DAS Executive Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, May 22, 2014  
1:00 to 3:30 PM  
ESC Board Room  

Present: Don Gauthier, David Beaulieu, Alex Immerblum, Elizabeth Atondo, Angela Echeverri, Allison Moore, Tom McFall, Adrienne Foster, and Kathy Oborn  

1. Call to Order/Approval of Agenda: President Gauthier called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm.  
3. Public Speakers: None  

Future Actions  

4. Noticed Motions for First DAS Meeting in Fall, 2014  
a. LACCD GE Plan BR 6200: Atondo reported that the District Curriculum Committee (DCC) changes in Board Rule 6200 would be up for a vote (18-unit plan with Area B open). She added that someone could make a motion on the floor to adopt a 21-unit GE plan (Model 3). Immerblum stated there was a general consensus to adopt a 21-unit GE plan. Beaulieu added there are two big arguments in favor of a 21-unit plan: the need to include American Institutions and the need to review the units of many of the CTE programs.  
b. E-66 Guidelines for CSU GE Certification: Atondo reported that E-66 language has been cleaned up and is ready for a vote in the fall.  
c. Course Outline of Record (COR): Atondo stated she would make a presentation to the full DAS in the fall, covering the required elements of the COR and demonstrating CurricUNET. She added that CurricUNET is a much more dynamic system than ECD; the COR document is more fluid and additional information does not appear as addenda. It would be up to colleges to decide what else they would to include in the COR in addition to the required elements. When sending the CORs to UCs or C-ID, they will only see the required elements. Atondo explained that adoption of CurricUNET is working its way through contracts and legal, and we do not have a firm date when it will be implemented. McFall asked whether the software could handle noncredit and not for credit courses. Atondo replied it could handle noncredit. Our current system (ECD) does not handle noncredit; which requires using hard copies of the CORs. At its last meeting, the DCC asked Atondo to report what each college Curriculum Committee had decided. She reported that eight out of the nine colleges (with the exception of East) would like to see the required Title 5 elements in the COR and have each college determine what else to include. Currently our CORs contain many elements that are not required under Title 5.  

Immerblum asked whether we really want different CORs at each campus and argued that the integrity of the COR was at stake. He stated he would like the local academic senates go through each element of the COR and discuss the need to include them. Atondo replied that the local curriculum committees have already had this discussion. She added that the common course descriptions recently developed by the discipline committees were only for the SIS (Student Information System) portal; they had nothing to do with CORs and curriculum. Gauthier stated, as an example, that non-CTE (career technical education) CORs do not need to include the SCANS portion of the COR because they are not applicable to academic courses. Other items such as self-reflective learning are not part of the COR. Gauthier reported we
would like faculty to understand that it is not a good idea to have SLOs in the COR because people are assessing and revising SLOs on an ongoing basis. Immerblum countered that he would like faculty to consider what should be part of the COR, in addition to what is required by the state. He argued that because self-reflective learning is one of our goals, it should not be dropped from the COR. Gauthier replied that not all colleges would agree. Immerblum stated that E-65 should have included self-reflective learning under professional development for faculty. Others believe self-reflective learning should be in the educational plans. Immerblum questioned how self-reflective learning would be supported if it is not in any document. Atondo replied the COR is the minimal rigid structure of a course; every faculty member is required to cover that information. Nuances are in the syllabi, which contain more detail and maybe hours spent in a given area. Atondo added that the content and objectives are the most important parts of the COR. It is not practical to ask the faculty to spend time on elements that are not required, when we are reviewing hundreds of CORs every semester. Immerblum expressed concern that the DAS voted to include self-reflective learning but does not really support it. Atondo and Gauthier replied self-reflective learning doesn’t belong in the COR and we should not mandate from the District to the other campuses. Immerblum questioned whether the curriculum chairs have shared this information with the local senates. Beaulieu reported that arguments to add sustainability, self-reflective learning and other items to the COR did not get a lot of support. People want to keep the COR as a technical document. Moore expressed concerns about infringements on academic freedom.

d. Coming Adult Ed – AB 86 discussions (dual-, concurrent enrollment, LA consortium):

Gauthier reported there was a Board ad hoc committee meeting at LAUSD’s Beaudry building to discuss Adult Education, Assembly Bill 86, and dual and concurrent enrollment. The consortium is creating an umbrella organization that includes local K-12 and LACCD representatives. At the meeting, there was a discussion about dual enrollment and concurrent enrollment differences, and how the consortium is going to be run. The consortium members are currently focusing on legal issues, not educational issues. He explained that dual enrolled students could be enrolled at both a high school and college, whereas in concurrent enrollment only one school receives funding. Gauthier, Beaulieu, Waddell, and others were involved at the very beginning. Trustee Mike Eng, President Larry Franks, and President Marvin Martinez have been attending the meetings. Gauthier stated that Trustee Eng publishes the meeting agendas beforehand and his ad hoc committee holds open public meetings. Gauthier reported that so far the discussions have centered on how they are going to admit students and run the program. Moore and Foster expressed concern that administrators have driven the consortium and faculty have not been a part of this discussion. Foster argued that someone should be there representing the senate; we need a designated person to report back to faculty on the developments. We also need to discuss who is going to pick up different students. Gauthier added there were huge legal issues surrounding how the program components are going to be spelled out.

Beaulieu and Gauthier expressed concern that the master document for Adult Education created by Vice Chancellor Cayajon did not include many faculty views expressed at the meeting. Beaulieu added that the number of high school students in college classrooms is a faculty concern. He argued that the point of this initiative is to serve a certain population (e.g. ESL students), not to take the cash and run with it to do CTE. He added that one problem is that many the Adult Ed students do not have anyone representing their interests and have a limited power base. There was a discussion about how some administrators might view Adult Education as a “cash cow.” Moore said the danger is that administrators may be more concerned about the money, but faculty need to be at the table to discuss how we are going to bring these students to a higher level. Immerblum asked for more guidance on what should be discussed at the local senate meetings. Gauthier will distribute Cayajon’s early proposal that was never implemented. Gauthier added that we need to discuss and have a District position on...
Adult Education. Once the law came forward, it had certain requirements and the funding was much reduced, to about $125 million statewide. The initial proposal was to give Adult Ed to the California Community College system in one fell swoop (about $400 M to do $1 Billion + worth of work). Gauthier explained that interested K-12 and community college districts have two years to form an organized consortium and emphasized that faculty need to participate and attend whenever possible. Echeverri suggested asking for funding for a faculty stipend. Immerblum asked if there were faculty on the hiring committee for an upcoming dean position and expressed concern about hiring someone with no educational experience. Gauthier replied that there were at least two faculty, one appointed by the Senate and another by the AFT, both with significant experience in non-credit programs.

e. Unprepared Students 2013 Scorecard: Gauthier distributed and discussed a report dated 4-30-14 that was prepared by Vice Chancellor Maury Pearl’s office. About 85% of incoming LACCD students are unprepared and place in remedial math or English (below college level). Statewide this figure is 73%. There is also a mismatch between what the demand for certain classes, the number of sections, and class size. We are not offering enough sections of some classes, which are heavily impacted and have large class sizes. The question is how to address this. For example, math classes that are four levels below college level have an average of 54 students/class. The completion rate for underprepared students in the LACCD is lower (36%) than statewide (41%). Mission, Southwest, and Trade have among the lowest ranked underprepared students. The clear solution is to offer more sections of classes for those less prepared with smaller enrollments and increase, if necessary, the enrollment in sections of higher level courses.

Beaulieu discussed the LACCD’s lack of a comprehensive and substantial joint Student Success plan in recent years. Gauthier mentioned the LACCD’s AtD (Achieving the Dream) program, which is being renewed for a fourth year. However, other than this effort, not much is getting done for Student Success. Immerblum added that former Chancellor La Vista agreed to hire a full-time dean of student success shortly before he left, but this has not moved forward. Dean Deborah Harrington is being paid by the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), not the District, and most of her efforts have been directed into FTLA (Faculty Teaching and Learning Academy) and 3CSN (Habits of Mind). Harrington was not getting any evaluative information about the success of the FTLA program. Gauthier reported that FTLA has been institutionalized at Valley. Beaulieu expressed concern that the transfer and student success numbers at Valley had not moved an inch. Foster stated that black students still have huge achievement gaps and we need to prioritize student success over other items. Beaulieu argued this is why we need a dean to take the lead on this effort. Initially, the plan was for Beaulieu, Gary Colombo and Deborah Harrington to work on student success. However, Gary Colombo got distracted with accreditation, Deborah Harrington was busy working with the state, and Beaulieu got distracted with the bond program.

Immerblum questioned the need to have a districtwide Student Success (SS) committee, since each college has a SS committee. Gauthier stated SS happens in the classroom and suggested having the SS committees give presentations to the DAS. Foster stated the DAS needs to put recommendations forward in writing and request that the LACCD hire a Dean of Student Success. Echeverri agreed with Foster and stated the DAS should go on the record on this issue. She added there might be more interest from the administration when low completion numbers start to cost the District state funding. Beaulieu stated there are many good things happening at the colleges, but there is no district coordination. Immerblum added SS should undergo program review and have a plan. McFall reported that at LATTC, the SS Committee get reports of what is happening at the campuses and shares ideas, but that is as far as it goes. Immerblum proposed a DAS recommendation to have the Chancellor ask the Dean Harrington...
to prepare a report detailing all of the SS efforts that are conducted at the campuses. Beaulieu reported that the grant just got renewed and suggested the DAS should ask the incoming chancellor what he wants to do organizationally to work on student success. He added that the Board is not meeting until July 9th to have its annual retreat.

Meeting quorum was lost

f. SIS Degree Audit: Atondo reported that Betsy Regalado wants the DAS to take a position on the SIS degree audit. There is an issue with students applying online on CCCApply because they are asked to select a major, undecided, transfer, or a specific degree before they attend an orientation. Under the current plan, students who select undecided and transfer would be given a degree audit against IGETC so they can see how they are progressing toward their degree or certificate requirements. This would cover UC/CSU transfers and associate degrees. Zimring-Towne feels that this may be uninformed and we should not initiate any degree audit before students are informed because many don’t know the difference between UC and CSU, AA or BA, etc. Foster asked how this would affect their ranking for priority registration. Atondo replied she did not think it was connected to registration priority. Immerblum added colleges wouldn’t get apportionment if a student has not declared a major. Atondo and Beaulieu replied that was true only after completing 15 units. The consensus of DAS members present was to support Zimring-Towne’s position and that new students should not be audited under IGETC.

g. Faculty Grade Submission: Atondo reported she attended the SIS implementation meeting yesterday to review faculty grade submission in People Soft. She explained that in the current SIS system, faculty can save partial grades for a class. Once submitted, the grades are immediately available to students. Surprisingly, the new system does not allow for the submission of partial grades. Faculty can save them temporarily, but all grades need to be submitted simultaneously. Gauthier and Foster asked Atondo to inquire why the new system was less flexible in this respect than the old one.

Discussion Items

1. Senate Release Time proposal: Gauthier reported on the DAS consultation follow up. Interim Chancellor Barrera would like to allocate additional senate reassigned time next year (14-15) and then additional funding through 2015-16. The example of an additional 0.2 FTE per year was meant to show how the funds would come through the DAS and would be assigned to the campuses through the budget transfer (BTA) process. One challenge is that the local senates do not have the same officer positions. He explained that these funds should be used for senate officers, not SLO coordinators or curriculum chairs, since these are positions best left to the colleges to fund as needed.

2. DAS – District Summit Planning - Save the date – Friday, Sept. 26th 2014 @ LA City College: Gauthier reported we have agreed on a date and location (LA City on the third floor of the student union). The plan would be to use adjacent classrooms for breakout sessions. There was a discussion on the agenda, which could include Student Success, Common Core (we should invite Beth Smith), Adult Education, Student Equity, and equity in campus funding.

3. DAS Meeting Calendar for 2014-15 & DAS Retreat – August 21, 2014 – 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM: Gauthier announced he would distribute a proposed meeting calendar for 2014-15. Foster suggested we obtain
Gauthier asked DAS members to suggest possible agenda items.

4. Meet/Welcome New Chancellor – June 16th 2:30 – 4:00 PM: Chancellor Francisco Rodriguez is coming on board June 1st. Gauthier stated he would try to have a short consultation meeting with Barrera beforehand.

5. Presidential & Administrative searches (Reports, HR Guide changes, etc.): Gauthier reported that Valley, Southwest, and Harbor colleges are wrapping up their presidential selection processes. Valley will also need to hire a Vice President of Administrative Services. Pierce has not hired a Vice President of Academic Affairs yet. Pasadena Community College is looking for a President and Dean of Student Success.

6. Sled Style Student Desks: Immerblum briefly discussed concerns about sled style desks in the classrooms.

Reports

1. Past President’s / 1st VP Report
   a. Energy Oversight: Beaulieu reported the committee members are meeting tomorrow trying to get money for Central Plants for Mission and West, which did not get automatically approved. There is a lot less money in the 40J Energy budget than previously thought. The subcommittee also received additional requests from Trade and City.
   b. Bond Steering: Beaulieu expressed increasing doubts about the effectiveness of AECOM.
   c. DBC report: The District Budget Committee made an important and unanimous decision to give more money to Southwest because it continues to struggle with low enrollment. The campus is persistently under-enrolled with less than 5,000 FTES (full time equivalent students). Southwest has low Latino enrollment partly because Latino students are hesitant to enroll at the campus. They also have to compete with El Camino College and Firestone Center (ELAC), which are close by. This year they are breaking even, but it’s clear they have a structural deficit. President Marvin Martinez (ELAC) is replacing President Burke (LAPC) as DBC co-chair. DBC also voted to give all the colleges more money to help enrollment growth. Mission is approximately at 6000, Harbor at 6000, and West at 7000 FTES.

2. 2nd VP Report
   a. Curriculum: See discussion above.

3. President’s Report: Gauthier reported that many campuses make money from independent vendors and filming. However, the insurance rates are going from $1 Million to $5 Million, which may effectively price us out of the film business. Additionally, vendors are required to have what they view as excessive levels of worker’s compensation coverage in order to be able to sell on our campuses, which is making many of the vendors disappear.
   a. Constitution vote: Gauthier reported that the recently revised DAS Constitution was approved by a total of 279 faculty districtwide.
b. TPPC – Literacy Statement: Gauthier announced that the statement would go out shortly.

c. Sustainability Institute: The Institute gave a great presentation at the last Board meeting at Southwest College. The Board members were interested and open to the idea that the District become more involved in this effort.

4. Treasurer’s Report: Immerblum reported the DAS has a balance of $140 in petty cash.

5. Committee & Campus Reports: None given.
   a. SIS report
   b. Student Success /SSSP
   c. Student Equity
   d. Achieving the Dream / Basic Skills
   e. Transfer committee
   f. Campus reports

6. Other Issues / Announcements: Gauthier announced he would prepare plaques for Kathleen Bimber and Beth Smith at the ASCCC. Some suggested Gauthier invite Kathleen Bimber to the upcoming Summit hosted at City.

Future Meetings:

Consultation 6/16/2014 @ 2:30-4:00 PM – Hearing Room
DAS Exec – 6/26/2014 Thursday @ 1:00 – 3:30 PM – Hearing Room
DAS Retreat – 8/21/2014 Thursday 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM - Hearing Room

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by DAS Secretary Angela Echeverri