

## 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.

## LPC Planning Priorities

- ❖ Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards.
- ❖ Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance.
- ❖ Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes.
- ❖ Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE, and Transfer courses.

## Academic Senate

### Members Present (voting):

**Senate President:** Melissa Korber

**Senate VP:** Tina Inzerilla

**Senate Treasurer:** Mark Grooms

**ALSS:** Julia McGurk, Marilyn Marquis

**STEMPS:** Jill Carbone, Richard Grow,  
Teri Henson

**BSBA:** Rajeev Chopra

**Counseling:** Heike Gecox (FA),  
Rafael Valle, Mike Schwarz

**Part-time Faculty:** Candace Brown

**ASLPC Student Rep:** Angela Toledo

### Members Absent:

Julia McGurk, Jill Carbone,  
Richard Grow, Candace Brown

### Guests:

VP Roanna Bennie, Toby Bielawski,  
Scott Vigallon, Deborah Bauer,  
Ruth Hanna, LaVaughn Hart,  
Greg Daubenmire

## DRAFT Minutes

### Presenter

### 1. GENERAL BUSINESS

**Melissa Korber**  
**Items 1-4**

#### 1.1 Call to Order/Quorum

Meeting called to order at 2:35 pm

#### 1.2 Approval of Agenda

**MOTION** to Approve Agenda

MSC: T.Inzerilla / M.Grooms / APPROVED

**MOTION** to REORDER the Agenda and move Agenda Items 6.3, 5.3, 6.1, and 6.2 after Section 1.0

MSC: T.Inzerilla / M.Grooms / APPROVED

#### 1.3 Review and Approval of Minutes – March 23 and April 13, 2016

**MOTION** to APPROVE Draft Minutes from March 23, 2016

MSC: M.Grooms / T.Henson / APPROVED

**MOTION** to APPROVE Draft Minutes from April 13, 2016

MSC: M.Grooms / T.Inzerilla / APPROVED

**1.4 Public Comments** (This time is reserved for members of the public to address the Academic Senate. Please limit comments to three minutes. In accordance with the Brown Act, the Academic Senate cannot act on these items.) – None

### 2. ACTION ITEMS - None

### 3. CONSENT ITEMS

#### 3.1 Curriculum Approval

##### Course Outlines – Credit

- CIS 55 (Integrating Office Application)

##### Course Deactivations – Effective Date: Fall 2016

- ELEC 1511 – Electronic Technology
- ELEC 1512 – Workforce Development Lab
- ELEC 29 – Independent Study Electronics
- ELEC 55 – Telecommunications Exam Prep
- ELEC 59 – Optical Electronics
- ELEC 70 – Introduction to Electronics
- ELEC 85.1 – DC Fundamentals
- ELEC 85.2 – AC 1 Fundamentals

- ELEC 85.3 – AC 2 Fundamentals
- ELEC 85.4 – Semiconductor Devices
- ELEC 85.5 – Digital Logic Fundamentals
- ELEC 85.6 – Digital Circuits 1
- ELEC 85.7 – Digital Circuits 2
- ELEC 86.1 – Operational Amplifier Fundamentals
- ELEC 86.2 – Operational Amplifier Applications
- ELEC 86.3 – Power Supply Regulation
- ELEC 87.1 – DC Network Theorems
- ELEC 87.2 – Transistor Amplifier Circuits
- ELEC 87.3 – Transistor Power Amplifiers
- ELEC 87.4 – Transistor Feedback Amplifiers
- ELEC 87.5 – Field Effect Transistors
- ELEC 87.6 – Thyristor/Phase Control Circuits
- ELEC 87.7 – 32-Bit Microprocessor
- ELEC 9 – Colloquium-Electronics Tech

#### **Course Outlines – Non-Credit**

- MATH 201 (Math Jam for Pre-Algebra)
- MATH 202 (Math Jam for Elementary Algebra)
- MATH 203 (Math Jam for Intermediate Algebra)
- MATH 204 (Math Jam for Statistics & Probability and Mathematics for the Liberal Arts)
- MATH 205 (Math Jam for Trigonometry/Pre-Calculus and Business Calculus)

#### **Program Deactivations – Effective Date: Fall 2016**

- A.S. for Science Technology - Control # 09220
- A.A. for Liberal arts and Sciences: Business (Duplicate) - Control # 19130
- A.A. for Liberal arts and Sciences: Computer Studies (Duplicate) - Control # 19132
- A.A. for Liberal arts and Sciences: Humanities (Duplicate) - Control # 19134
- A.A. for Liberal arts and Sciences: Language Arts (Duplicate) - Control # 19136
- A.A. for Liberal arts and Sciences: Mathematics/Sciences (Duplicate) - Control # 19138
- A.A. for Liberal arts and Sciences: Social Science (Duplicate) - Control # 19140
- A.S. for Electronics Technology: Telecom Systems – Control # 21583
- A.S. for Surgical Technology – Control # 18826
- Certificate of Achievement for Electronics Technology: Telecom Systems – Control # 09218
- Certificate of Achievement for Technical Illustration – Control # 01053
- Certificate of Achievement for Bridgestone/Firestone Apprenticeship – Control # 17515

#### **Requisites**

- CIS 55 – Strongly Recommended: CIS 50

**3.2 Dean, Academic Services, Science, Engineering, Math and Public Safety Hiring Committee –**  
Kristy Woods, Jennie Graham, Michael Ansell

**3.3 Dean, Academic Services, Computing, Applied Technology and Social Sciences Hiring Committee –**  
Ana Del Aguila, L.W. Hasten, Tina Inzerilla, Bill Komanetsky, Aki Hirose, John Ruys

**3.4 Senior Administrative Assistant Hiring Committee** – John Ruys, Elena Alvarado, Mark Tarte

**3.5 Counselor, Veterans Program Hiring Committee** – Jill Oliveira, Mike Sato, Angela VenJohn, Rafael Valle, Gilberto Victoria

**3.6 Accreditation Steering Faculty Committee** – Tina Inzerilla, John Ruys, Ann Hight, Elena Cole, Joel Gagnon

**MOTION** made to APPROVE Consent Items 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5.  
MSC: T.Inzerilla / M.Grooms / APPROVED

**MOTION** to REORDER Agenda and move Item 7.1 next.  
MSC: M.Grooms / R.Chopra / APPROVED

**4. REPORTS**

**4.1 Basic Skills** – No report

**4.2 CTE Liaison** – No report

**4.3 Integrated Planning Committee** – No report

**4.4 Staff Development**

Reported under Agenda Item 6.3

**4.5 Faculty Association** – No report

**4.6 Student Senate** – No report

**4.7 Treasurer**

Senate Treasury Account Ending Balance for 2015-2016 - \$2,181.06

**4.8 President** – No report

**4.9 District Integrated Planning & Budget Committee** – No report

**Michelle Gonzales/Ashley McHale**

**Mark Grooms**

**Mike Sato**

**Greg Daubenmire**

**Heike Gecox**

**Angela Toledo**

**Mark Grooms**

**Melissa Korber**

**Rajeev Chopra**

**5. OLD BUSINESS**

**5.1 District Policies AP/BP 4020**

**(Curriculum & Program Development)** – Next meeting

**5.2 Administrative Evaluations** – Next meeting

**5.3 Online Education Initiative – Resolution and Report**

Melissa Korber briefly recapped why the resolution was written and stated that the focus was on Canvas and not the OEI. There has been some concerns regarding adopting Canvas, and earlier in the semester a suggestion was made to have someone attend the Senate meeting in order to provide more information. The consensus of the group at that time was to wait until the OEI Task Force had handed down their recommendation, which they now have.

**Mike Schwarz/ Teri Henson**

**Marilyn Marquis**

**Marilyn Marquis**

In the meantime, a resolution from the Senate was suggested with Marilyn Marquis and Teri Hanson volunteering to do so. Marilyn explained that she did not have a clear sense of what the OEI was about to begin helping write the resolution and did some researching. The initiative originated from the State Chancellor's Office and on that website she found meaningful information and put together a handout that provided a better understanding of the OEI. The handout covered specific areas and the reason why:

The initiative – to ensure that more students are able to complete their educational goals by being able to access high-quality online courses.

The Goal – to improve the quality of the online educational experience across the colleges.

The funding for the initiative – is sponsored by Foothill-De Anza CCD in partnership with the Butte-Glenn CCD and its CCT Technology Center at Butte College as recipients of a \$56.9 million 5-year grant disbursed by the State Chancellor's Office.

The types of participation – 1) Shared resources; 2) Shared resources and adopt Canvas; or 3) Shared resources, adopt Canvas, and participate in the OEI.

Faculty is provided with – professional development, guidance, and training on the use of Canvas.  
Students are provided with – tutorials, online counseling, tutoring for underprepared students.  
Technology Tools provided – Common Course Management Systems.

The ASCCC has already adopted a resolution urging local senates to establish courses design standards. The goal of the OEI is to establish standards for all online courses, a rubric for developing these courses, and how to use online materials. The Basic Skills Work Group of the OEI is currently focused on modules that can be embedded into online course. A course exchange will be piloted in Fall 2016 with eight [8] colleges participating, and is a seamless pathway for students to register for online courses across participating colleges without requiring students to complete separate application and matriculation processes. If a college chooses to participate in the OEI, they do not have to participate in the course exchange.

Marilyn understood the resistance the faculty may or may not have to the OEI, and found that the biggest challenge would be moving from Blackboard to Canvas. She felt the information contained in the handout would help faculty better understand what the OEI is setting out to do. She stated that the idea of the OEI is to design a standardized platform to guarantee that online courses have the same rigor and standards that are already in place for other courses.

Melissa continued the discussion with the OEI Task Force recommendation, which read as follows:

*“Based on the results, it is evident that there is not a consensus among the OEI Task Force members. The Chabot OEI Task force members want more time to review the comparison of Blackboard and Canvas CMS before they can make a final recommendation. The majority of LPC OEI Task Force members and the District members have made their final recommendation to move forward on Canvas CMS at this time. Each college must complete an Institutional Participation Agreement to sign up to canvas.”*

Since both colleges are not in agreement at this time, it was stated that the Senate consider the resolution that was prepared by Teri Henson and Marilyn Marquis.

Ruth Hanna was present and stated that she has a number of online courses and spoke in detail about her concern with moving over to Canvas, and asked for just a bit more time before making the decision to transition over.

Mike Schwarz mentioned that a compromise by faculty to invest in Canvas could be contingent upon offering additional support to faculty, above what Canvas offers.

Deborah Bauer was on the OEI Task Force and teaches at another college part-time. At that college faculty were notified of the college considering implementing Canvas, and then it happened. The Canvas training stages do not rush faculty through, and she now is involved with training faculty, and very much supports the use of Canvas.

Scott Vigallon mentioned that Blackboard is coming up with a new version called Blackboard Ultra that is similar to Canvas, and did not have an answer when asked about the migration process. He did state that the nationwide trend is going from Blackboard to Canvas, and that everyone he has spoken to about Canvas did not have any negative comments.

Going back to the resolution, Teri explained that the premise was to allow for ample time for those who will need to dedicate a significant amount of time towards making the change from Blackboard to Canvas, and that support be provided to faculty and others, above what Canvas has offered. Also, that during the implementation process, whether it be during summer or the regular academic year that faculty receive compensation by either reassigned time, reduced load, or stipend. Marilyn added that consideration was given to wording the resolution in a way that it could also be accepted by Chabot. Teri acknowledging that bringing in Canvas was probably going to happen, and when it does happen “we” need to be supported. The resolution is not about adopting Canvas, but if it were to be adopted.

LaVaughn Hart stated that the FA has asked to negotiate the time to completely transition over. When the decision to adopt Canvas is made and the college is accepted, there is a 9-month period that is given for entering the first class and having students in that class. After that an additional 18 month period is given to fully implement over to the system.

A brief discussion reiterating the positive comments about Canvas, and feedback from some faculty indicated that LPC should consider getting onboard now. Melissa polled her students and asked if they would research the resources available on the OEI and those that did felt that the system was user friendly.

The resolution will move forward and be finalized by the next Senate meeting for presentation at the following Board meeting.

**5.5 2015-2016 Academic Senate Executive Board Elections****Marilyn Marquis**Academic Senate Executive Board for 2016-2017

Vice President – Tina Inzerilla

Secretary – Mike Schwarz

Treasurer – Mark Grooms

Mark Grooms was elected and has declined the position of Treasurer due to the fact that he will be leaving at the end of the Spring Semester. A Special Election Ballot for the Treasurer position was presented to the Senate with voting taking place from May 16 through May 24, 2016.

**5.6 Summer Library Hours****Tina Inzerilla**

The Library will be open 9 hours per day Monday through Thursday during the Summer Semester.

**5.7 Faculty Handbook Review – Next meeting****Melissa Korber****6. NEW BUSINESS****6.1. Adult Education and Non-Credit Classes****Roanna Bennie**

VP Roanna Bennie was on the agenda to answer questions about the Non-Credit classes associated with the Adult Education at LPC. A large amount of time will be devoted to meeting with the FA and working on pieces of this program to help bring it together on this campus.

Adult Education is used as a way to build non-credit classes to help adult students with progressing through a pathway, and non-credit can also service in other ways. Last week a group from Orange County was invited that have a large non-credit program that generates 100's of FTES for their college, have their own building, processes, and twenty-six [26] full-time faculty. Since LPC is new and wanting to know more about offering non-credit courses and adult education, areas such as registering students in non-credit courses, having instructors that meet minimum qualifications, and how these instructors should be paid are just some areas that need to be explored further. Inviting a college with a large number of enrollments in non-credit courses was a way of gaining some insight on how non-credit works.

One question was why adult education was being brought to the campus if locations already exist within the local communities. It seemed as if the college would be taking away jobs from adult schools. LPC is part of a consortium that has two community colleges and the adult school sites, which are well established. The one that suffered the most was in Pleasanton, which "fell" quite a bit and is now up and running. The idea is not to take over or absorb their courses; what it is trying to do is have community colleges come along side and fill the gaps.

Non-credit curriculum will go through the same curriculum process and have the same state approvals. Orange County has its own curriculum committee for non-credit, which would not be something LPC will be doing. LPC is just looking at models at this time, and the FTES from non-credit courses is not expected to grow fast, but expected to come from growth money.

It was stated that the presentations made by the Adult Education Non-Credit Product Manager seemed to be moving fast with wanting to implement this program at LPC. One faculty member stated that it was not about supporting a non-credit program but the process with which non-credit will be sustained. The response was that some non-credit courses are funded by full apportionment that leads to the potential of being able to generate more. Also, there may be some additional institutional support that could be provided.

How would the decision be made if additional apportionment was made available and a discipline was requesting much needed classes, and non-credit for adding more courses? The response was that the CEMC process would be used, the same curriculum process, same FTEF process, etc. No processes outside of the CEMC unless it is decided by the CEMC.

With regard to counseling, how will the students be served because in that department it is more about the head-count, and what about dedicated resources? Non-credit students can be supported through SSSP funding and reported separately. Their head-count would be just like other regular students; they will be seen for counseling, seen for education planning, and all other services. As non-credit grows, these students could continue to be supported through SSSP funding and using the current process in place for requesting funds.

Who decides what curriculum gets developed? Are faculty going to be asked to develop a particular course? The response was that Math Jam is on board, and the Horticulture program is very interested in being part of the non-credit program.

## **6.2 Accreditation Steering Committee**

**Melissa Korber**

The Accreditation Steering committee met two weeks ago. VP Roanna Bennie, Melissa Korber, Marilyn Marquis, Elena Cole, Mike Sato, and Heike Gecox met to review the process established. VP Bennie presented at a Town meeting the function of the steering committee. This committee answers to the College Council, and their task is to define the expansion of the steering committee and work around the particular needs of the next report and visit. The committee does have a few tasks that are more global, such as making the accreditation more of the backdrop and integrating the work into committees and offices in a way to encompass what has already been accomplished, so as not to panic once every five years. Not only has the steering committee recommended expanding the committee for each report and visit, but also recommending having reassigned time available to get through the next report and visit on time.

## **6.3 Staff Development Process**

**Greg Daubenmire**

The Staff Development committee has received many more proposals than in past years, with many part-time, and new faculty applying for funding. There has been some confusion with the application process and where to send some of the forms. Greg Daubenmire, Chair of the Staff Development Committee, was on hand to explain the two-step process for submitting an Activity Proposal.

A request begins with completing an Activity Proposal form that requires writing a brief summary of the activity, and if a conference is involved a Conference Request form must also be completed. Related documentation should be attached, and both forms approved by the division dean or supervisor before submitting to the Staff Development Committee. The deadline for submitting proposals is the first

Monday of each the month by 5:00 p.m., and the maximum amount currently being awarded is \$250. The Staff Development Committee then meets the following week to review the proposals and the applicants are notified shortly thereafter. After the activity has been completed, a one-page report must be submitted to Greg before any expenses related to the activity are processed. Both the report and expense claim must be submitted within 30 days after the completion of the activity.

There is also misinformation on the Staff Development webpage regarding the Variable Flex Proposal form. The instructions indicate that the paperwork is to be submitted by April 1<sup>st</sup> to the Vice President of Academic Services, which is incorrect and has caused confusion.

The Staff Development Committee is recommending hosting three workshops as Fall Flex Day activities to go over the process. The committee also will be working on the Variable Flex Process, which has three links also with incorrect information. Greg will be working with the new Web Master to update the Staff Development webpage and streamlining the process to make accessing information less confusing. He will return and present updated information regarding the Staff Development Activity Proposal and Variable Flex Proposal processes to the Senate next Fall.

A brief Q & A session following before moving on to the next agenda item.

## 7. GOOD OF THE ORDER

**7.1 LaVaughn Hart** – LaVaughn wanted to share information regarding apportionment and how an issue might occur which may lead to the Academic Senate wanting to lend support. Three years ago the BAM (Budget Allocation Model) was developed that included apportionment funding received from the State flowing through the allocation model. Percentages were set for the amount of funding both colleges, the district, and M&O were to receive. The purpose of the BAM was to establish a constant way to do business as opposed to an every moving decision depending on who was in charge. Our Chancellor was not in place here when the discussions, design and development of this model took place and has indicated that she does not believe in using the BAM. Last year the apportionment funding did not flow through the BAM and the Chancellor decided to hold on to over \$2.4M in funding.

The PBC has repeatedly made recommendations that all have been turned down, and the Chancellor's rationale was to build reserves. Some funding was released, which was the Innovation Funds that came out this year. The district made a decision to rollback from summer 2013-14 that amounted to \$1.53M that should have flowed through the BAM – the Chancellor refused and kept that money. District reserves have grown 86% in one [1] year.

It is known that the college will be in stability next year, which is not necessarily a bad thing because rollbacks do not have to be made. In order to come out of stability there needs to be rollbacks and future plans need to be made. The PBC has discussed and came up with a figure of 17500 in rollbacks. The Chancellor is only releasing to the colleges a total of 17229. Both colleges have built their schedules around 17362 for 2016-17 to be able to meet the goal of 17500 by the end of 2017-18. LaVaughn and Lorenzo Legaspi will be meeting with the Chancellor next Thursday and recommending that 17500 be placed in the budget. It does not seem right to ask and receive from the State funding for both colleges an amount of 17500, set the goal for both colleges at 17362 for next year and receive funding for only



17229. If the Chancellor denies adding 17500 to the budget, the next step will be to present this information to the Board.

Discussion continued regarding the budget, and the various scenarios that might happen depending on the outcome of next Thursday's meeting with the Chancellor. Ways the Academic Senate could show support were also briefly discussed. An invitation to attend the next Senate meeting will be extended to the Chancellor that will be based on the outcome at IPBC meeting scheduled for Friday.

**7.2 Mike Schwarz** – In response to Marilyn Marquis speaking on transparency, Mike was informed by the Student Services committee representative that at today's RAC meeting a vote was taken to return to the former process used for requesting instructional equipment.

**7.3 Tina Inzerilla**- Tina spoke about the faculty rankings related to the new faculty hiring positions. Originally, History was ranked #4, then went to #3. The hiring process began last week and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Level interviews were held last Friday. The committee was notified by Dr. Russell that only 6 positions could be hired and that History was not one of them. The President asked if part-time faculty could fill in for the History position during the Fall and perhaps until next academic year. This suggestion was made while hiring was moving forward with positions that were ranked lower than History.

Melissa Korber mentioned that a meeting had been held earlier in the day to discuss all of the positions with LaVaughn Hart also present. A list was made in the following order: Art; History; Math; History; Math; Counseling; Psychology; Kinesiology; CNT; and Theater. Biology and English – Highly Probable; Humanities – Hopeful, and Anthropology – No (due to budget issues). Ways of funding the positions that are in question are currently being discussed.

Dean Dyan Miller is leaving and plans for making a fourth division are continuing forward. Discussion of having a director instead of a dean for athletics, and reassigning faculty to other divisions for only a year are being considered. It is hopeful that the hiring for the two new deans will move forward, although the structure for this year may carryover. Nothing has been decided.

**8. ADJOURNMENT** – 4:40 p.m.

**MSC:** M.Grooms / T.Inzerilla / APPROVED

**9. NEXT MEETING** – May 25, 2016