

District Academic Senate Meeting

Thursday, March 9, 2017
Los Angeles Harbor College
MINUTES

Attendance

	Present (Senate Presidents in parentheses)
Officers	Don Gauthier (President), Angela Echeverri (1 st VP), Vic Fusilero (Secretary), Alex Immerblum (Treasurer)
City	(Dan Wanner), Kamale Gray
East	(Alex Immerblum), Jeff Hernandez, Lurelean Gaines, Jean Stapleton
Harbor	(Susan McMurray), William Hernandez
Mission	(Leslie Milke), Thomas Folland, Mi Chong Park, Curt Riesberg
Pierce	(Anna Bruzzese), Joe Perret
Southwest	(Naja El Houry)
Trade	Inhae Ahn, Lourdes Brent, Larry Pogoler, Martin Diaz
Valley	LaVergne Rosow, Vic Fusilero
West	(Adrienne Foster), Allison Tom-Miura
Guests	

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda: President Don Gauthier called the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m. The agenda was adopted as amended with no objections (Rosow/Brent **MSC**). Rosow expressed gratitude for the lunch provided. McMurray said that the food came from Sacred Grounds.

Approval of the Minutes: (Immerblum/Rosow **MSC**). As edited.

Public Speakers: LAHC President Otto Lee welcomed the DAS to Los Angeles Harbor College. He encouraged the DAS to keep up its good work and to continue to advocate for their campuses in Sacramento. He also personally thanked Gauthier for all his work.

Action items

1. Emergency: Adjunct Hiring Policy.

Gauthier thanked the task force for their work on this adjunct hiring policy. Immerblum walked the senators through the draft document. Immerblum reported that the task force is awaiting language from HR for lines 8-9, 81 of the draft document. Immerblum reported that the only point of contention between DAS and District was that District wants the supervising dean to be a voting member, whereas the DAS task force wants the supervising dean to be non-voting. Immerblum reported from his conversation with the Chancellor on whether the supervising dean should (not) vote: The Chancellor noted that the deans have the liability responsibility; therefore, the deans should have a vote. The Chancellor conceded that deans would not serve as content experts, to which Immerblum responded with the question as to why the deans should then be given a vote. Immerblum also noted to the Chancellor that giving the deans a vote would overstep the accreditation recommendation. Immerblum also noted that adjunct hiring

32 differs from full-timer hiring. Pogoler suggested allowing the Chancellor to write a best
33 practices document on how supervising deans can participate as non-voting members
34 on adjunct hiring committees, but Pogoler supported not giving deans voting rights.
35 Milke did note that, according to the draft policy, adjunct hiring committees can go
36 forward even if invited deans do not come. Brent noted that liability is not the deans'
37 purview. J. Hernandez noted that DAS has given ground to District in drawing up the
38 draft adjunct hiring policy. He suggests including a cover letter (see handout:
39 "Transmittal of DAS Approved Adjunct Faculty Hiring Policy, March 9, 2017"). Perret
40 asked for information against giving deans a vote? Gauthier suggested that this goes
41 against the ACCJC recommendation. Both District and DAS are trying to implement a
42 common adjunct hiring policy for all nine colleges in the district. Gauthier also noted
43 that this is senate purview. Pogoler reported on situations in which deans have been
44 retaliatory regarding hiring decisions. Brent has concerns about lines 8-9 of the draft
45 hiring policy; Pogoler suggested changing lines 8-9 to read as follows: "Board policy
46 about the LACCD commitment to diversity and equity will be inserted here." DAS has
47 voted NOT to give votes to deans in adjunct hiring committees.

48 *LACCD ADJUNCT HIRING GUIDE*

49 *District Academic Senate Recommendation Approved Unanimously on 3/9/2017*

50 ***The Board Policy statement about the LACCD commitment to diversity and equity***
51 ***inserted here.***

52 *The Adjunct Pool*

53 *The District's established pool refers to a group of applications that have been submitted*
54 *by applicants to the LACCD Part-Time (adjunct) Faculty Employment portal. The pool*
55 *shall be considered for each part-time vacancy or possible future vacancy within a twelve*
56 *month period and includes all currently and previously employed adjunct faculty*
57 *(internal candidates) and all applicants who have never been employed as adjunct faculty*
58 *by any college in the LACCD (external candidates). To be entered into the pool, all*
59 *applicants meet Minimum Qualifications or the equivalent for the discipline in which they*
60 *are seeking to teach and must have submitted a complete adjunct application. Part of the*
61 *application will include a check box so faculty can indicate if they are already working in*
62 *the District and another check box so faculty can indicate the college or colleges at*
63 *which they would consider working.*

64 *An adequate pool is one that contains three or more candidates who meet Minimum*
65 *Qualifications or the equivalent. The LACCD Human Resources Department (HR) shall*
66 *keep applications from all candidates on file for a minimum of one year and will annually*
67 *notify all candidates to request an update of their information should they wish to remain*
68 *in the pool. Department chairs will be granted access to the pool on an as-needed basis.*
69 *Adjunct faculty who are already-employed at one or more colleges in the District may be*
70 *hired at another college within the District without going through an interview, although*
71 *it is recommended that such an interview is conducted.*

72 *The Selection Committee*

73 *A selection committee must form when applicants new to the District are considered for*
74 *an assignment. This ensures that more than one faculty member takes part in the*
75 *interview process to select new faculty members. The division or department chair or*
76 *his/her designee serves as the committee chair and selects at least one additional faculty*
77 *member in the discipline to serve. If no other faculty in the discipline at the college are*
78 *available to serve on the committee, then the chair of the committee may take the*
79 *following progressive steps to fill the committee vacancy: (1) seek out a colleague in the*
80 *discipline from another campus in the district, (2) a colleague on campus in a related*
81 *discipline, or (3) a colleague in the discipline from a college outside the district.*
82 *Committee members must be contract or regular faculty full time. The supervising dean*
83 *of the department shall be invited to attend the adjunct selection committee meetings as a*
84 *non-voting member, but the absence of the dean shall not prevent the selection process*
85 *from moving forward.*

86
87 *It is strongly recommended that an EEO representative, possibly from the same*
88 *department, be present as a non-voting member. Furthermore, all committee members*
89 *must have participated in EEO hiring committee training or EEO rep training within the*
90 *previous three years. Other faculty members may be added to the committee as non-*
91 *voting resources with the approval of the committee chair. The composition of the*
92 *selection committee is reported to the supervising dean. All members of the committee*
93 *will review the applications and transcripts for appropriate minimum qualifications.*

94
95 ***Note:** Equivalency determinations will not be conducted for the selection of adjunct*
96 *faculty.*

97 ***The Committee Chair Responsibilities:***

98 *1. Guides the selection committee through the adjunct faculty hiring procedure according*
99 *to the guidelines as presented in this document.*

100 *2. Facilitates committee discussions.*

101 *3. Facilitates the review of applications for minimum qualifications.*

102 *4. Leads committee dialog about handling of incomplete applications, paying special*
103 *attention to equivalency, and the handling of extraneous application materials that were*
104 *not specifically requested.*

105 *5. Coordinates the screening process, schedules committee meetings, manages the*
106 *logistics of the process (rooms, times, dates), and facilitates the development of questions*
107 *and demonstration topics.*

108 *6. Informs the appropriate administrator of the committee's decision to send a*
109 *candidate's name forward so that HR can confirm the candidate meets MQs.*

110 *7. When HR confirms the MQs have been met, contacts the top candidate to inform*
111 *him/her of the committee's decision to offer him/her an assignment and sets up an*

112 orientation meeting with the candidate.

113 8. Via emails, informs remaining interviewees of the decision.

114 9. Performs all other committee duties as outlined in the “Selection Committee Members’
115 Responsibilities” section below.

116

117

118 ***The Selection Committee Members’ Responsibilities:***

119 1. Work in partnership with the other participants throughout the process and at its
120 conclusion to reinforce the importance of confidentiality, fairness, understanding
121 individual biases, eliminating unlawful bias, equal employment opportunity, and respect
122 and sensitivity to all cultures, language groups, genders, and other protected classes
123 under the law. (HR will provide more appropriate language here.)

124 2. Sign confidentiality agreement for selection committee members and comply with its
125 guidelines.

126 3. Screen applications and participate in the process to select interviewees.

127 4. Attend all interviews, rate interviewees, and participate in dialog to select the top
128 candidate.

129 5. Act as agents of the District and obey all laws and regulations related to hiring
130 processes.

131 6. Observe and monitor the interview/selection process for compliance with district
132 hiring procedures and equal opportunity laws to provide a fair and impartial process.

133 7. Alert the chair and vice president of any concerns regarding confidentiality, bias, or
134 fairness.

135 ***Prior to the Interview***

136 The committee is not required to review incomplete applications. The committee shall
137 review and rate complete applications using a rating form developed by the committee.

138 The size and complexity of the rating form shall depend on the number of applications
139 and the discretion of the committee. A minimum rating form that consists of rating
140 categories for sensitivity to diversity and the overall quality of the applicant is available
141 from HR. More complex rating forms could identify categories for work experience,
142 education, training, experience working with diverse groups, etc. The committee shall
143 meet as a group to discuss the candidates’ qualifications. The discussion shall be strictly

144 *confined to each candidate's qualifications and serves to ensure that no candidate is*
145 *overlooked by committee members who may have missed important qualifications of a*
146 *candidate during their individual review. The committee will invite the number of*
147 *candidates that ensures the most qualified group of applicants is interviewed. There is no*
148 *minimum or maximum number of candidates who must be invited to interview. When*
149 *deciding who to interview, the committee shall err on the side of inclusiveness.*

150 ***Interviews***

151 *The committee chair shall invite selected applicants for an interview. The same questions*
152 *must be asked of each applicant, and each applicant must be rated on the same criteria.*
153 *HR, the supervising dean, or the committee chair may provide a list of example questions*
154 *that serve as a starting point for committees to develop their own questions to ask each*
155 *interviewee. Follow up questions that serve to clarify responses or probe further into*
156 *answers are encouraged. Each committee member shall individually rate candidate*
157 *responses to each of the interview questions.*

158 *Teaching positions may require a teaching demonstration during the interview process.*
159 *Committees for non-teaching positions may decide to require a demonstration showing*
160 *how the applicant would provide appropriate services such as a counseling session.*
161 *Instructions for the demonstration shall be given to the applicant at the time he/she is*
162 *invited to interview. The instructions should specify the topic to be taught or service to be*
163 *provided, the kinds of student who will be the intended audience, and the kinds of*
164 *technology that are available. If a demonstration is conducted, each committee member*
165 *shall rate the demonstration as part of the evaluation.*

166 ***Reference Checks***

167 *The committee chair or designee or supervising dean is strongly encouraged to conduct*
168 *reference checks, including former employers. Reference checks shall be limited to*
169 *position-related criteria.*

170 ***Finalizing the Selection***

171 *The committee considers all of the information it has collected and then selects a finalist.*
172 *The supervising dean and committee chair will fill out LACCD Form HR R-130N and*
173 *submit it to the local campus personnel office who will forward it to HR after final*
174 *approval by the vice president. Once form HR R-130N has been submitted along with*
175 *official transcripts to HR and the candidate is cleared, the candidate may visit the local*
176 *campus personnel office to fill out additional paperwork.*

177 *At the completion of the process, all of the committee's paperwork, including paper*
178 *screening forms and interview rating forms, are turned in to the supervising dean and*
179 *kept on file.*

180 ***Emergency Hire Procedures***

181 *In the event that, as determined by the committee, there are no district applicants or*

182 *there is an inadequate pool, or no suitable candidate has been found within the pool, or if*
183 *the vacancy and subsequent need to hire a new adjunct faculty member is the result of an*
184 *emergency (i.e. loss of instructor, added course section, etc.), and the time to conduct*
185 *formal interviews/find a suitable candidate is prohibitive, a department chair can use*
186 *her/his best judgment to hire the best available candidate. The department chair will*
187 *need to consult with the supervising dean to ensure that the candidate meets the minimum*
188 *qualifications for the position prior to making a job offer. District HR will subsequently*
189 *verify the candidate does meet MQs.*

190 (Immerblum/Gaines **MSC**). Unanimous.

191

192 **Motion to accept J. Hernandez' Transmittal Letter (mentioned above) to accompany**
193 **the adjunct hiring policy (Immerblum/Pogoler MSC)**. Pogoler suggested that once the
194 changes are made to the adjunct hiring policy, the final adjunct hiring policy can be sent
195 to all nine senate presidents. Immerblum reported that the effective date should be
196 immediately, once it has been passed by the Board. Gauthier will also ask Vice President
197 Roman for a breakdown in hiring with regard to diversity, which VP Roman has
198 previously promised. DAS applauds the work of Immerblum and the task force in
199 producing this draft adjunct hiring policy.

200

201 2. E-64 Program Approval

202 Milke noted that the document for approval has cleaned up previous language. Gauthier
203 noted that this document also went through consultation.

204 (Milke/Immerblum **MSC**). As amended. Unanimous.

205

206 3. Bylaws changes - PDC

207 Brent noted changes in the makeup of the meeting quorum. Bruzzese expressed
208 concern that the language expressed that only three of the college liaisons needed to be
209 present to make a quorum. Foster said that if the PDC is only a steering committee, then
210 it is not subject to Brown Act requirements. Pogoler noted that the quorum
211 requirements for the Senate is 50%; the steering committee can determine its own
212 quorum requirements. Pogoler suggested that we could decrease the number of officers
213 in order to lower the quorum requirements. Perret: If people don't show up to
214 meetings, then the committee members need to ask themselves the reason for this.

215 McMurray: There is a problem in physically getting to meetings; there is not a problem
216 in content. **Tom-Miura: Moves to amend that the membership of the PDC Steering**
217 **Committee be reduced to include: PDC Coordinator, 2nd VP (or designee), and liaisons**
218 **(1 from each of the 9 colleges) [for a quorum requirement of 6 members]** (Tom-
219 Miura/Bruzzese **MSC**). **Amendment to the motion: Nays:** Brent, Rosow, J. Hernandez. J.
220 Hernandez: Reported that he will vote against the motion. Brent reminded the senators
221 that the original PDC Bylaws had already been approved by the DAS, but the PDC Bylaws
222 were unworkable for various reasons. Gauthier commended Brent on her work on the
223 PDC. Echeverri asked for flexibility suggesting that liaisons might send designees. Milke
224 pointed out that the work of the PDC demands heavy work from the DAS Exec, and that

225 Brent is carrying the brunt of the work of the PDC. (Vote on the original document as
226 amended: **J. Hernandez moved to amend the definition of meeting quorum as: “... at
227 least three of the nine college liaisons (or alternate).”** Rosow expressed concern that
228 alternates may not know the current status of the work and thus the committee would
229 be less effective. J. Hernandez took Rosow’s point and added that we should not be
230 creating barriers for the PDC to do its work. Bruzzese expressed concern that alternates
231 may not be allowed. Pogoler added that DAS is not allowed to have electronic meetings
232 (according to Brown Act). He agreed with Rosow’s point that the committee may be less
233 effective with alternates, but he would still accept a less effective committee than a
234 paralyzed committee. Immerblum suggested supporting this burgeoning committee
235 with liaisons (or alternates).

236 **Revision to Bylaws**

237 **District Academic Senate**

238 **Recommendation from DAS Professional Development College Steering Committee**

239 **Article X**

240 **Subsection 5. Professional Development College (PDC) Steering Committee.**

241 **The Professional Development College (PDC) Steering Committee shall be composed of**
242 **the following:**

- 243 ■ **PDC Coordinator – selected by the DAS Executive Committee (Committee chair);**
- 244 ■ **DAS 2nd Vice President/designee;**
- 245 ■ **Liaisons – 1 representative (or alternate) from each of the 9 colleges chosen by**
246 **each college’s Senate.**

247 **The DAS PDC Steering Committee will oversee the DAS Professional Development**
248 **College (PDC), which is designed to improve and/or develop competencies of current**
249 **and future community college instructors. The DAS PDC Steering Committee shall be**
250 **responsible for forwarding recommendations to the DAS regarding the scope and**
251 **direction of the PDC; with the PDC Coordinator, providing status reports to DAS;**
252 **coordinating the design and implementation of PDC curriculum and monitoring course**
253 **offerings; with the DAS Treasurer, overseeing budget needs/requests; and promoting**
254 **and representing the PDC at appropriate venues.**

255 **The DAS Professional College Steering Committee reports to the District Academic**
256 **Senate.**

257 (Rosow/Gaines MSC). Abstention: Bruzzese.

258

259 **Old Business/Discussion**

260 **1. District Consultation Process E-XX**

261 Gauthier reported that this process originated with Vice Chancellor Cornner and other
262 District officers. Part of this document came from DAS; the other part came from
263 Chancellor’s Directive 70. Pogoler expressed concern that the flowcharts describe parity
264 between groups on the same level within the charts. J. Hernandez appreciated the
265 bidirectional arrows in the first flowchart. Gauthier noted that the Conference
266 Committee was an ad-hoc committee formed when agreement cannot be reached and
267 covered operational matters, e.g. bond steering. J. Hernandez suggested adding
268 definitions that explain what is covered under operational issues. Pogoler asked where

269 local senates fit here. Gauthier answered that these flowcharts only cover district-wide
270 issues. Gauthier said that this document is only a first-pass (e.g. a first draft), and
271 suggests that the senators look at this document. Gauthier called for volunteers to work
272 on this document.

273

274 2. Election Committee Report and Attendance/Verification of eligible voters

275 Bruzzese asked if there would be a meeting where senators could ask candidates
276 questions. Gauthier noted that in the past there were never official meetings; instead,
277 we simply solicited candidates and their statements, which were then circulated. Milke
278 suggested organizing a forum in which candidates could be asked questions. Immerblum
279 did not remember any such forum in the past. Bruzzese asked that Fusilero's list of
280 eligible voters be sent to all senators. Rosow suggested a grooming process for
281 candidates as people move up through offices. Pogoler noted that San Luis Obispo
282 College has incoming officer take a year to shadow current officers, and the remaining
283 three years were then fully functional. Pogoler asked that candidates be solicited at the
284 current meeting. Bruzzese reported that nominations for all four DAS offices are now
285 open. Nominations should be sent to Miller.

286

287 *Motion to extend meeting by 10 minutes (Foster/Brent MSC).*

288

289 3. Brown Act for Consultation – New Process:

290 Gauthier said that one limitation of the Brown Act with regard to Consultations is that it
291 reduced the informal nature. Bruzzese noted that transparency works in the favor of
292 DAS. District will always bring all their people to the meeting, but DAS will always have
293 fewer members present. Gauthier noted that policy is not made at Consultations, which
294 Bruzzese countered. J. Hernandez suggested that having additional formal meetings was
295 important, but we also need informal consultations. At local college consultations, we
296 also have a few members attend. Nothing gets decided at Consultations, but discussed
297 items are followed-up in local senate meetings. Bruzzese reported that Pierce feels left
298 out at Consultations. McMurray asked for patience with the current way in which
299 Consultations are conducted. Brent reminded the members that this item was not an
300 action item, but rather old business and only warranted a report. Brent asked that the
301 agenda be moved forward. Gauthier will bring back this topic for discussion. Milke
302 suggested alternating Consultations: one meeting being informal with just the
303 Chancellor; the next meeting with the Chancellor and others from his office. Immerblum
304 agreed with Milke's suggestion that a meeting with just the Chancellor would be very
305 helpful. Immerblum suggested moving this topic to DAS Exec.

306

307 **New Business**

308 1. Gauthier announced a district task force has been formed that will present workshops
309 called "Know Your Rights" (Mar. 24, LA Trade Tech; Apr. 28, ELAC; May 19, LA Mission
310 College; June 23, LATTC; all 10 a.m.-12 p.m.). The workshops will address policies,
311 services, and programs impacting our undocumented and DACA students.

312

Reports

- 313 **1. President's Report**
314 **a. Bond Steering:** Gauthier reported on discussions on the timeline for the
315 CC-Bond and the rehiring of a possible new construction firm.
316 Immerblum reported that discussion also covered criteria for how to
317 spend bond money will be discussed. Pogoler asked for less waste on the
318 new bond project. McMurray reported that District has said that Harbor
319 is overbuilt. Gauthier noted that there is \$130 million left in Prop J.
320 **b. DW-IT Project:** Centered on servers, especially after the ransomware
321 incident at LAVC.
322 **c. TPPC:** Gauthier has met with District Technology Committee.
323 **d. Adult Ed:** An Adult Ed dean has been hired at District.
324 **e. ECDBC/DBC:** Next DBC meeting is on Wed., Mar. 15.

- 325 **2. First VP Report**
326 **a. Equivalency Committee:** Mar. 13: The previous proposal from Pierce is
327 being discussed.
328 **b. Discipline Day:** Went very well. OER, Multiple Measures, Adult Ed were
329 all covered. Board Meeting: students reported a false alarm at ELAC and
330 demanded action from the Board; the students want policies in place for
331 faculty. Immerblum thanked Echeverri for her work on Discipline Day.
332 McMurray reported on a document circulated by Puente on the LAHC
333 campus for how to deal with ICE authorities if they should come onto
334 campus. Gauthier asked McMurray to send this document out to
335 senators. Pogoler said that faculty on a public campus do not have the
336 right to ask for a warrant; federal authorities have an untrammled right
337 to come onto campuses.

- 338 **3. Second VP Report**
339 **a. Curriculum Report.** No report
340 **b. Digital Badges.** No report.

341 **4. Treasurer's Report:** See handout.

- 342 **5. Standing Committee Reports**
343 **a. PDC:** Brent will send info about March classes. They are late start. The
344 first day is March 17. Faculty members are currently experiencing
345 problems that students are also having.
346 **b. Academic Technology Committee.** No report.

347
348 **Other Items:** None.

349
350 **Noticed for Next Meeting**

- 351 **1. E-79**
352 **2. BR 6200**
353 **3. BR 6700**
354

355 **Future Dates:**
356 *DAS, Thursday, March 9, 2017 @ LAHC 12:30-3:30 p.m.*

357 *DAS Exec, March 17, 2017 @ ESC*
358 *Consultation – Monday, March 20 @ ESC, 2:30-4:00 p.m.*
359 *Area C, E-3 470 Conference Room @ ELAC*
360 *Cesar Chavez District Holiday, March 30, 2017*
361 *Spring Break, March 31-April 4, 2017*
362 *DAS, April 13, 2017 @ WLAC 12:30-3:30 p.m.*
363 *ASCCC Spring Plenary, Marriot San Mateo, CA, April 20-22, 2017*
364 *Consultation – Monday, May 1, 2017 @ ESC, 2:30-4:00 p.m.*
365 *DAS, Thursday, May 11, 2017 @ LATTC – DAS Elections*
366 *Consultation – Friday, June 9, 2017 @ ESC, 3:30 p.m.*
367
368 **Adjournment**
369 The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.
370
371 Respectfully submitted by Vic Fusilero, DAS Secretary