DAS EXEC MINUTES
10/3/14 10:00 am-1:00 pm
Educational Services Center

Attending: Don Gauthier (President), Alex Immerblum (Treasurer, East), Angela Echeverri (Secretary), Susan McMurray (Harbor), Kathy Oborn (Pierce), John Freitas (City), Leslie Milke (Mission), Adrienne Foster (West), Wally Hanley (Trade), Josh Miller (Valley), and Allison Moore (Southwest).

Absent: David Beaulieu (1st Vice President) and Elizabeth Atondo (2nd Vice President).

Call to Order: President Gauthier called the meeting to order at 10:10 am.

Approval of Agenda: Oborn/Echeverri (MSU) moved to approve the agenda. Gauthier will add hiring comments and credit for life experience under his report. Immerblum requested to add a proposed ASCCC resolution on the timing of the statewide consultation process.

Approval of Minutes:
DAS Executive Minutes of June 26, 2014: Minutes were approved (Oborn/Miller MSP; Moore abstained).
DAS Executive Minutes of September 5, 2014: Approval of minutes was postponed until the November meeting.

Old Business
1. Adult Ed report including upcoming issues from Consortium. Gauthier reported he had attended two out of four meetings on Adult Education so far. There is another meeting today he could not attend due to the DAS Executive meeting. There will be additional meetings every Friday for the next few weeks. So far there has been good LACCD faculty participation, between 25 and 40 attending per meeting. They have discussed gaps between the two systems (K-12 and Community College). Some of the issues are under the unions’ purview, while others are under the senate’s such as minimum qualifications (MQs) and professional experience. Some K-12 faculty have lifetime credentials and at some point we have to decide whether we want to honor their credentials in our system. Gauthier and Immerblum have also met with East’s President Marvin Martinez, ELAC’s AFT Chapter Chair Armida Ornelas, and Adult Education people to discuss the implementation of Assembly Bill 86.

Foster mentioned she was serving on the Standards and Practices Committee and stated we have to adhere by a very rigid timeline. She added this was worthy of a resolution at the state level to inform faculty of what is happening. Foster and Oborn volunteered to draft a resolution to alert the ASCCC of the need to examine the process for implementing Assembly Bill 86.
Immerblum stated there would probably be courses that do not require a Master's degree, such as noncredit credit courses that could be taught by faculty with a Bachelor's degree. Oborn added we need to look at the MQs for some of these disciplines and there may be new areas that we don’t teach yet. Gauthier agreed, mentioning classes for Adults with Disabilities. Foster replied that MQs for Learning Disability specialist, Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS) Counselor and Director are being reviewed. Moore and Echeverri asked whether Adult with Disabilities would become a part of the community college system. Gauthier replied that this is what it looks like would happen.

Gauthier stated that in order to make that seamless transition from noncredit to credit or from high school to college, we need to work closely before we are mandated by law to do it a certain way. It is also pretty clear faculty have some wiggle room on the timeline and how this plan is implemented. The first draft of the consortium's completed plan is due by October 31st and then it will be open to review and comments. The final AB 86 implementation plan from the Consortium has to be submitted by 12/31/14 and the state will respond to the plan by 3/15/14. It is possible, pending funding, that Adult Education courses in the Consortium may be taught as early as summer 2015. There are 70 different implementation plans that will be submitted across the state. The AB 86 six-member Work Group, which includes state chancellor Bryce Harris and Department of Education representatives, will decide which plan or plans to approve.

Gauthier stated the AFT has a different stake in the process because they would like to absorb the new members, while the DAS is mostly concerned about the academic implications and impacts on our programs. He added he would like to appoint someone like Susan McMurray, who has experience with adult education, to take the lead on AB 86 and represent the DAS at these meetings. There will be possibly two meetings to look at the draft LACCD plan in November. Immerblum asked whether the DAS had officially appointed any of the faculty representatives. He added the DAS should know who the faculty are and the representatives need to know who they report back to and what their role is. Immerblum asked that the DAS officially appoint representatives and select a point person. Gauthier replied that the attendance has been very fluid; the consensus was to have one person plus an alternate for each of the five Adult Ed areas. Immerblum asked that the DAS appoint a point person to represent the DAS, in addition to five people for each area. Gauthier replied we have not identified an individual for Adults with Disabilities.

2. Culinary Arts and Food Service Proposal: Gauthier reported he had heard nothing new on this issue. Under the current proposal, Mission, Trade, and Harbor would have to share their culinary facilities with a private contractor. Hanley announced that several hundred students and the Associated Student Organization (ASO) plan to protest the proposal at the upcoming Board meeting.
at Trade. Immerblum stated the Board should hear faculty concerns, respect the autonomy of the academic programs, and come back with a revised proposal.

Gauthier replied the model that is used by the district is a master agreement, but it is possible to set up an agreement to have multiple vendors. Milke stated the problem originated with how the study was done (over the winter break) and an apparent lack of transparency, which started this maelstrom. Mission is having discussions with its culinary program. The culinary students are all whipped up and are sending emails to Trustee Svonkin; it has become a very contentious situation. Gauthier reported the Board is considering redoing the study in a more transparent fashion. Each campus has different food service needs. East has a new campus center with a food court, but will not have food services because this has not been figured out. West has a food vendor (Love Birds) that was shut down for a time because of sanitation issues. Pierce has a food court with one common kitchen, which cannot be easily shared. The other point is that these spaces are the labs for our instructional programs and should not be for lease to outside entities. Oborn said there are two issues that need to be addressed: the existing culinary programs and the colleges that don’t have food service or culinary programs. Milke said Mission has the culinary program and a “servery.” She suggested leaving the three existing culinary programs alone and focusing on proving food service for the other six schools. Gauthier stated the full DAS should discuss the proposal and put a resolution together. He will invite Svonkin to the next DAS meeting at Mission.

New Business

3. Process for selecting a 4-year degree from district (SB 850-Block): Gauthier reported that 15 districts would get one 4-year Baccalaureate degree each within the next three to five years. He assumed the District would develop a competitive process to request and select proposals. It is not clear what the state level process will be to select the 15 districts. Nursing is excluded under the bill, because it is already taught at CSUs. We have been tasked to come up with ideas. Milke suggested Multimedia as a possibility; others suggested some of the allied health majors. Immerblum stated the ASCCC needs to give guidance to the districts and senates on how to proceed. Gauthier encouraged discussion on the campuses and for local senates to start compiling a possible list of programs.

4. Absence policies and student exclusions: Gauthier reported there have been some questions about how many absences a student is allowed before they can be excluded from a class. These questions are coming from faculty members who are getting pressure from deans. He stated that the absence policy is not in the LACCD’s Board Rules. Oborn mentioned there is language on attendance in Title 5 Section 55002.a.2.B, which states that students who miss an excessive number of classes may be dropped. Gauthier replied it is clear we have to develop a local policy and added he would request clarification. Faculty do not have to take roll in credit classes, but soon they will have to submit a second exclusion roster. Immerblum added the District does not have a policy on what
an excused absence is. Oborn asked whether extra credit assignments (e.g.: donating blood or voting) have to be related to the course content. Gauthier and Immerblum replied that these assignments could be considered service learning or, in part, used to satisfy Institutional Learning Outcomes related to civic engagement or participation.

5. 60-unit limit discussion item and possible ASCCC resolution: Gauthier reported this item came from Freitas because of certain high unit majors that do not fit the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) guidelines, such as computer science, physics, geology, and chemistry. In order to meet the 60-unit cap, faculty would have to agree to change their current organic chemistry, physics and calculus courses from five units to four units. Colleges would have to either get rid of their local degrees and the Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs), or comply with the 60-unit limit. One approach would be to try to convince the legislature to change the 60-unit limit and move all the degrees to Title 5 where they belong. Another alternative would be to reopen the model curriculum for the sciences. The TMC for geology and physics excluded several major courses and students need to take an extra 10 units to satisfy the local degree requirements.

Gauthier added that many students are transferring to four-year institutions without getting their associate degrees. He suggested starting by approaching the state chancellor’s office. Freitas stated that the way the bill is written, the 60 unit limit might be waived, but so far the state chancellor’s office insists on taking a strict interpretation. Immerblum and Freitas added that this is an opportunity to standardize the unit loads for the major courses. Immerblum stated he didn’t like the imposed limit of 60 units, but agreed there are some classes that have too many units. Gauthier said these issues need to be discussed by the disciplines and announced that the next District Discipline Committee meeting would be February 27, 2015. He added that the Math Committee meets regularly, but some of the other disciplines don’t. Immerblum argued the DAS should examine the 60-unit issue thoroughly and then approach the state chancellor’s office. Freitas will send out a list of the disciplines that may be impacted. He added the now we also have the 100-unit limit, which will affect registration priority.

6. Proposed Collegial Consultation Process (Freitas/Hernandez): DAS members discussed a draft document titled Collegial Consultation Process between DAS, College Senates, Chancellor and Board. This document was adapted from the Mira Costa Community College District and lists the following steps:

1) Proposal brought to the DAS President;
   a) DAS President brings a proposal to DAS Executive for review and identifies the proposal as a matter covered by the “rely primarily” or “mutually agree” form of collegial consultation;
b) The Executive Committee decides whether to forward proposal to full DAS or return it to the originator;

c) If the Executive Committee agrees to bring it forward to the DAS for a first reading, the DAS Secretary sends the proposal to the appropriate district groups and to college senates for review;

2) First Reading by the DAS with input from appropriate district constituencies and college senates, including District legal;

3) Final Review by DAS Executive Committee;

4) Distribution of the final draft proposal to district groups and local senates, including legal department;

5) Final reading by the DAS;

6) Approval by college senates; and then,

7) Final Approval and posting.

Gauthier questioned whether the DAS would want to charge its Secretary with sending proposals brought to the DAS Executive Committee to the various district groups and college senates for review or whether the Educational Services Office should continue carrying out this role. Freitas explained that the consultation process would involve the local senates approving proposals before the Board approves them. Gauthier added that many proposals require review by General Counsel and guidelines for these revisions could be written into the process.

Gauthier stated the District has a problem tracking the approval and implementation of its Board Rules and administrative regulations (E-regs). He added the District needs to develop a tracking system, because it is not efficient for the organization to lose items in the process or to constantly revisit the same issues. Freitas stated that matriculation and instruction are clearly academic issues and argued that all Board Rules should go back to the college senates for approval. Immerblum stated the proposed process is more thorough, requires additional steps, and does not include a vote by the DAS representatives. Moore argued the vote of the DAS representatives should override the local senate votes. Milke and Foster argued that steps 5 and 6 of the process above should be reversed, i.e.: approval by the college senates should be followed by a final reading and approval by the DAS. McMurray opined that DAS representatives have a larger role and should not focus solely on local campus issues.

Freitas questioned whether the DAS vote should be by college delegation (1 per college) or by each DAS representative, because not all colleges have full representation at DAS meetings. Immerblum asked whether the DAS constitution allowed colleges to send alternates. Gauthier replied it did not. Freitas stressed the importance of encouraging the local senates and their DAS delegates to get more involved in DAS matters. Immerblum stressed a clear consultation process needs to be in place. Gauthier added the status of Board Rules and E-reg proposals should also be posted on the Web page to be more transparent. Immerblum recounted that former Vice Chancellor John Clerx did a
very good job of moving proposals along the consultation process, in a time
when there were clear delineations between the roles of the Vice Chancellors.
Gauthier concluded the discussion by stating he and others would work further
on the draft consultation document.

7. Prerequisite policy flaws (Freitas): The proposed draft policy (based on Mira
Costa’s) had a provision that any student who challenged a prerequisite would
be enrolled into the class and then later excluded within five days if they lost the
challenge. City faculty were concerned the student would be automatically
enrolled and then might have to be unenrolled. It is not clear whether these
students would get a grade of “W” if they were unenrolled after the census date.
The plan is for this proposal to become an E-reg. Freitas also stated that the
challenge part in Board Rule 8605.10 didn’t make sense:

“Colleges shall enforce all conditions a student must meet to be enrolled in the
registration process so that a student shall not be permitted to enroll unless he
or she has met all requirements, except for those for which he or she has any
challenge.”

Freitas stated he didn’t recall whether Board Rule 8605 (Prerequisites, etc.) was
approved by the DAS in May; Gauthier replied he would check. Moore reported
Southwest was checking prerequisites after the third week of the semester,
which resulted in students getting dropped late and others not being able to
add. Freitas stated City faculty are not supportive of allowing students who
challenge a prerequisite to be enrolled automatically in the course. Foster
added as the District transitions to the new Student Information System (SIS)
and standardized prerequisites, this is going to be a nightmare for students and
Admissions and Records. Freitas suggested having a deadline for student
challenges several days before the semester starts to minimize this problem.

Echeverri, Moore, McMurray and others expressed their concern about the role
of the District Office in the upcoming 2016 Accreditation visit.

8. ASCCC Proposed Area C Draft Resolution: Immerblum discussed a document
he wrote titled “Area C Draft Resolution to Foster Statewide Consultation
Processes” with the following resolves:

“Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge
the Chancellor’s Office to align the state reporting documents and state
reporting deadlines be aligned with academic calendars; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge
the Chancellor’s Office to set as January 1 the deadline for submission of all
reports that require local senate approval and that specifically affect college
budget allotments.”
Several suggestions were made to the language. Immerblum thanked Freitas and others for their suggestions and stated the main idea behind the resolution is that the current timelines are not practical for proper vetting of critical documents through college governance structures. Immerblum would like to bring the draft resolution to the October DAS and Area C meetings.

Hanley/Oborn moved to bring the draft resolution to the October DAS and Area C meetings (MSU).

**Action Item**

1. **Agenda for DAS meeting at LAMC:** The following agenda items were discussed:
   - Area C Draft resolution
   - Board Rule 6200 noticed motion
   - Noticed motion for Course Outline of Record
   - DAS Resolution to the Board Recommending Three Areas for District-Wide Focus in Student Success Efforts

McMurray requested adding an additional focus area to the last item: **culturally responsive training**, which could involve both faculty and classified staff. She stated this was one of the four focus areas under SSSP. Freitas suggested listing them as priority areas for the senates. The DAS resolution for Student Success areas has the following resolves:

```
“Resolved, that the District Academic Senate, local senates including counseling and teaching faculty, CEOs and VPs of Academic Affairs and Student Services, work together to implement the following three four high-impact practices at all of our campuses: namely. First Year Experience programs, accelerated pathways in mathematics and English, and integrated tutoring with faculty and peer mentors, and culturally responsive training; and

Resolved that the Chancellor and the Board actively support and financially underwrite any gaps in the establishment of these four areas of focus, and the colleges curtail or eliminate critically assess and reevaluate programs that have not worked as expected or that remain efficacious for only small groups of students so that any savings could be applied to the aforementioned areas of focus.”
```

McMurray and Echeverri suggested the changes above. Immerblum expressed concern that the focus areas should be tied in with local educational planning documents and the resolution needs to urge alignment with all local college planning processes. Moore stated the First Year Experience has worked well at Southwest, but it is funded through a grant and will go away next year. Foster agreed with Moore, adding we have had conversations about these student achievement gaps for 10 years and argued it is time for the District to put some resources behind the efforts. Gauthier agreed that the District has the data and it is time put money into these programs. He asked DAS members for additional suggestions. Freitas will send Gauthier additional language on the equity plan.
Gauthier will add student equity language to the draft and will place it on the October DAS agenda as an urgent action item to see if we can get some agreement.

2. DAS Student Success and Articulation Officers resolutions: These items are also slated for the October meeting. Gauthier added a whereas at the top noting the 225,000 degrees and certificates that Chancellor Harris has set as a system target by 2024-25. There is also a chart showing that Pierce has fallen below Mission, Southwest, and Harbor. Gauthier distributed pages of the student equity plan and noted what they should look like.

Reports

First Vice President: Absent, no report.

Second Vice President: Absent, no report.

Treasurer’s Report: Immerblum reported that two colleges want to have their additional 0.2 reassigned time given to two people split as 0.1 x 2. Gauthier stated says this would violate the agreement to hire a teaching position. Immerblum stated he is working to get the assignments processed. The DAS still have the DAS 0.2 position that needs to be awarded.

President’s Report:

Summit Report: Gauthier thanked DAS members, campus teams, presenters, John Freitas and City College folks for doing such a great job. Chancellor Rodriguez’s presentation inspired many; he is passionate about student success and we want to support him.

Hiring Comments: Moore reported that DBC’s Executive Committee pressed Deputy Chancellor Barrera on the faculty hiring timelines. The Full Time Obligation Number (FON) is released in November and the hires are frequently completed late. The consensus was that while certain individuals have blamed the senates for holding up the prioritization process, in practice there are many other reasons for the hiring delays. Freitas stated that Article 33 stipulates the faculty hiring prioritization process has to be agreed upon by the local Senate, AFT and College President. Oborn added that Article 33 also stipulates that long-term substitutes need to go through the prioritization process, but this has not always been the case. Foster suggested having a January retreat to compare our local hiring policies and discuss other issues.

Credit for Life Experience (Prior Learning): Gauthier stated the District does not have a formal policy to award credit for life experience. Trade Tech has a grant and is coming up with a set of programs to give college credit for life experience. We need to think about the impact on the district and how it relates to Title 5. The Credit by Exam task group released a paper last spring; they are looking at practices for giving people credit more quickly when appropriate. All of our campuses give students 18 units of General Education credit for going through a police academy or being a veteran.
Other Items: Foster announced she was serving on the Community College of San Francisco restoration team. Milke asked about professional growth money. Gauthier replied each campus gets two sums of money; one is for professional conferences and another is for tuition reimbursement. He forwarded the amounts from the Educational Services Center a couple of weeks ago.

Adjourn: Meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm (Hanley/Oborn MSU).