

# District Academic Senate Exec Meeting

Friday, September 16, 2016

ESC Hearing Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor

## MINUTES

### Attendance

	<b>Present:</b>
<b>Officers</b>	Don Gauthier (President), Vic Fusilero (Secretary), Alex Immerblum (Treasurer)
	<b>Local Senate Presidents:</b>
<b>City</b>	Dan Wanner
<b>East</b>	Alex Immerblum
<b>Harbor</b>	Susan McMurray (arrived 11:10 a.m.)
<b>Mission</b>	Leslie Milke
<b>Pierce</b>	Anna Bruzzese
<b>Southwest</b>	Naja El-Khoury
<b>Trade</b>	Lourdes Brent (arrived 11:45 a.m.)
<b>Valley</b>	Vic Fusilero
<b>West</b>	
<b>Guests</b>	David Keller (Curriculum Chair, Harbor)

**Call to Order** at 10:07 a.m.

**Approval of Agenda** as amended (Bruzzese/Fusilero **MSC**). **Minutes** from August 16, 2016 meeting approved as amended (Immerblum/Bruzzese **MSC**).

**Public Speakers:** None.

**Action Items:** None.

### **Old Business:**

#### 1. CBT/Intellus (discussion):

Gauthier reported that there will be a presentation on CBT/Intellus at the DAS Summit. Immerblum suggested that Atondo be the point person for discussion on CBT/Intellus. Discussion has been tabled until DAS has more information.

#### 2. Summit Planning and Discipline Days:

Gauthier reported that planning is ongoing. Local Senate presidents should send list of attendees to Gauthier. Dec. 2 is 1<sup>st</sup> Discipline Day, focused on particular groups (e.g. Computer Science, CTE). Gauthier has sent out a save-the-date announcement encouraging people in those groups to attend.

#### 3. Community College League of California (CCLC) Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Templates:

According to the ASCCC website, The CCLC Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Service is a free service that provides districts with a variety of documents and support services, the most notable of which are the Board Policy and Administrative Procedure

31 Templates, which are described by CCLC as information that is “legally required, legally  
32 advised, or suggested as good practice for boards and districts.” Subscribing districts  
33 receive an implementation handbook, semi-annual template updates, and access to an  
34 active listserv. Workshops as well as individual assistance are also available to  
35 subscribers to help with adapting and implementing local BPs and APs. This collection of  
36 services helps keep in-house legal costs down to a minimum.” Local college presidents  
37 have been talking about adopting these templates. Gauthier will forward information  
38 when it is obtained. Currently there is no one spearheading this move to adopt.  
39 Immerblum asked if the CCLC Templates could be made into a Consultation agenda  
40 item. Gauthier replied that adoption of the CCLC Templates is still only under discussion.

41 4. Enrollment Problems:

42 Gauthier reported that most colleges within the district have flat or declining  
43 enrollment. Efficiency is also down. Milke reported that students at Mission cannot go  
44 online to register for late-start classes, but rather they must go directly to the  
45 Admissions Office; Milke asked if this was a District decision. Gauthier will check on  
46 whether this inability to register online for late-start classes is a District matter.

47 5. LA College Promise:

48 Gauthier reported that District hopes that incoming students will already have dual  
49 enrollment classes and will already have financial aid in place (e.g. FAFSA). Because  
50 many teaching faculty involved in the program will be adjunct faculty, Gauthier hopes  
51 the best adjunct faculty will be involved in order to encourage enrollment. Gauthier  
52 reported on the LA College Promise kick-off: Although 600 people were invited, several  
53 people were turned away. Dan Wanner reported that he was left outside. Gauthier  
54 discussed with Joanne Waddell AFT’s concerns regarding LA College Promise, e.g.  
55 number of charter school students involved, books, transportation. El-Khoury asked who  
56 will really benefit from this program. Wanner asked if the Chancellor plans to have  
57 individual campuses set up their own local Promise programs. Gauthier has concerns  
58 that the program will be top-down and District-driven. Gauthier is still waiting for word  
59 on a steering committee. Milke said that Mission’s AFT rep has concerns about the  
60 program. Immerblum suggested that local colleges not wait for a directive from District  
61 to assemble local college teams to work on LA College Promise.

62 6. Rename DAS Online Education Committee to DAS Academic Technology Committee:

63 Bruzzese asked where this move to rename the committee had come from. Before  
64 Miller had met with Linda Delzeit, Gauthier had asked Delzeit to present at the DAS Exec  
65 in July. Gauthier reported that Miller had had a meeting with--among others, Linda  
66 Delzeit—regarding changing the name of the committee. Bruzzese asked for the people  
67 involved in that meeting. Gauthier had asked for names. Bruzzese asked if Josh’s  
68 meeting was an informal discussion about the Academic Technology Committee.  
69 Bruzzese had given Gauthier the name of Pierce’s Senate Distance Education  
70 Instructional Technology Committee (DEITC) Chair, who was not included. Milke  
71 reported that DE stakeholders had suggested changing the committee’s name, rather  
72 than forming a new committee. Milke reported that Delzeit had had a meeting with  
73 Mission’s DE people, who had previously said that taking on technology was too much,  
74 but were now saying that they felt that they could take on technology issues. It was

75 suggested that electronic badges were a large concern. Gauthier reported that District  
76 hoped to have a single point of contact for technology issues and a single committee to  
77 make sensible decisions on technology issues, rather than have nine separate college  
78 policies. Immerblum summed up the on-going discussion: A District-wide DE  
79 stakeholders group had formed a DAS Online Education Committee, which was  
80 concerned, not just with online education, but also with academic technology. Milke  
81 suggested that Miller report on his conversations and to wait for information before  
82 voting on this issue. [This issue had been originally planned as a motion, but because of  
83 its untimely announcement, it was moved to discussion]

84 7. Support Puente Program resolution from LATTC:

85 Tabled to next meeting.

86

87 **New Business:**

88 1.HR Audit and HR accreditation recommendations:

89 District HR had circulated a handout in response to accreditation. Milke suggested that  
90 DAS should propose an adjunct hiring policy, rather than District HR. Gauthier reported  
91 that HR's initial proposal was a three-member panel (chair of department, someone  
92 from the discipline in question, and a union representative). Gauthier expressed concern  
93 about current abuses of departments with high numbers of adjunct faculty. Milke  
94 suggested that departmental chairs maintain their own hiring pools in order to be  
95 flexible in hiring faculty. Immerblum reported that Ventura's community college district  
96 has a centralized policy, but they only have three campuses, whereas LACCD has nine  
97 campuses. Milke suggested sitting with District HR to come up with a policy better than  
98 the one described in their handout. Immerblum and Milke suggested that this District  
99 HR motion to the Board will not have Senate support. Milke suggested talking to Alberto  
100 Roman to stop this process because Senate would oppose the HR motion. Immerblum  
101 strongly urged that Senate have more input in this process. Gauthier noted that HR's  
102 action plan timeline does not have anything taking place until December 2016.  
103 Immerblum agreed that hiring guidelines needed to be cleaned up, but DAS needed to  
104 take charge of this issue. Gauthier asked for DAS Exec recommendations and concerns,  
105 which Gauthier would then send to Roman. Immerblum pointed out that District is not  
106 following shared governance guidelines. Immerblum urged that departmental chairs  
107 retain flexibility in hiring, cautioning that District HR would be unable to follow through  
108 on their own hiring suggestions in the handout. Immerblum suggested bringing together  
109 district-wide Chairs of Chairs on local campuses to get together to craft hiring policies.  
110 Gauthier reiterated that the centralized hiring pool used for hiring full-time faculty will—  
111 in HR's suggested policy—be used for hiring part-time faculty. El-Khoury welcomed the  
112 idea of creating a centralized hiring pool for adjunct faculty. McMurray reported that  
113 there were already people in the hiring database who did not meet MQs. Gauthier will  
114 communicate all of the above concerns to Roman and Waddell. Immerblum reported  
115 that East has hired approximately 100 new probationary faculty over the last four years  
116 and expressed concerns that deans could not do their best work while serving on so  
117 many tenure review evaluation committees. Gauthier reported that the actual number  
118 of faculty that need to be evaluated on an annual basis was around 3800.

119 2. ITT Collapse:

120 Gauthier reported that there is now pressure on several campuses to take in ITT's  
121 students. Some incoming students may apply for credit by exams.

122 3. LACC Rebased:

123 Wanner reported that LACC was rebased retroactive to 2015-2016, with a loss of 200  
124 classes. Wanner asked about ECDBC's role in this rebasing. Gauthier expressed shock  
125 because usually every attempt is made to avoid rebasing. McMurray reported that  
126 Harbor is going through cuts as well, cuts—especially in advanced courses—that were  
127 not made with division chairs. McMurray asked for suggestions on how to deal with  
128 future cuts.

129 4. Delay in Common Assessment from State:

130 Gauthier reported that there was a delay, which meant that either the District did not  
131 have to have assessments in place or that these assessments were too complicated to  
132 implement. Immerblum expressed concern with these common assessments and its  
133 reliance on students to self-place.

134 5. Discussion of scheduling of DAS events:

135 Bruzzese expressed concern that Pierce was being excluded regarding scheduling dates  
136 for Consultation and Exec Retreats. Bruzzese wondered why no one else had expressed  
137 concern about the quick change of dates, which led to the absence of a quorum for  
138 these meetings. Gauthier reported that the only date for the Exec retreat had been the  
139 week of August 26, 2016. McMurray said that DAS senators already have too many  
140 meetings. Gauthier said that people cancelled at the last minute. Bruzzese suggested  
141 that a meeting should not have been scheduled if there was not going to be a quorum.  
142 McMurray suggested looking at considering online participation in meetings. Gauthier  
143 expressed that his intent was not to exclude anyone because he too was interested in  
144 having everyone participate in order to have a quorum. Bruzzese expressed concern  
145 that Pierce's absence might suggest that Pierce was not concerned with District  
146 business. Immerblum suggested that those presidents unable to attend should send  
147 representatives. Bruzzese expressed resentment that only Pierce was asked to send a  
148 representative. El-Khoury expressed faith that Gauthier did not intend to exclude  
149 anyone. Gauthier expressed frustration in trying to schedule Chancellor Consultations  
150 with little input from DAS senators on dates. Milke reported that she too is often unable  
151 to come and that she is unable to find a representative. Bruzzese suggested having  
152 Consultations on Mondays in one month, and on another day in another month. Milke  
153 suggested asking the Chancellor for another day. Gauthier reported that the  
154 Chancellor's secretary is unable to find another day that is free for the Chancellor except  
155 Monday to schedule the Consultations. El-Khoury asked about the possibility to use  
156 CConfer for future DAS meetings. Bruzzese agreed that DAS senators had too many  
157 meetings.

158

159 6. New Subjects from Pierce sent to ESC Feb. to Apr. 2016: Bruzzese reported that  
160 viability studies were concluded before she came on board. Bruzzese urged that Pierce  
161 has issues with new subjects being unable to move forward on ESC, and she expressed  
162 concern that a new process was being used that had not been vetted. Gauthier said that

163 Reading was a new subject that was brought in and which had to be brought into the  
164 district. Immerblum clarified the issue by remarking that Reading was a discipline in the  
165 state, but not in the district. DAS worked with the District to get the E-115 and had met  
166 with an alternative arrangement. Bruzzese reported that she and Pierce felt that  
167 Gauthier was holding up the approval process. Gauthier replied that the process was  
168 delayed because related disciplines needed to respond to Pierce’s request for a new  
169 subject name.

170

171 **Reports:**

172 President’s Report: None.

173 First VP Report: Equivalency and Discipline Issues. None.

174 Second VP – Curriculum Report:

175 E-64 (Program Approval) Dan Keller reported that a draft of E-64 had been brought  
176 before DCC. According to the proposal, a college would approve a new program, after  
177 which it then goes to district and is noticed to the Board. Afterwards, the new program  
178 moves on for statewide approval. Each college defines its own process for approval.  
179 Keller reported that the draft also included a set number of programs: pathways,  
180 degrees, certificates, basic skills programs. Furthermore, the draft puts forward four  
181 paths for how to approve programs: 1) introduce new programs; 2) changes that require  
182 CCCC approval; 3) changes to program listing in SIS system; and 4) all others. Keller  
183 said that the draft reduced the original Title V language to two pages. There are only  
184 three steps: notice, vetting the challenge process. ADTs are legally required, and they  
185 cannot be challenged. CTE programs are posted, vetted, and approved by the Los  
186 Angeles Orange County Regional Consortium (LAOCRC), to make sure that they do not  
187 unduly challenge neighboring programs. Keller felt that it did not make sense to allow  
188 challenge to non-ADT and non-CTE programs. DCC removed the previous two-month  
189 challenge period, so that new programs could move directly from the colleges to the  
190 Board. Keller said that those concerned with E-65 would also have misgivings with E-64  
191 and the absence of language delineating how administration could give its input. Keller  
192 is considering adding a line to the draft: “Each college shall determine how  
193 administration gives its input.” This draft will now go before the entire DAS.

194 Treasurer’s Report:

195 The Treasurer previously reported that we were \$200,000 over budget. After further  
196 investigation, Immerblum reports only a \$80,000 discrepancy.

197

198 Standing Committee Reports:

199 None

200

201 **Adjournment**

202 The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

203

204 Respectfully submitted by Vic Fusilero, DAS Secretary