for those researching the records of students who would qualify for a degree.

John Armstrong spoke about DegreeWorks, a software program in use by counseling and for evaluating students who are close to qualifying for a degree or certificate. DegreeWorks is described as: *"A web-based product that enables students and their advisors to review past, present, and future academic coursework to evaluate which degree requirements are complete and which degree requirements are remaining. DegreeWorks integrates seamlessly the Banner Student System. This software supports real time delivery of degree completion information through intuitive web self-service interfaces. It allows advisors to search for students by school, degree, and/or major to view degree progress, and provides the ability for advisors to make degree requirement substitutions electronically. Online environment reduces paperwork and manual degree checklists, increases productivity between academic departments across campus, and long-term potential for data mining (i.e.: To evaluate which course requirements all students have completed and which course requirements students still need and use that data to plan course offerings)."*

John explained that scribing or coding is necessary in order to match the catalog and the language that this program operates on. LPC has been testing this program for only a few months and there are "bugs" that are being worked out. He's not yet confident that the information generated is accurate and will continue to manually check student records until such time the program's output is consider 100% accurate. Students also have Catalog Rights and the system would need to be programmed with the different catalog years. Counselors would need to select the correct catalog year in which that particular course is listed since multiple catalog years could apply to students. Using the incorrect catalog year could result in inaccurately determining whether a student qualifies for a degree or not. Rubrics would also need to be recognized and with the changes between Chabot's and LPC's, the system wouldn't recognize courses taken at Chabot if an evaluation was being done at LPC. Course taken before 1994 would not show up in DegreeWorks because that was before Banner was implemented and information from courses taken at other institutions, course substitutions and waivers, Veteran and PE exemptions would all require manual input since have to be manually input.

Diana Rodriguez added her feeling of people already discussing DegreeWorks is placing us on the right track, and saw it as a great benefit to students but finding the right path and how to implement that is still something that needs to be figured out.
A reason the Statewide Senate has highly encouraged discussions regarding automatically awarding of degrees is that with the new ARCC II Reports that will be presented to the Board and posted on the Statewide Chancellor's

website, includes our success rates in terms of awarding degrees and certificates and other data are included too such as Basic Skills Sequence and things of that sort. At Chabot it was found that ECD students were not applying for their certificate even though they qualified. Because of this the success rate took a drop. The concern across the state is that even though we are being assured that no form of performance based funding is being considered but when you look at the Matriculation Bill, the way matriculation is now paid will be changing and based on performance, based on completion of matriculation sequences and the State wants this data online to compare between colleges the concern is that performance based funding is around the corner. So the concern is how to accurately capture what is an actual count at the college. This is why discussions regarding automatic awarding of degrees are taking place.

MOTION made to extend discussion an additional 5 minutes.
MSC: C.Keune / A.McHale/ APPROVED

DegreeWorks was seen as a great tool for the students once the "bugs" are worked out. Before we branch out, starting with a small test group of students once the system goes live would be best.

If a student is over 18 and someone other than the student is calling, information cannot be shared. By automatically granting degrees, the college is going into that students' file without permission and auditing it. We cannot assume that students automatically want a degree, since there may be some personal issues as to why they do not apply. The opt out selection may be overlooked, and an informational letter letting the student know that they may qualify for a degree would justify auditing their file, and giving them the option of applying and not assuming they've overlooked the opt out selection.

5.4 Deadlines for AA-T and AS-T Degrees: At the last meeting a directive from the State Chancellor's Office was received making the college aware that 80% of our degrees had to be in AA-T or AS-T format by the end of this year, and by next year at 100%. Sarah Thompson and Dr. Janice Noble had interpreted that as being 80% of every major or program. Marina Lira saw it as it 80% degrees that are already offered. Communications received and being passed around have just made interpretations even more confusing.

Sarah met with Jeremiah Bodner and a detailed 3-page document was drawn showing how the directives could be interpreted three different ways. The Senators are to take this document to their next division meeting for discussion, and bring back feedback from faculty to decide which of the three options best matches the faculty's interpretation, while keeping in mind what' best for students. Feedback collected will be discussed and a decision made at the Senate's first meeting in January.

5.5 Credit by Exam:
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: A.McHale / H.Gecox / APPROVED

6.0 DISCUSSION –NEW BUSINESS

6.1 New IEC Charge: No report.

6.2 Student Success Task Force Focus for 2013:
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: A.McHale / H.Gecox / APPROVED

6.3 Implementation SB 1456:
MOTION made to reorder agenda and bring this discussion forward.
MSC: A.McHale / C.Kutil / APPROVED

Diana Rodriguez spoke about some of the implications arising from the implementation of SB 1456. She stated that there were Twenty-two recommendations and out of the eight areas that are being focused on, three have already gone into legislature (Mandated Services; Board of Governor's Waiver; Student Support Initiatives). What this bill will do is align the matriculation process for the community colleges. Currently, it's a lot of what we already do such as education plans, assessments, orientations which are the largest areas. One area she's concern with is tracking what it is we do and how the tracking is done. That is where the funding dollars will be based on, although there is still a lot of conversations going on about the funding model and how it will be based. This time of the academic year is when the Statewide Chancellor's Office looks at the implementation and how they want it organized and give direction to community colleges of how they want it implemented. In academic year 2013-14 district offices and campus leadership will look at the implementation in order to maximize the funding received and how to move through the processes. As the process moves forward in 2014-15 it becomes the responsibility of the campuses to start implementing what the college set out to accomplish and track all the items that need tracking as designated by the Chancellor's Office. This is a critical year because this is the year funding will be based, and allocation will be given in 2015-16. If this were to occur now, the college wouldn't be able in best shape due to lack of resources and not having a structure in place.

SB 1456 will place restrictions on how matriculation funding can be used that will impact Student Services, and in 2014 impact the area of instruction. Currently eight areas benefit from this funding and conversations point to that number reducing, which leads to the question of where will the funding to continue operating the areas affected come from? Under this bill, not only will areas no longer be funded, but funding can be reduced for not meeting the required number of assessments. The language is not clear and can be interpreted in different ways. Further research and clarification is still being

done to make certain that the college is in compliance with this mandate, and updates will be shared at future meetings.

6.4 Instruction Materials Laws:
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: A.McHale / H.Gecox / APPROVED

6.5 New ARCC Reports – An Opportunity for Improved PR:
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: A.McHale / H.Gecox / APPROVED

6.6 Program Review Change and other Documentation: The presentation of Program Review documents was made prior to this section of the meeting. Jill Carbone and the committee were thanked for all the hard work and effort the group has shown by the inclusive information contained in the Mission Statement, Definition and Validation for purposes of Program Review. No further discussion occurred and the three documents will be listed as Action Items on the next meeting agenda.

7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER

7.1 Announcements: None

7.2 2012 Meetings: 2nd and 4th Wednesday – Next Meeting: December 12, 2012

7.3 Adjournment: 4:43 p.m.
MOTION to **ADJOURN**
MSC: A.McHale / H.Gecox / APPROVED

* * * * *

ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

EXECUTIVE OFICERS		ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER	
Senate President:	Sarah Thompson	ALSS:	Vacant
Senate VP:	Elena Cole	STEMPS:	Cindy Keune, Craig Kutil, Ashley McHale, Eric Harpell
Senate Secretary:	Justin Garoupa		
Senate Treasurer:	Melissa Korber	BSBA:	John Ruys, Geoff Smyth
Senate Admin Assist:	Carmen McCauley	Counseling:	Heike Gecox
		ASLPC Rep:	Rafi Ansaria

* * * * *

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.