District Academic Senate Meeting

Thursday, February 13th, 2014
West Los Angeles College

MINUTES

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Gauthier</td>
<td>(President), David Beaulieu (1st Vice President), Elizabeth Atondo (2nd Vice President), Alex Immerblum (Treasurer), Angela Echeverri (Secretary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Dana Cohen, Kalynda Webber, April Pavlik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Alex Immerblum, Jeff Hernandez, Lurelean Gaines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>Susan McMurray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Leslie Milke, Curt Riesberg, Pat Flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>Elizabeth Atondo, Joanne Zimring-Towne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Lourdes Brent, Inhae Ahn, Tom McFall, Larry Pogoler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>La Vergne Rosow, Vic Fusilero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Adrienne Foster, Helen Young, Clare Norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Call to order/Approval of Agenda: President Gauthier called the meeting to order at 1:32 pm. Agenda was approved (Rosow/McMurray MSP).

2. Approval of December 12, 2013 Minutes:
Minutes of the December 12, 2013 DAS meeting were approved with a few corrections (Foster/Brent MSU).

3. Public Speakers: None.

Action Items

4. None

Discussion Items

5. Joint AFT-Senate Issues Committee: Gauthier reported that the DAS and AFT leaderships are interested in have discussed the possibility of collaborating on unifying issues of mutual interest. The joint AFT-Senate committee will draft an outline of a charter with its proposed mission, goals, and parameters. Gauthier will bring the draft back to the DAS Executive for discussion. He observed that administrators commonly find ways to divide and conquer faculty and stressed the importance of having a united front and solving problems before they spin out of control.

6. BR 8603 and Enrollment Management: Gauthier reported that according to Vice Chancellor Maury Pearl’s statistics, about five percent (or 7,000) of Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) students attend more than one college in the District. He added that identifying which classes these students are taking would facilitate enrollment management. Hernandez stated the numbers were not huge and speculated that many of these students were taking science classes. Beaulieu noted that the data suggests there is less cross enrollment occurring than previously thought. He added that the other issue is that there is an
DRAFT
30 unanticipated initial cost of about $100,000 to customize the new Student Information System (SIS) for
31 local priority registration with additional costs incurred when the system is upgraded periodically in the
32 future). Immerblum expressed concern that the DAS passed a very important resolution, which was being
33 undermined once again by the administration coming back with data to support its position. He expressed
34 frustration with the fact that the DAS did not have the opportunity to make its case to the Board and
35 argued that was it not worth capitulating on this issue, if it meant colleges lost their accreditation and
36 enrollment management purview. Echeverri asked whether the customization cost would be ongoing and
37 to each college. Gauthier replied that the $100,000 is a single year cost to the District; any future change
38 would cost another $100,000 more. Webber stated that BR 8603 contains much more than registration
39 priority. She added that this situation underscored the need to revise the consultation process. Gauthier
40 agreed and replied that administrators were feeling the heat from the Accrediting Commission for
41 Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) more than ever.

42 Beaulieu stated that enrollment management is a mutual agreement issue under Title 5 and therefore
43 college presidents would have to agree with the DAS position. He added it would be a tougher task to
44 convince them now, since the numbers are coming in lower than we expected, but that does not mean we
45 should necessarily give up. McMurray expressed concern that software implementation decisions were
46 being made without proper consultation and that administrators were deciding which data faculty get to
47 see. Gauthier urged faculty to be at the table during the District Planning and Assessment Committee
48 (DPAC) meetings. Rosow asked whether faculty would have access to data directly or through the
49 researchers. Gauthier replied it would probably depend on the type of data needed; in some cases, the
50 researcher or department chair could provide it. McFall reported he had difficulty obtaining data at his
51 campus. Joanne Zimring-Towne stressed the importance of data and stated that access to data was not
52 affected by enrollment priority. She expressed concern about having an extended registration period and
53 developing policy based on an atypical moment in time (due to the influx of students during the recent
54 budget crisis). Hernandez replied that the reason the Board Rule creates college-based priority is because
55 there is pressure to have a statewide college system. He argued that students who take classes at other
56 campuses don’t do as well as students who enroll at a single campus. Hernandez expressed skepticism that
57 the customization cost was the main obstacle and speculated that it was the timeframe, which could
58 probably be addressed. Gauthier expressed frustration that District administrators promised faculty that
59 the new SIS could be customized and did not stand behind that promise. Immerblum asked Gauthier to
60 sustain the DAS position, because it has not changed and therefore the Chancellor and administration have
61 to accept it. Gauthier replied they were aware of the DAS position, but did not agree with it. Pogoler
62 argued the DAS needed to hammer its position publicly anyway, even if the administration does not agree,
63 so that it will be on the record.

64 7. Constitution and Bylaws (noticed for vote at March meeting): Gauthier distributed and discussed
65 proposed changes to both documents. Pogoler pointed out that the documents had two conflicting
66 mechanisms of changing the constitution. He added that the DAS needed to decide on one and strike the
67 other.

68 Constitution Article 8 (Amendment to the Constitution and Bylaws) states:
“Every six years, the DAS Constitution and Bylaws shall be reviewed so as to revise or amend such language.....

Any proposed amendment or addition to the Bylaws, must be presented to the DAS Exec, and a majority must approved the proposed change before going to the full DAS for ratification. If ratified by a majority vote of the full DAS, the Bylaw change shall become effective immediately and formal notice shall be sent to all the senates of the outcome. “

Bylaws Article XIII (Amending the Bylaws) states:

“Section 1: A proposed amendment to the By-Laws may be presented by any member of the DAS.

Section 2: Any amendment to the By-Laws shall be referred to the Executive Committee for study and, if considered in order with the DAS Constitution, it will be presented for notice at the next regular DAS meeting and voted on at the subsequent meeting.

Section 3: The DAS may adopt proposed amendments to the By-Laws by a two-thirds vote of all members present and voting. Adopted amendments shall be recorded by the DAS Secretary along with the approval date. A history of changes shall be maintained by the Parliamentarian as keeper of the official copy of the Constitution and By-Laws of the Academic Senate.”

Pogoler stated that if the DAS were to adopt the Constitution, it would take precedence; otherwise, the language needs to be deleted. Gauthier thanked Pogoler for pointing out the discrepancy and asked DAS members to carefully review both documents. He noted that in the latest revision, all references to “campus” had been replaced with “college.” Gauthier added that the Constitution language did not preclude changes occurring more frequently than every six years. Immerblum asked whether the Constitution should have a simple sentence referring to Article XIII of the Bylaws. Rosow agreed the language should be deleted from the Constitution because it belongs in the Bylaws. Rosow added that the rule of thumb is that “Constitution is policy, Bylaws is procedure.” Pogoler argued that the amendment language should be in the Constitution because the Bylaws are subordinate to the Constitution. Hernandez agreed and argued that Article XIII (Section 2) of the Bylaws needed to be substituted for the language in the Constitution. Webber asked whether the final language would be approved by the DAS first. Beaulieu replied that the Bylaws were approved by the DAS; the Constitution has to be approved by all faculty. He added that the DAS approved the addition of the first vice president position two years ago. Brent asked who the members of Constitution Committee were. Gauthier replied that the members included Immerblum, Freitas, Pogoler, and himself. Pogoler argued for keeping Article IX (Section 3) of the Bylaws because it is out of Robert’s Rules. Pogoler, Beaulieu, and Gauthier suggested the following changes to Article IX (Section1) of the Bylaws:

Article IX: Presentation of Issues

“Section 1: The DAS President (or designee) shall may terminate general discussion of an action item at the end of ten minutes and shall may call for a vote on the disposition of the any actionable item, unless time is extended by a majority vote of the members present.”
Gauthier concluded the discussion by asking DAS members to review the proposed changes carefully and discuss at the local senates.

Reports

8. President’s Report

a. Sustainability Institute: Gauthier reported that the DAS has requested funds for a 0.2 director position for the Sustainability Institute, which has been around since 2007. The federal Previous funds for this position lasted until late 2013. The Institute has two three components; one is academic, another is career-technical, and the other has to do with reaching out to our communities. There is a large project taking off at the Southern California Marine Institute (SCMI); we are trying to use this as a learning space and participate with other members of the consortium. Beaulieu added that the position was opened up to all LACCD faculty; Alexis Navarro from East and George Leddy from Valley did the initial work along with Vice Chancellor Cajayon. McMurray reported that Harbor’s Dean of Economic Development Sandra Sanchez expressed concern that the CSUs might try to take over the SCMI. Immerblum asked whether it would be a C or D basis position. Gauthier replied it would be D basis. Beaulieu added that we finally have a commitment from the District administration for this position.

b. Chancellor Hiring Report: Gauthier reported that a new chancellor has not been hired yet. The Board is taking its time and not communicating about the status of the selection process.

c. District News (AFT-Senate, Accreditation, SIS updates): Gauthier met with interim Chancellor Barrera to discuss a number of issues. McMurray stated she received an email from Barrera requesting Senate appointees for Harbor’s presidential hiring committee. Gauthier replied senators should not appoint anyone until they agree on the hiring procedure. He directly spoke to Barrera and Trustee Veres to ensure they use the current process and change it later if needed. Even though there is only one search firm, they will provide multiple candidates. He added that the selection committee members should be meeting soon to go over the job announcement. Immerblum stated that in the past the Chancellor took it upon himself to develop the final job announcement without committee approval.

d. ACCJC revised standards: Gauthier announced that the ACCJC revised standards are coming out. He asked DAS members to review the standards and send comments to Phil Smith so we can develop resolutions for the ASCCC Spring Plenary.

He Gauthier also announced that the federal government provides free training on settling disputes through Interest-Based Bargaining (IBB). The current AFT-District contract negotiations are using IBB and both sides report many positive aspects of the approach for conflict resolution.

e. Adult Education: The LACCD is working with K-12 districts to create a regional consortium for Adult Education under provisions of AB 86. The main fight is so far has been over who is going to lead and control the money. Los Angeles, Culver City, Burbank, and other K-12 school districts are going to participate. They have identified five areas including English as a Second Language (ESL), Citizenship, adult learning, and basic skills. Other programs such as home economics were removed from the program.
Governor Brown has not said much about Adult Education this year, but there will be more money attached to it in the future. They are also moving toward more dual enrollment, so we may start to see many kids graduating from high school and college at the same time. Beaulieu expressed concern that immigrants would get the short end of the stick on this. Pogoler added it was obvious there is no money to be made in Adult Education; K12 dropped the program because they lost money.

9. Past President’s / 1st VP Report

a. Bond Steering: Beaulieu reported that it is clear the direction is toward centralization in the bond program. All the Campus Project Managers (CPMs) have been let go; that model is now defunct. About 35% of the staff have been let go; some individuals remain as independent contractors reporting to AECOM downtown. This is a dramatic change, and we are not sure this is the best way to do business. At least four presidents are not happy with the changes, but they have not complained to the Board about it because they seem not to care. AECOM reports to Jim O’Reilly and he reports to the Board’s Infrastructure Committee. We are left with something similar to what the state controller’s office suggested, but he feels they shot way past the mark. The closure of the e7 studio was seemed arbitrary. The fiber optic program (ConnectLACCD) has been put on hold for 90 days. On the energy front, some strange decisions are being made, but they claim they are following process. BSC has been reduced to the faculty representatives (Beaulieu, Gauthier, and Waddell) complaining. The presidents don’t bother to complain, because it seems to be a waste of their time. Faculty do get data and information at the meetings, but there seem to be discrepancies. While some Board members seem to be on board with this “one throat to choke” policy, Trustee Moreno has been very strongly opposed to this.

b. District Budget Committee: Valley and Southwest were discussed in DBC Exec, since both are running deficits and seem to be locked in a very tough financial spot. Valley was poorly managed and administered for years and finds it difficult to cut anything. Southwest has some profound structural problems; they seem to be caught in a vicious cycle of a low enrollment patterns.

c. Equivalency: They still have over 300 files to reconcile at some point. The new Human Resources Vice Chancellor, Albert Ramon, from all reports is doing a great job. They are not spending any time on new equivalencies. The external and internal auditors keep coming as well. Some of these cases take weeks to untangle. We get half dozen new cases and another six or so inquiries per semester. Gauthier urged DAS members to make sure adjunct faculty are qualified before hiring them. Senates need to ask for verification.

10. 2nd VP/DCC Report

a. Discipline Day: Atondo reported that Discipline Day would take place on Friday 2/28/14 at Valley. They have received about 150 confirmations so far and are taking RSVPs until the 19th. It will be a working session in which discipline faculty need to conduct committee business and to review single college attributes: levels below transfer, hours (lecture/lab), all college course descriptions for the new SIS, etc.
b. LACCD GE Plan (BR 6200): DCC is looking at revising our General Education plans. LACCD currently has two GE plans, which our students don’t need (or use). DCC is proposing to adopt a single GE plan, in addition to the CSU plan, and IGETC. One issue coming up from Trade is that they have many CTE programs with a lot of units required for the major. We need to make sure that the GE plan doesn’t have too many units. Our current proposal has 21 units; it’s a hybrid. One solution is to make an exception for CTE students; the other is reducing the plan to 18 units (what our current plan B looks like). Our CTE students are best served by the 18-unit plan, however the social science faculty may not approve it because Area B would only have three units. An argument can be made to have an 18 unit GE, CSU, and IGETC plans. Rosow said if the idea is for students to transfer, it would be more efficient to do that under a graduation plan we espouse. Atondo stated next DCC meeting is March 7.

Rosow/Brent moved to extend 10 minutes (MSU).

Gauthier left the meeting to make his evening class at LAVC. Beaulieu took over.

Pogoler said Trade faculty like Plan B, and they are going to keep it. He added we could get a Board rule change, but that would really upset Trade. He expressed concern that DCC will pander to the social science faculty. Many of their CTE programs were 66 units. He added that they are simultaneously being asked to give up two units from their CTE programs and three more with the 21 unit plan. At Pierce’s behest, they had their own graduation plan in which they got rid of Physical Education. Hernandez asked why we are moving away from Plans A & B. Atondo replied it is confusing to students and counselors struggle with the plans; none of them see a need for it from a curriculum standpoint. When these plans were adopted many years ago, the CSU and IGETC plans did not exist. Plan A was an attempt to meet the needs of our transfer students. There is no reason to have multiple plans. She surveyed 74 districts and found that only five had more than one plan.

According to SB 1440, we cannot impose additional courses on our transfer students. Pogoler stated he was perfectly willing to let go of plan A and substitute it with IGETC and CSU. Atondo replied the GE plan will have 18 units. They have not discussed what area B will look like.

15. Treasurer’s Report: Immerblum distributed a written Treasurer report dated 2/13/2014. He is processing mileage claims in two batches this year. Rosow gave Immerblum kudos for doing an exceptional job as DAS Treasurer.

15. SIS Report (Webber): Webber reported on the District’s progress on SB 1456. The dates for Fall 2014 enrollment are set to begin on 4/14, which is during Spring Break. The enrollment priority groups have been established cording to Title 5, we do not have any special groups (e.g.: international students). Students with 101 or more units, and two or more semesters on probation will lose their enrollment priority even if they are EOPS students. Kimble will redo the probation report to make sure they are accurate. Immerblum expressed concern that many students will be affected. Webber said all campuses should develop an enrollment priority appeals process. The district-wide appeal process was wrapped up in to BR 8603 which went nowhere, so it needs to be developed at the campus level. We have been expecting to have a timeline for months; it seems that most campuses have not delineated their timelines. Colleges are responsible for sending out notices to students that have one semester of probation or a certain number of units. Implementation of SB 1456 is moving forward; the adoption of the new SIS has caused delays. Foster said that
at their recent SS meeting, it was noted there would be many recommendations for Board Rule changes; she asked how these will be forwarded. Webber replied the body will draft recommendations that will go to consultation. There are forthcoming BR and administrative regulations that should come to consultation soon.

At the last operational steering committee, they voted down the prepaid wait list. They did vote to approve a district-wide transcript; noncredit courses need to be transcripted on a separate page.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Minutes submitted respectfully by DAS Secretary Angela Echeverri