DAS Executive Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 26, 2014
1:00-3:30 PM
Educational Services Center

Present: Don Gauthier, Elizabeth Atondo, Angela Echeverri, John Freitas, Joshua Miller, Leslie Milke, Susan McMurray, Adrienne Foster, and Kathy Oborn

Guests: Eloise Crippens (Equivalency Committee) and Allison Tom-Miura (Trade)

1. Call to Order/Approval of Agenda: President Gauthier called the meeting to order at 1:25pm.

2. Public Speakers: None

Action Items

1. Equivalency issues: Crippens explained that requests for equivalencies first go to the appropriate District Discipline Committee and then to the DAS Equivalency Committee, which can either agree or disagree with the original decision. She reported that two equivalency requests had been submitted and denied twice by the Equivalency Committee. These individuals have the opportunity to appeal the decisions to the DAS Executive Committee and the Board of Trustees. Crippens distributed both applications and the DAS members discussed the merits of each appeal. The DAS Executive Committee decisions are listed below.

Accounting: After reviewing the documentation and discussing the merits of the appeal, eight DAS Executive members voted in favor of denying the appeal and one member abstained (Echeverri).

Addiction Studies: After reviewing the documentation and discussing the merits of the appeal, eight DAS Executive members voted in favor of denying the appeal and one member voted in favor of granting equivalency (Echeverri).

New Items

1. Noncredit Progress Indicators: Allison Tom-Miura introduced herself as a noncredit faculty member from Trade who teaches Basic Skills. She is an active member of the Noncredit Discipline Committee and the ASCCC Noncredit Task Force. Tom-Miura distributed and summarized two handouts titled "Key Noncredit Issues-July 26, 2014" and "Noncredit Success from Indicators to Student Completion." She recounted that in the spring of 2012 the ASCCC passed a resolution calling for the Chancellor’s Office to collect and record grades for noncredit courses and implement a grading system using Pass (P), Satisfactory...
Progress (SP), and Not Passed (NP) after a two-year pilot project across California. The state is not ready to memorialize noncredit grades, but a number of districts have institutionalized the reporting of grades for noncredit courses. She added that the LACCD is not adequately documenting student grades and progress in its noncredit courses and programs.

She explained that while the District has the technology to do so, current LACCD transcripts do not distinguish between students who successfully complete and demonstrate competency for noncredit courses and programs, from those who do not. In other words, the transcripts of students who complete and pass a noncredit course/program, will look the same as those who do not. She added that instructors frequently receive requests to verify that students have successfully completed noncredit courses and programs. However, since there are only eight noncredit instructors throughout the District and most are adjunct, it is very hard to track them down to verify student grades and completion.

Tom-Miura stated that noncredit students are concerned because their certificates are not transcripted and there is no formalized way of documenting successful completion. Furthermore, it is impossible for LACCD colleges to accurately report Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) certificates to outside agencies. She added that reports on CDCP certificates awarded are now included on colleges’ Score Cards. Tom-Miura argued that since noncredit courses and programs were state approved and funded, they should be documented and transcripted like any other apportionment-funded course. She also mentioned that the processes to report the CDCP certificates vary across the nine LACCD colleges.

Freitas noted that Title 5 allows colleges to give grades for noncredit courses and that there are no restrictions in Title 5 as to how many times a student can take a noncredit class. Freitas suggested the DCC could draft a Board Rule to ensure colleges could report the successful completion of noncredit grades and programs. He added that this would tie in with Assembly Bill 86 (July 2013), which calls for the formation of Adult Education Consortia across the state. Another issue is that the State Chancellor’s Office is not keeping track of the data. Foster stated it would be important to educate the students about the changes during orientation. There are two main types of noncredit certificates:

- **Completion certificates**: Workforce and career programs.
- **Competency certificates**: Academic programs

Tom-Miura concluded by stating that noncredit faculty would like consistency of standards and the ability to memorialize the noncredit competency certificates.

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

April 25, 2014 DAS Executive minutes were approved with corrections.

Freitas/Foster (MSU)
May 22, 2014 DAS Executive minutes approved with corrections. Oborn/Foster (MSP, Milke abstained)

Gauthier announced there would be no Executive meeting in July.

Action Items

1. **BR 6200-GE (original 21 unit vs. 18 unit plan):** Atondo reported that DCC approved Board Rule language for an 18-unit GE plan, but it seems like a GE plan with 21 units has more faculty support. The Board Rule language needs to be vetted and voted on in the fall of 2014. At this point it appears that Trade may object to the 21-unit GE plan, but other colleges will support it. Gauthier will instruct the DCC to put forward a motion with the original 21-unit plan. Atondo replied that DCC is done and suggested the DAS put together a 21-unit plan.

   McMurray/Foster moved that the DAS propose a 21-unit GE plan with 3 units in Area B1 and 3 units in Area B2 (MSP, Freitas voted against).

   Atondo stated that at the first DAS fall meeting we could vote on the 18-unit proposal and ask for an alternate motion to consider the 21-unit plan. Freitas said the earliest possible approval date would be in October. Milke suggested sending out the original GE plan with 21 units over the summer and voting early fall.

2. **Meeting Schedule/Locations:** The 2014-2015 DAS meetings will be held as follows:
   - September 11: Valley
   - October 9: Mission
   - December 11: Pierce
   - February 19: East
   - March 12: West
   - May 14: Harbor

   There was a brief discussion about the best time to hold DAS Executive meetings due to scheduling conflicts for several members. Executive meetings in the fall of 2014 will be held on the first Friday of the month at 10:00 am as follows:
   - Friday September 5
   - Friday, October 3
   - Friday, November 7
   - Friday, December 5

   In the fall the DAS Exec will evaluate whether the Friday time slot works better than the traditional Thursday time.

3. **Board meeting coverage for July @ ESC (7/9 and 7/23):** Gauthier will be out of town and will miss two Board meetings during the month of July. He asked for volunteers to cover these Board meetings. He explained that there are
usually two Board committee meetings from 12 or 1 until 3 pm. The general
session usually starts at 3:30 pm. Oborn volunteered to attend the Board
meeting on 7/9/14 and Freitas volunteered for 7/23/14.

4. **Equivalency issues (Crippens):** See above.

**Discussion Items**

1. **Senate reassigned time:** Gauthier reported that the suggestion to increase
reassigned time for senate officers by 0.2 at all colleges is harder to implement
than allocating funds in the fall to campuses that need them. He suggested
discussing how to distribute these funds at the DAS Executive retreat.
McMurray asked whether these funds could be used for SLO-related reassigned
time; the consensus was that they should not.

2. **Discussion on resolution in support of Articulation Officers:** Atondo
reported that there are several new articulation officers in the district and some
are not getting enough support and reassigned time. She added that there is a
general lack of awareness of what they do. The articulation officers are putting
together a paper describing what they do, their roles and responsibilities, and
the importance of transfer center directors and articulation officers being
reassigned full time or at least 50%. She mentioned that the Pierce Transfer
Center Director has a 0.5 C-basis assignment. Atondo would like the DAS to
endorse the recommendations. Gauthier replied we would discuss the
document at the DAS retreat in August.

3. **IT Policies and Procedures:** Gauthier recounted there was a presentation on
IT by Jorge Mata and Ann Diga in the Board Room, which will be going on the
road and visiting the campuses. He encouraged DAS members to express any
concerns to Mata and Diga ahead of time.

4. **Presidential Searches:** Three new permanent college presidents have been
hired as indicated below:

- **Harbor:** McMurray reported that President Otto Lee is coming on board
  August 1, 2014. She mentioned that there were no vice presidents on Harbor’s
  presidential selection committee.

- **Valley:** Incoming President Erika Endrijonas is coming on board July 29,
  2014. She was previously an executive vice president in the Ventura district.

- **Southwest:** Gauthier announced that Linda Rose previously from Santa Ana
  College had been selected as president of Southwest College.

Freitas recounted that the presidential selection process was changed in a back-
door way by changing the job announcement without the committee.
Furthermore, the Board changed the Board Rule on presidential hiring and took
out the candidate public forums. McMurray expressed her concerns about the
presidential hiring process, the undue influence of private consultants, and the lack of public forums.

District vs. College budget issues (Freitas): Freitas asked why the LACCD claims it spends 90% or more for salaries, benefits and utilities, but tells the state it spends around 85% for these items. Foster suggested the DAS go on the record to ask these questions. Gauthier added that the leadership position has been that if more than 85% of a college's budget goes to salaries it is in trouble. McMurray noted this information does not include money from grants. Gauthier suggested discussing this issue at the upcoming DAS leadership retreat. McMurray asked about the appropriate level for setting the reserves.

New Items

1. Scheduling evening blocks-work group: Gauthier argued against scheduling evening classes from 6:50 to 10:00 pm. He stated that many students leave after their first break and 10 pm is too late for them to get out of class. Some students need to catch a bus at 9:40 PM, for example. He added that when classes only meet once a week, you also have to spend more time reviewing the material. He argued the current evening work blocks are inconsistent with student success and challenge the Carnegie Rule. He suggested evening classes be taught twice a week, e.g. from 5:00 to 6:25, 6:40-8:10 or 8:20 to 9:45 pm. Freitas added that teaching 3 hour 10 minutes blocks in the spring was awful. Gauthier would like the campuses to discuss this issue. Oborn reported that at Pierce faculty are allowed to configure their own time blocks. Foster countered that this would affect the ability of students to take other classes. Gauthier mentioned that other disciplines such as math already create evening conflicts with the existing schedule.

2. Faculty hiring (Foster): Foster wants to see other hiring policies (HR-120) because their policy is outdated. Milke discussed LAMC's faculty hiring policy. This will be another retreat item.

Reports of Committees

Officer Reports

President's Report:
Gauthier stated that the Bond Steering Committee will not meet until July. He mentioned we are still working through equivalency issues.

2nd Vice President Report

a) COR Elements: Atando recounted that the DAS had discussed Course Outline of Record (COR) elements in the past. She reported that eight of the nine college curriculum committees want to include the Title 5 elements and allow each college to add additional elements if they want to do so. Only one college (East) wants the other colleges to include additional elements in the COR. In July DCC will entertain a motion stipulating the COR will contain the Title 5 required elements and all
additional items would be locally determined. This motion will come to DAS in the fall. She asked DAS Executive members to discuss this issue with their curriculum chairs. She added that the COR is a technical document and argued it should not include educational philosophies.

b) Curriculum Submittal Deadline Change: DCC wants to move the curriculum submittal deadline up more from May to the end of March.

c) Administrative Regulation Changes

E-66: Atondo reported this regulation will be up for a vote on in fall. The proposed changes are not major.

E-64 and E-65: Both the program and course approval processes need a major overhaul. In our curriculum approval process, curriculum goes from senate to the vice president of academic affairs and the college president. There is no good reason for doing that; curriculum should go from senate to Board and the senates need to assert their primacy. We also need to find a better process to vet curriculum throughout the District because challenges happen at the end of the approval process. If there is a challenge, it is because discipline committees are not meeting or talking.

d) Prerequisite Policy: Atondo stated we need to update our prerequisite policies due to Title 5 changes. She distributed a draft policy from Mira Costa Community College. The policy would be part of an administrative regulation (E-reg), go to DCC in July and then to DAS.

Strategic Execution Plan for Building Programs: Gauthier discussed a handout summarizing how much bond money is left at the LACCD colleges.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by DAS Secretary Angela Echeverri