

**LAS POSITAS COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE  
REGULAR MEETING**

Room 4129, Mertes Center for the Arts Building  
September 11, 2013 – 2:30 p.m.

**APPROVED MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Mona Abdoun, Rajeev Chopra, Elena Cole, Debbie Fields,  
Heike Gecox, Michelle Gonzales, Cindy Keune, Kevin Lopez  
(Student Rep), Thomas Orf, John Ruys, CK Singh (Student Rep)

**GUESTS:** None

---

**1.0 GENERAL BUSINESS**

**1.1 Call to Order/Quorum** – 2:40 p.m.

**1.2 Approval of Agenda**

**MOTION** to **APPROVE** Agenda

**MSC:** C.Keune / H.Gecox / **APPROVED**

**1.3 Approval of Minutes from August 28, 2013**

**MOTION** to **APPROVE** Draft Minutes

**MSC:** C.Keune / M.Gonzales / **APPROVED**

**1.4 Public Comments** – None

**2.0 ACTION ITEMS**

**2.1 Restructuring of Committee Reports** – It was suggested that committees not having to report at each meeting be divided.

**MOTION** made to have the Senate President divide the list of committees, and decide if reports are to be made at the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> senate meeting of the month.

**MSC:** C.Keune / R.Chopra / **APPROVED**

**3.0 CONSENT ITEMS**

**3.1 STEMPS Dean Hiring Committee** – Debbie Fields will now serve as the FA appointed member on the dean hiring committee for the STEMPS Division.

#### **4.0 REPORTS**

- 4.1 Curriculum Committee** – None
- 4.2 SLO Committee** – None
- 4.3 BaSk Committee** – None
- 4.4 DE Committee** – None
- 4.5 Program Review Committee** – None

- 4.6 CEMC** – Tom Orf reported that an additional FTF allocation of 160, to be shared district wide, has become available. The topic of how future allocations can be handled will most likely be discussed at the next CEMC, meeting scheduled for this Friday.

A brief discussion ensued regarding future allocations. How should allocations be divided? Should a method be developed? What should any remaining allocation be handled? Should some allocation be set aside? The new model will give the colleges more control, which will bring up many more questions and concerns. Processes will have to be developed since there have never been any formal procedures set in place, and the new allocation model offers more control to the colleges'. It is certain that plenty more discussion will take place.

- 4.7 Staff Development** – None

- 4.8 Hiring Prioritization** – Tom Orf was contacted and confirmed with the committee chair that the Senate will need two sessions to approve the ranked positions, one for presentation, and another for voting.

- 4.9 Faculty Association** – Debbie Fields shared the names of the newly elected LPCs FA representatives:

Vice President – LaVaughn Hart  
Treasurer – Kevin Ankoviak  
Grievance Officer – Nan Ho  
Membership – Debbie Fields  
PT Faculty Rep – Vicki Austin

- 4.10 Student Senate** – Kevin Lopez reported that 212 students were currently participating in the Textbook Loner Program, and a total of 350 books have already been rented out to students.

The Club Rush event was held on September 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>. The purpose was to provide information about the different clubs, and to recruit new members.

September 19<sup>th</sup> has been set aside for a Student Appreciation Lunch to be held from 11:30am –1:30pm in the patio area in front of building 1700.

The student senate is in the process of discussing various legislative issues.

- 4.11 Treasurer** – Rajeev Chopra distributed a master list of committee representatives for the entire college. Each senator is being asked to share this at the next division meeting to verify the information.

An email will be sent soon reminding faculty of the suggested donation of \$25.00 to the senate treasury that funds two student scholarships each year, and various other events.

- 4.12 President** – Tom Orf's report was based on the DEMC and what will be mentioned at DBSG, Agenda Item 4.13. He will also report on Equivalencies, Agenda Item 6.1.

- 4.13 DBSG** – Thomas Orf reported that this committee had already met and discussed several items, one of which was the allocation for each college. Each college will be given control of their own amount, although when to report back to the DBSG and how often with their budgeting and actual spending was not been decided.

The 15 to 18 outstanding "issues" that have not been answered was the second item of discussion. With the committee's many participants it was found to be difficult when trying to reach an answer or agreeing with the different issues. A taskforce was suggested to deal with the first 12 outstanding issues, and out of the total no more than 5 were considered difficult.

The third item discussed was the allocation of extra monies and how this would be handled. There are general apportionments, and extra funding that are revenues generated by the district that have not yet gone through the allocation model. This year there is already \$1.1M in excess, which does not include rent expected from the Franklin property. The idea of paying back the RUMBLE fund using the excess money was turned down. There were no concrete ideas for how to use the extra money, and a suggestion from the Chancellor was to hold off doing anything until all parties involved were in agreement. If the money were to go to the colleges and not the allocation model, perhaps the colleges should begin submitting budgetary plans 2-3 years out. This would include faculty doing 2 or possible 3 year discipline plans.

Discussion ensued with the type of feedback and reaction to the idea of rolling discipline plans. It was unsure if the Senate had a role in this issue, and if 10+1 issues existed. The consensus was to take back the idea of how additional allocations should be dealt with to the next division meetings for gathering feedback. The idea of writing 2-3 year discipline plans would actually fit into the college's program review model, help with planning classes of rotating courses, and notifying students ahead of time when specific courses will be offered.

## **5.0 DISCUSSION OLD BUSINESS**

**5.1 Board Policy Review for Fall 2013** – Thomas Orf reported that no word has been received from the Chancellor's office regarding review of board policies. This item will remain on the agenda until information is received.

**5.2 College Taskforce and Senate's Role** – Thomas Orf reported that the taskforce will resume this year. A brief explanation of the role of this group to familiarize the two ASLPC representatives was presented. Elena Cole is the Senate's representative and a conflict with the time the committee meets has resulted. Unless the committee can meet at another time, a replacement for Elena will have to be found as it is very important that there be senate representation at these meetings.

This taskforce began because of the previous Chancellor's look at the college's situation. There was a concern that with accreditation around the corner, and no clear planning structure in place something has to be done. An effort was made to revise the college's committee structure, although ideas presented were not completely followed through, and discussion brought up a number of concerns. The taskforce began working on a planning structure and revisited the Mission, Vision, Values statements. The taskforce accomplished revising the "statements" and came up with lots of ideas for the college's goals. This year putting those ideas together to develop and implement them is a main task due to the beginning of the accreditation cycle.

## **6.0 DISCUSSION – NEW BUSINESS**

**6.1 Equivalencies** – Thomas Orf began by explaining that faculty are hired based on a list of minimum qualifications specific to a discipline. If they do not meet the minimum qualifications they can petition for an equivalency in that discipline by submitting a packet that contains documents relevant to their experience. This information is then sent to a committee that reviews the documentation and either approves or denies the equivalency.

Questions at this meeting were: If an individual is denied an equivalency, is the documentation currently requested sufficient enough to prove that the individual does or does not qualify? Should the process be modified? Should the equivalency be determined by discipline or by course? What should be the criteria for determining if someone coming in and asking for an equivalency to teach in a certain area qualifies? Can there be an equivalency on a course by course basis, and can the FA be asked to look into this?

The FA is asking that both college senates review the process because of its vagueness. A brief discussion ensued and the senators will bring back feedback from their divisions to the next senate meeting.

## **7.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER**

### **7.1 Announcements** – Talking Points for this meeting are to include:

- \* DBSG – 2 or 3 year discipline plans
- \* Equivalencies
- \* Minutes located on Grapevine, Academic Senate Tab

### **7.2 2013 Meetings** – Next meeting September 25, 2013

### **7.3 Adjournment** – 4:00 p.m.

**MOTION to ADJOURN**

**MSC: C.Keune / J.Ruys / APPROVED**

\* \* \* \* \*

## **ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER**

### **EXECUTIVE OFFICERS**

Senate President:	Thomas Orf
Senate Vice President:	Elena Cole
Senate Secretary:	Cindy Keune (Fall)
	John Ruys (Spring)
Senate Treasurer:	Rajeev Chopra
Senate Admin Assist:	Carmen McCauley

### **ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE ROSTER**

ALSS:	Michelle Gonzales
STEMPS:	Debbie Fields
BSBA:	John Ruys
Counseling:	Heike Gecox
PT Faculty:	Mona Abdoun
ASLPC Rep:	Kevin Lopez, KC Singh

\* \* \* \* \*

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.