LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
REGULAR MEETING
Room 4130, Mertes Center for the Arts Building
January 23, 2012 – 2:30 p.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Elena Cole, Heike Gecox, Justin Garoupa, Michelle Gonzales, Melissa Korber, Cindy Keune, Craig Kutil, Ashley McHale, Janice Noble, Sarah Thompson

GUESTS: Jeremiah Bodnar, Janice Noble, Rajinder Samra, Scott Vigallon, and other members of the Campus Community

---

1.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

1.1 Call to Order/Quorum: 2:37 p.m.

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

1.3 Approval of Minutes of October 24, 2012
MOTION to **TABLE** approval of draft minutes from November 14 and November 28, 2012
MSC: M.Korber / A.McHale / **APPROVED**

1.4 Public Comments - None

2.0 ACTION ITEMS

2.1 The LPCAS approves Option 1: We submit a list to the State that includes a total of 12 AA-T/AS-T degrees we plan to create (80% complete by the end of Spring 2013, 100% by the end of Spring 2014).
MOTION to **OPEN** discussion on Options 1
MS: M.Korber / A.McHale

Action Item 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 are all related. Opinions shared during the discussion may incorporate dialogue that pertains to all three Action Items.

Sarah Thompson stated that the Executive Board, Dr. Janice Noble, VP of Academic Services and Jeremiah Bodnar, Curriculum Chair, had been made aware of the different options and the potential workload associated with each one. Solutions were discussed regarding how to manage this task and help alleviate some of the work that will be associated with the more ambitious

options. Sarah will be attending and speak at the next Curriculum meeting of ways to streamline the workload and to empower the committee to make priorities in terms of the tasks that they will be facing. The Curriculum committee has not been faced with the amount of curriculum that has passed through recently, which will only increase with now having to meet the AS-T/AS-T degree mandate.

At the last meeting the Senators were asked to gather feedback from faculty in their divisions as to how many degrees would be created in order to help select the best option. From the ALSS area there were 11, STEMPS were not sure and would report back, and BSBA did not have a number.

Discussion continued with recapping the 3 options, and being realistic about being able to meet the 80% / 100% goals under each option. A decision will need to be made soon since a deadline date of January 31st has been set by the State.

VOTE: NO - Unanimously

2.2 The LPCAS approves Option 2: We submit a list to the State that includes every program that wishes to offer an AA-T/AS-T degree (80% complete by the end of Spring 2013, 100% by the end of Spring 2014).
MOTION made to **APPROVE 2.2**
MSC: C.Keune / A.McHale / (1- Abstention) / **APPROVED**

2.3 The LPSAC approves Option 3: We submit a list to the State that includes every program where an AA—T/AS-T degree could be created (80% complete by the end of Spring 2013, 100% complete by the end of Spring 2014).

VOTE: None taken as Action Item 2.2 APPROVED.

2.4 The LPCAS approves the College Prerequisite Policy
MOTION made to **APPROVE** College Prerequisite Policy
MS: J.Garoupa / A.McHale

Jeremiah Bodnar took a few minutes to briefly explain this policy before a vote was taken, since in depth discussion has previous taken place.

VOTE: 2 – Abstentions / **APPROVED**

2.5 The LPCAS approves the ranking priorities of the Hiring Prioritization Committee
MOTION made to **APPROVE** ranking priorities
MS: M.Korber / J.Garoupa

A list of the rankings was displayed and approval from the Academic Senate will move this item forward to the President's Office, which has already been approved by RAC.

VOTE: 1 – Abstention / **APPROVED**

2.6 The LPCAS approves the Board Repeater Policy BP4225
MOTION made to **APPROVE** Board Policy BP4225
MS: J.Garoupa / A.McHale

Approval of the changes in this policy will make it in compliant with Title 5.

VOTE: APPROVED

2.7 The LPCAS approves the Administrative Policy for Course Repetition AP 4227
MOTION made to **APPROVE** Administrative Policy AP 4227
MS: J.Garoupa / A.McHale

Approval of this policy will ensure that the Board Policy is carried out according how it is written, including following Ed code and Title 5.

VOTE: 1 – Abstention / **APPROVED**

2.8 The LPSAC approves the Board Credit by Examination Policy BP 4235
MOTION made to **APPROVE** Board Policy 4235.
MS: A.McHale / M. Korber

This policy is reflects the requirements in the Ed Code and Title 5.

VOTE: 2 – Abstentions / **APPROVED**

3.0 CONSENT ITEMS – None

4.0 REPORTS

4.1 Curriculum Committee – None
4.2 SLO Committee – None

4.3 BaSk Committee – Having accepted the position of Interim Dean for the STEMPS division, Paula Schoenecker has replaced Lisa Everett as coordinator of the BaSk committee. This committee is discussing combining the funding and concentrating on just one major project. Currently the focus is being placed on the Math area, specifically math remediation. Diana Rodriguez will be attending one of the BaSk meetings to suggest that monies

be set aside should mandates listed in the recently passed matriculation law require funding support.

4.4 DE Committee – Scott Vigallon reported that the Governor's proposed budget has set aside $16.5 million for community colleges online courses. The Governor is in support of MOOCS (Massive Online Open Courses) and there is interest in creating 250 online courses and a course management system for community colleges that can be used throughout the State. Scott has asked that if this goes through what happens with meeting effective contact hours under accreditation? The reply was not official but the jest was that students would be taking the MOOC courses not for credit but using that knowledge and applying for Credit by Examination. San Jose State will soon be offering MOOCs and piloting three related to Remedial Math. They are the first to offer credit for a MOOC course, and yesterday Georgia State University became the second. San Jose State reached an agreement with Udacity who are hiring student that go into the classes and act as motivators to keep them interested and help ensure that the students do not drop out of the course.

4.5 Program Review Committee – No official report given at this meeting, although a representative will be at the next Senate meeting to present draft materials that include templates and timeline.

4.6 CEMC/Senate Subcommittee – The CEMC has not yet met this year. Melissa Korber reported that the CEMC Subcommittee members have been tasked with projects, and no future meeting date has been set.

4.7 Staff Development – None

4.8 Hiring Prioritization – Melissa Korber reported that this committee will not be meeting again until March, and previously in this meeting the approval for this committee's hiring prioritization recommendation will move forward to the President.

4.9 Faculty Association – Debbie Fields reported that the new FA office has been set up and located in Building 2100 - office 2111.

4.10 Student Senate – None

4.11 Treasurer – Melissa Korber reported that the current balance is $1,481.94. She is encouraging the Senators to begin collecting the recommended donation of $25.00. The money is used to sponsor student scholarships, and help with Staff Appreciation costs. After much research, the Senate account will remain with Bank of the West.

4.12 President – Sarah Thompson shared that the process for hiring an additional Security Officer is underway and the Senate was asked for a faculty representative. Michelle Gonzales expressed interest and will meet with Sarah to learn more about the hiring process.

DBSG will meet this Friday, and a local meeting is scheduled for Thursday to prepare a plan of how the "extra" money should be divvied up at Friday's meeting. In addition, the Senate and FA appointees to the DBSG will meet beforehand for a morning session to review issues related to the revenue based model, the college, and their participation on the committee.

4.13 DBSG – Report incorporated in 4.13.

5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS

5.1 Reviewing Our Committee Structure – At the last Planning Task Force meeting the members began looking at the committee structure of all of the different committees on campus and the difference in terminology used for the working groups. It was found that a habit had formed where every group was considered a committee and only an adjective distinguished one from another. The tasks performed by the Food Service group are far distant from those of the Curriculum Committee. Looking at what a committee is tasked with and coming up with a structure that would best facilitate those tasks is the direction the Planning Task Force decided to take. They will start with the College Council, (IEC) Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Planning Task Force, and (RAC) Research Allocation Committee. These committees will be looked at through three different ways - a Functional Lens: what has to get done for the college to keep operating, an Accreditation Lens: what should the college keep up with to maintain accreditation status, and through State Mandates: huge mandates have been passed down that require institutional change although the college does not have a structure that facilitates this.

In order to begin this process, the chairs of the College Council, (IEC) Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Planning Task Force, and (RAC) Research Allocation Committee have invited to sent the Task Force a list of their tasks or participate in the discussions that will take place. The outcome is that after a commitment to work on this over the next couple a weeks, a proposal would be drawn to present to the college outlining how to best handle our committee structures.

The Task Force is working closely with the Program Review committee and a retreat is being considered. Ideas and feedback continue to be appreciated

5.2 Mission, Vision and Values Statement – Another area that the Planning Task Force is addressing is the Mission, Vision and Values statement. This has been placed on hold because a finalized version from the sub-committee

has not yet been presented to the Task Force, and needs to be done before it can be presented to the college as a whole.

Complications have been raised resulting from Governor Brown's budget proposals that may affect the Mission, Visions, and Values statement. His proposal is to move adult education to the community colleges, and have $3M transferred to the community colleges for adult education, and $17M to start apprenticeship programs. Since the college does not have this type of structure in place, Contract Ed is non-credit and thought to be a location that could accommodate the adult education program since they are able to increase and decrease their student number based on the types of contracts received.

Scott Vigallon shared that there were accreditation requirements for Distance Education that are extensive, of which two have to do with the Mission Statement. 1) That Distance Education is considered when the Mission Statement is developed; and 2) that Distance Education is reflected in the Mission Statement. A substantive change proposal is currently being written and language in this document will include the fact that compliance related to this requirement is being made.

Discussion included insuring that requirements, such as those of Distance Education and of others, are monitored by whatever committee becomes responsible for developing the Mission/Visions/Values statement to make certain that the statements are all inclusive.

5.3 Automatic Awarding of Degrees
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: A.McHale / C.Kutil / **APPROVED**

5.4 Credit by Exam – Sarah Thompson reported that there are many issues that have come up locally, and others that are coming down from the State regarding Credit by Exam. The discussion of local autonomy for disciplines to decide whether or not to offer credit by exam is still protected by Title 5 and the Ed Code. Although there is no requirement to offer a credit by exam, recommends are beginning to surface from the State Chancellor's Office. One of the recommendations is that courses that are prerequisites for other courses have a credit by examination option. Discussions are beginning to happen with disciplines across the State about what to do. The biggest issue that needs discussion is the relationship of credit by exams and the MOOC movement.

Scott Vigallon added that a conference was held at UCLA that was attended by individuals from around the country, the CCC, Chancellor's Office, faculty unions and many more, who met to discuss the MOOC movement. The end result was that recommendations or resolutions were drawn due to the number

of issues involved. Credit by examination was mentioned but not discussed in detail. The conversation was basically letting everyone know that there's a movement coming that is being driven by the top. San Jose State is piloting MOOC courses and credit by exam was mentioned at a San Jose Press Conference, which was attended by the Governor, CSU President, UC President, and faculty. It was mentioned there that this was being driven by faculty although there are some who would disagree. Mt. San Jacinto College in Southern California received funding from the Bill Gates Foundation and piloting a non-credit MOOC course that will prepare high school students for the assessments, and will share the results.

A MOOC was described as a Massive Openly Online Course that began at Stanford is has taken off throughout the country. Ivy League schools are embracing this method of teaching, which places thousands of students in one course. It's a way of democratizing education and bringing it to the masses.

At the moment the courses are free not for credit nor are the courses accredited. Udacity has been offering the courses for free and are running out of funding. As a startup company they were hoping for sponsors to help fund the free course, but they have learned that perhaps the courses should be accredited. Udacity has been promoting MOOC courses to colleges, which have a 90% drop out rate.

Discussion ensued regarding how the system works. Udacity would support offering the course at a college. Students completing the course would earn a certificate. The certificate would prove the student had taken the course. The college would be able to charge a fee of no more than the unit cost for the course, and provides the student the opportunity to test by credit by examination. The certificate is not a guarantee that the student has passed the MOOC course, only that they have taken it. If they do pass they earn course credit. So many issues are still involved that there will certainly be much more discussion on this subject.

5.5 Senate Role in Flex Day Planning
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: C.Kutil / A.McHale / **APPROVED**

5.6 Disciplines to include on the 100% Goal Worksheet for AA-T/AS-T –
Divisions not yet providing feedback on which disciplines should be included on the 80% or 20% Goal Worksheet are to do so by January 31st to Sarah Thompson and Jeremiah Bodnar. The Curriculum Committee will be meeting on February 4th and will need this information.

6.0 DISCUSSION –NEW BUSINESS

MOTION to **REORDER** agenda Items 6.5 then 6.8
MSC: C.Keune / E.Cole / **APPROVED**

6.1 New IEC Charge – Rajinder Samra presented the final version of the IEC charge. He explained that the committee wanted to come up that with a charge that was manageable, doable and meaningful. The charge addresses accreditation, State and Federal mandates, focuses on key items that need to be completed, and also has the flexibility to look at things on a broader perspective.

The charge read as follows: ***"The Institutional Effectiveness Committee provides ongoing and systematic evaluations of key college processes and metrics that lead to recommendations or sharing of information for improving student learning and institutional outcomes."***

This committee will be reviewing metrics data to look at how well the college is doing with assessing student success (for example) and share what is learned with College Council and programs that may find this information helpful, depending on what key metric or processes is being looked at.

The committee will also be looking at map data and compression data, which is considered a key metric for the college. This type of date determines how likely students complete their course of study since many are assessed at lower level math courses. The IEC has invited someone from the math department to speak on this issue at a future date.

The IEC is also in the process of evaluating the Mission/Visions/Values statement to see how effective it has been and if it continues to be.

The IEC charge will be placed as an Action Item on the next senate agenda.

6.2 Student Success Task Force Focus for 2013
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: M.Korber / M.Gonzales / APPROVED

6.3 Instruction Materials Laws
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: M.Korber / M.Gonzales / APPROVED

6.4 New ARCC Reports – An Opportunity for Improved PR?
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: M.Korber / M.Gonzales / APPROVED

6.5 The Impact of Governor Brown's Budget Proposals – Sarah Thompson displayed a summary of the Governor's budget proposals. 1) No proposal for an increase in student fees. Fees will remain the same for one year. 2) Proposition 30 passed and colleges received funding although not all will be going into the General Fund. $197M will be used for restoration of classes, growth money, etc. for the colleges. $180M will be used to pay down the deferral so colleges will need to borrow less. $134M towards money we thought was there, that would come from different areas (i.e. Federal, etc.). $17M to increase access to matriculate students to the use of technology with the primary focus placed on DE.

There are three recommendations that draw an area of concern and those are, 1) The Governor's recommendation to change the apportionment per student. His recommendation is to have a differential apportionment for students who make it to censes, and another for students who complete the course. The Student Success Task Force has recommended not going towards performance based or completion based funding. Working with a budget based on differential amounts received at censes and at completion is not reasonable. Operating costs for the course remain the same no matter of the number of students that are left in the class. 2) This recommendation will impact students since it is being proposed that community colleges limit State supported instruction to 90 units. Any units above the 90 will not be subsidized by the State and the student will be responsible for the entire cost of the course (and does not apply to students receiving Financial Aid). Depending on the course, a 3 unit course could cost up toward $600-$700. It is unclear how the money collected would be handled, whether it would stay with the college or taken by the State and a portion given back to the college. 3) This recommendation is a shift of the remaining adult education program, including $300M from K-12 to community college, in addition to $16M for K-12 apprentice program to the community college apprentice programs. Keep in mind that there are adult education schools in our district that would come our way that would include language training, GED, and a variety of other personal development training.

Discussion continued with questions and the ramifications of offering adult education at community colleges. Also, what is the Senate's role? Looking at statewide responsibilities the faculty is responsible for curriculum, student success, etc. If adult education comes to the community colleges, will those students become the responsibility of the faculty or be under a separate umbrella? Currently, faculty does not have a connection with contract education students, the curriculum, and what about facilities issues? The discussion ended with many more unanswered questions left up in the air.

6.6 Evaluation of the Efficiency of Efficacy of our Current Senate Structure
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: M.Korber / M.Gonzales / APPROVED

6.7 Staff Appreciation Day
MOTION to **TABLE** until next meeting
MSC: M.Korber / M.Gonzales / APPROVED

6.8 Hiring Timeline and Process – Sarah Thompson has been contacted by the Interim Chancellor asking for an appointee from the Academic Senate for the Chancellor's hiring committee by January 31st. Three faculty members are asked to serve and Charlotte Lofft will serve from the Faculty Association, and Kathy Kelly from the Chabot Academic Senate. Generally, if the senate president from one college is on the committee, the other senate president serves as well. With Sarah stepping down as president and Tom Orff stepping in, it seemed logical for one or the other to represent on the hiring committee. A brief discussion ensued as to whether it would seem unfair to not offer the opportunity to all faculty, but with the January 31st deadline nearing this did not seem doable. Sarah will contact Tom to discuss this further then contact the Interim Chancellor.

7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER

7.1 Announcements – None

7.2 2013 Meetings: 2nd and 4th Wednesday – Next Meeting: February 13, 2013

7.3 Adjournment: 4:38 p.m.
MOTION to **ADJOURN**
MSC: M.Korber / A.McHale / APPROVED

* * * * *

ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

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

* * * * *

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.