

**LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
REGULAR MEETING**

SSA Building – Room 1687
September 24, 2014 – 2:30 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Mona Abdoun, Toby Bielawski, Jill Carbone, Rajeev Chopra, Greg Daubenmire, Heike Gecox, Mark Grooms, Richard Grow, Titian Lish, Thomas Orf, Gilberto Victoria

GUESTS: Elena Cole, Jason Craighead, Dyan Miller, Barbara Morrissey, Diana Rodriguez, Karin Spirn, Scott Vigallon

1.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

1.1 Call to Order – 2:30 p.m.

1.2 Approval of Agenda

MOTION made to **MOVE** Agenda Items 6.3, 6.1, and 6.2 before 1.3.

MSC: R.Grow / J.Carbone / APPROVED

1.3 Approval of Minutes from September 10, 2014

Draft Minutes - TABLED

1.4 Public Comments – None

2.0 ACTION ITEMS

2.1 Faculty Position Left Unfilled After Hiring Process Concludes – The Senators presented the following comments from their divisions:

BSBA – Consensus was that the position rollover for one year, then be placed back in the hat, if unsuccessful a second time. Also, rolling over the position would mean not having to wait advertising for the position.

ALSS – Agreed with rolling over the position.

STEMPS – A small number of faculty went with the discipline keeping their priority. A larger number of faculty went with resubmitting the proposal under the assumption that the same position would come up as a high priority the following year.

SS/Counseling – Rollover for one year.

Since the divisions were not completely in agreement, the Senate will respond to the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee, and have them decide to either rollover the position, or have the discipline resubmit their proposal.

2.2 Revised Equivalency Process Document – A document outlining the Equivalency process has been the topic of discussion at several of the Senate meetings, and was up for a vote at today's meeting.

The Senators have also discussed how to handle a tie vote among the committee members. One suggestion was to eliminate an arbitrator, and have 2 permanent administrator members (one from each college), and 2 faculty from the discipline or closest to (one from each college) the equivalency that is being reviewed. This would mean having to change the faculty representatives each time there was an equivalency. Another suggestion was to deny the equivalency in the case of a tie, and there not be a second go around.

Due to the importance of having more discussion related to the membership, how a tie vote should be handled, and voting on a document that contained language that the Senators were not in agreement with, the document was TABLED. At a later date a recommendation from the Senate will be presented to the FA that will cover the makeup of the membership, and changing the language in that portion of the document.

3.0 CONSENT ITEMS

3.1 Untenured Faculty Evaluation Committees –

SS & Counseling: Rafael Valle – Gilberto Victoria and Michelle Gonzales
Jill Oliveira – Christina Lee and James Dobson
Michelle Zapata – Michael Schwarz and Catherine Suarez

MOTION made to accept the committee makeup for the SS & Counseling faculty.
MSC: R.Grow / T.Lish / APPROVED

4.0 REPORTS

4.1 Curriculum Committee – No report

4.2 Program Review Committee – No report

4.3 SLO – Tina Inzerilla submitted the following SLO report from the meeting held September 1, 2014:

- ~ The SLO committee has decided to stay and continue to use the current version of eLumen.
- ~ Program Planning Updates worksheet from College Day – The SLO sections were great and addressed how SLO assessments impacted students.

- ~ Communicate SLOs to students. Students must understand SLOs.
- ~ Only 53% of the SLO assessments have been completed. We need to focus on completing assessments by November 4th.
- ~ Possibility of someone receiving 100% release time in Spring 2015 to assist in completion of SLOs.
- ~ Thank you faculty and Student Services for completing their SLOs, SAOs, assessments, and degree/certificate outcomes.

4.4 CEMC – Thomas Orf reported that the Committee will be meeting this Friday, and had previously created a list of prioritized classes. The lists were developed based on which courses would help the most with reaching the base number the college had set. The Committee used a scale of three levels where the highest offered the most courses. The President went with the third, which meant that quite a number of classes will be added during Fall 2014 and Spring 2015. That number will be known after CEMC meets this Friday.

4.5 Faculty Association – No report

4.6 Student Senate – No report

4.7 Treasurer – Rajeev Chopra reported that an additional \$225.00 had been collected.

4.8 President – No report

4.9 PBC District Budget – Rajeev Chopra reported that the District Budget Committee met on Convocation. The idea was to set up a tone to move forward with the new allocation model although some individuals were still hung up on writing new essences. Lorenzo Legespi has already written some but none have been vetted. There was discussion related to the flow of funding and the amounts, although no decisions were made at this meeting. This committee was scheduled to meet only four times a year, and the September 29 has already been canceled.

5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS

5.1 Accreditation Update – Elena Cole reported that the teams are working on their self-accreditation reports that are due November 4th. There has been discussion regarding addressing what was included in the last midyear report and how these should be addressed, since new standards have been introduced. Dr. Barry Russell has been on the ACCJC Board and has been asked to look into getting some answers to the college's accreditation committees' questions.

Another area that has been confusing has been the Improvement Plans (IP) and if all of them need to be addressed. Mixed information has been going around where it has been said the accreditation teams will only be interested in the agenda items that were addressed in the midterm report. Such as what has the college accomplished since the last report, and what is still in progress. This is something that Elena is working on to

get more clarification. With Dr. Janice Noble's departure, the college needs to have a representative that is consistent so that miss-information is not circulated, and with the loss of our ALO that process has been interrupted.

6.0 DISCUSSION – NEW BUSINESS

6.1 Online Education Initiative – Scott Vigallon was present to speak about the Online Education Initiative (OEI), a statewide effort that will help increase the number of students obtaining AA degrees and transferring over to 4-year colleges. This 5 year funded plan is expected to begin on June 1, 2015, and will centralize all online courses and support services, allowing any student from any community college in California to take online courses from other community colleges and receive credit. The focus will begin with ADT courses, move over to other degree courses, Basic Skills then Credit by Exam.

Colleges providing the “teaching” will receive the FTES, and colleges providing the students will be considered the “home” college. Colleges opting in those participating will have to adhere to a number of agreements. Taskforce and Steering committees will come together to make decisions, with some of these groups already having been formed. There will be online tutoring, online proctoring, etc. The plan is also to have a federated user ID that would be universal and used by all those participating. The courses would be reviewed for quality and web accessibility, and a common course management system will be established. Training support and the course management system will move from the local to the State level, so the turnaround time for assistance with questions or problems may be delayed.

With many more questions left to be answered, Scott will be looking into having someone from OEI visit the campus to meet with himself and faculty to answer as many questions as possible. There will be lots more discussion, and he encouraged going to the OEI website to learn more about the plan. <http://ccconlineed.org/>

6.2 PE Sports Request – Jason Craighead presented to the Senate the idea of adding another intercollegiate program, Water Polo. He has already spoken to the CEMC and the Curriculum committees and is interested in offering a women's and men's Water Polo team in Fall of 2015.

This sport was chosen because of the following:

- The 580/680 corridor is one of the largest areas contributing to individuals interested in participating in the sport of Water Polo, with So. CA being number 1.
- There is support from the community.
- Students have left the tri-valley area to play in this sport, and would have attended LPC had it been offered.
- Many students participate in dual sports, Water Polo and Swimming are considered opposite seasons so there would be no conflict. Questionnaires

completed by students when they apply to the college shows Water Polo as at the top.

- The infrastructure and facilities are already in place, with only a few basic items needed.
- Satisfies a Title IX requirement by offering a sport that would include underrepresented female students, and increasing opportunities for underrepresented genders.

He concluded by adding that the last time LPC added a new sport was in 2010.

The Senate will discuss and vote on this item at the next meeting.

6.3 3SP Plan – Diana Rodriguez spoke about the 3SP Plan known as the Student Success and Support Program. This program is to promote student success for all students, and each community college district is required to adopt a Student Equity Plan for each of their colleges. LPC's plan is approximately 75-80% written, and the committee is in the process of vetting the planning agenda. Those who will be heavily involved with administering the plan, include administrators, counseling faculty, and some staff. Copies of the plan have already been given to these groups for them to read and make edits.

Chabot's Student Services department has contacted to see how they are progressing with their document, and also to make certain there are no contradictions, or duplicating of efforts. Diana will also be making this presentation to the Classified Senate and the ASLPC.

The purpose of the 3SP is to provide students with the information of what types of resources are available to them on campus, set out an educational plan, take them through the orientation process, and provide to them as much information as possible before they step in the classroom. The plan consists of letting the State know what we (as a college) have done in the past years in the various areas in order to prepare students, and how is the funding going to be used to continue to build upon what already has been done. The college's plan outlines activities as well as the need for additional staffing. The funding for the needed positions will not impact the general budget, and will be categorical funded. These funds are very descriptive and can be used in only direct or indirect services.

The plan is due October 18, and both Chabot and LPC have asked for a two week extension, which has been granted. The District's Educational Support Services committee will need to review the plan, but due to their meeting being canceled the turnaround time for presenting then submitting the final document did not leave enough time.

A short Q & A period followed, and in closing it was mentioned that this plan replaced what use to be known as Matriculation, and will be submitted annually.

6.4 Possible Senate Resolution on Budget Passed by BOT – The Senate’s resolution was placed on hold, and the following related information was reported by Thomas Orf.

At the last Board meeting the budget document where “general” costs are listed were items that raised questions. When the apportionment from the State is received some costs are taken from the top, which is shared between LPC, Chabot, M&O, and the District. The budget document had listed costs that included \$350,000 for board elections, \$50,000 for district accreditation, and more than \$100,000 for the Educational Master Plan. The problem was not the listed costs, but that discussion had not taken place within the PBC or any of the other entities involved. With the new allocation model in place, anything that has to do with the budget needs to be brought to the front end of that committee for discussion, creating the budget, then presenting it to the Board for approval. None of this process was followed.

At the Board meeting statements related to what was discovered were read by two LPC faculty members. The response from the District was that this was part of the growing pains of implementing a procedure that is still new. Rebuttals were stated by the each of the Senate Presidents from both colleges’. Thomas Orf replied that this was not the case of going through growing pains, and certainly not the way to handle being transparent.

Tom Orf and LaVaughn Hart both discussed further what had happened, and the suggestion of having the Senate write a resolution that adamantly outlines that all budget items must go through the PBC. Also related to this was that LaVaughn Hart is the Chair of the PBC and had no prior knowledge of what was being presented. Also, Thomas Orf is the Chair of the Educational Support Services Committee, and the meeting was canceled without being notified ahead of time.

Tom will draft a resolution and present it at the next Senate for discussion and feedback from the Senators.

7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER

7.1 Announcements –

~ Transfer Day – Monday September 29, 2014

Talking Points:

- ~ Equivalency Document
- ~ New Program – Water Polo
- ~ Hiring Prioritization Update

7.2 Adjournment – 4:00 p.m.

* * * * *

ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Senate President: Thomas Orf
Senate Vice President: Greg Daubenmire
Senate Secretary: Jill Carbone
Senate Treasurer: Rajeev Chopra
Senate Admin Assist: Carmen McCauley

ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

ALSS: Toby Bielawski, Titian Lish
STEMPS: Richard Grow
BSBA: Mark Grooms
Counseling: Heike Gecox, Gilberto Victoria
PT Faculty: Mona Abdoun
ALPC Rep: Joel Roland

* * * * *

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.