District Academic Senate Meeting
Thursday, Dec. 10, 2015
LA City College, Student Union, 3rd Fl. Multipurpose Room
MINUTES

Attendance (see sign-in sheet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance (Local Senate President in parentheses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gauthier (President), Angela Echeverri (1st VP), Elizabeth Atondo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2nd VP), Vic Fusilero (Secretary), Alex Immerblum (Treasurer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dan Wanner), April Pavlik, Kamale Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alex Immerblum), Jeff Hernandez, Lurelean Gaines, Jean Stapleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Susan McMurray)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Leslie Milke), Curt Riesberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Anna Bruzzese), Blanca Adajian, Denise Robb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alistaire Callender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhae Ahn, Lourdes Brent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Josh Miller), LaVergne Rosow, Vic Fusilero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adrienne Foster), Helen Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Saslow (Pierce), Dr. Cynthia B. Worthen (Dean of Academic Affairs, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda: President Don Gauthier called the meeting to order at 1:32pm. The agenda was adopted as amended with no objections (Gaines/Pavlik MSC)

Approval of the Minutes: Milke/Gaines MSC. Abstentions: Gray

Public Speakers:
1. Lauren Saslow (Pierce), LACCD Librarian Discipline Committee, Presentation on SirsiDynix and BLUEcloud. Motion to approve upgrade to SirsiDynix and BLUEcloud as presented (Rosow/Bruzzese MSC).
2. Dr. Cynthia B. Worthen, Dean of Academic Affairs, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology (CSPP). (PowerPoint handout)

Action items:
1. Motion to approve Resolution to Recommend District-Wide Acceptance of Instructure/Canvas as District-Wide Learning Management System:
   “Whereas, the Distance Education Stakeholders Group and DAS concluded that a single Learning Management System was "feasible" across the District;
   Whereas, both faculty and students would benefit from using a single system with additional services not currently available in Etudes or Moodle;
Whereas, the colleges potentially could realize significant savings for traditional LMS functions in both hybrid and fully-online courses for all faculty;

Whereas, District colleges using Canvas LMS could participate in the CCC system-wide Course Exchange and other OEI state initiatives in support of our online programs and courses; and

Whereas, the colleges may continue to use an existing LMS as training and content transfer into Canvas proceeds and current contracts expire in the coming year or two;

Resolved, that the District Academic Senate support the move to Instructure/Canvas at a pace and along a timeline decided by each college;

Resolved, that all nine colleges begin discussion and negotiations with Instructure/Canvas and begin training all faculty in its use in anticipation of deployment.”

(Rosow/Immerblum MSC). Unanimous.

2. Resolution to Support DAS Version of E-65 / Next Steps:

Foster asked what the current process is. Gauthier answered that the resolution is DAS’s final offer. Immerblum asked if lines 44-66 are new. Atondo confirmed that lines 44-66 are a clearer interpretation of the original lines 66-131.

a) Motion to approve E-65 as amended: [secondary line numbers refer to numbering in amended E-65 document]

Title V, sections 55000-55202 provide the regulatory framework for course curriculum approval. Section 53200© defines the senate role in academic and professional matters, and explicitly lists ‘Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and implementation matters assigned to faculty in the Education code. However, curriculum doesn’t happen in a vacuum. Rather, courses and programs are crafted by faculty in the context of a college’s educational and strategic master plans as well as departmental goals, and shall reflect the demonstrated needs of students, faculty and the institution. Curriculum development is a collegial and collaborative process involving all college constituencies, as appropriate, because collectively each has a stake in ensuring that the college offers the curriculum that best serves the needs of its students. Faculty, as content experts, and academic administrators, with legal and compliance perspectives, work collaboratively through the process to ensure the highest quality outcome for the college and its students.

Discussions about the appropriateness of new courses or programs and whether or not they are congruent with existing college plans and goals shall be held well before the suggested curriculum goes to the local senate for approval. Administrators shall communicate any concerns to the faculty proposing courses or programs as early as possible in the process. In some cases, such discussions could lead to a re-evaluation of college or department plans through existing shared governance processes in place at the college.

Finally, there are multiple points during the curriculum process, as described in this policy, when all appropriate constituency groups have opportunities to make suggestions or offer their perspectives on the courses or programs under consideration.
No final review of courses and programs occurs beyond that of the local senate, as provided in existing District board rule (18104 A).

The following describes how the above-referenced regulations shall be carried out at the Los Angeles Community College District (District).

Step 6) District Board of Trustees (BOT) approval (for proposals type B and D only.)

a. Following the above steps, four signatures are required before the proposed courses are noticed for action “for adoption at any District college” on the next available BOT agenda. The four signatures include the Chancellor, the Deputy Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor of Educational Policy and Institutional Effectiveness and the District Academic Senate President.

b. If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to step 7.

c. If not approved, the proposal will be returned to the EPIE office who will inform the DAS President, DCC Chair, CIO, Academic Deans, local Senate President, CC Chair, and the college initiator.

b) Motion to approve resolution to approve amended language in E-65:

Resolution to Approve Amended Language in E-65

Whereas, the District Academic Senate through the consultative process has worked for the past two years to clarify the language and the curriculum process contained in E-65;

Whereas, the VPs of Academic Affairs have objected to the language proposed and continue to insist on a final approval of curriculum before it goes to the Board of Trustees;

Whereas, the justifications for such final approval offered by the VPAAs are not sufficient to convince the DAS of such a need, especially given the careful consideration of the collaborative and transparent curricular process and mutual respect for the roles of both faculty and administrators;

Whereas, “No legal requirement exists for administrative approvals of new courses and programs following curriculum committee approval and prior to submission to the governing board,”1 colleges around the state have policies in place whereby curriculum goes directly from the local senate to the Board for approval; and, Whereas, existing Board Rule 18104.A clearly establishes that the Board shall “rely primarily” on the Senate for “curriculum including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines” per Title 5, Sec. 53200 (c) under professional matters;

---

1 ASCCC, October, 2015. “Ensuring Effective and Efficient Curriculum Processes.”
Resolved, that the Board of Trustees and/or its designee adhere to faculty primacy in matters under Title V and the “10 + 1”;

Resolved, that the District Academic Senate approves the attached language in the preamble to E-65 along with a clarification of Step 6 naming all the signing parties before any proposed courses are sent to the Board for inclusion on the BOT agenda.

(Milke/Rosow MSC)

3. Spring 2016 Agenda:
Gauthier advised that agenda items will depend on the outcome of E-65. Consequently, he has asked for items to be sent to him. Gauthier announced the DAS Exec Retreat on Jan. 25th.

Old Business/Discussion:
1. DAS PDC Spring program: Courses offered include Education 205: Diversity in Education, by M.H. Smith at Southwest, Communication 385: Directed Studies, by Josh Miller at LAVC.
2. CCC Registry Day @ LAX Hilton: Jan. 30, 2016. Milke advised that this is DAS’s event so as many DAS members as possible should attend. Gauthier announced that a flyer would be coming out soon.
3. EEO Hiring Workshop: Gauthier announced that the EEO Hiring Workshop would be held at the end of January. Gauthier also reported discussions he had held with HR regarding problems with job descriptions that have multiple MQs. To this, Milke reported that Mission has had a few positions with multiple MQs, and these were approved. Immerblum expressed concern that the Chancellor was not impressed with the seriousness and complexity of the large number of future hires. Jeff Hernandez suggested asking District how much was the backlog on Notice of Intent to Fill Academic Positions (NOIs). Foster advised that faculty needed to take back its leadership position in faculty hiring and to move the hiring process and EEO selection forward.
3. Status of E-64: Gauthier reported that there was a hold on E-64.

New Business:
1. Hiring – Gauthier suggested increasing time for teaching demonstrations. Milke reported that faculty were receptive to a 15- to 20-minute teaching demonstration. Foster advised that we should not limit the interview process to one day, but rather, that we should take several days if necessary. Young agreed that two days were feasible, but if interviewing is pushed to April-May, it would be difficult for faculty to find extra time to commit to hiring. Jeff Hernandez suggested having applicants give guest lectures as part of their teaching demonstration.
2. Library Materials policy discussion: Gauthier would like DAS to examine the policy that currently prevents libraries from selling materials, from which proceeds return to the library.
3. Converting Professional Development Committee Task Force into Steering Committee: Gauthier declared his openness to discussions regarding converting the task force into a steering committee, but this would have to be acted on fairly soon. **Motion for DAS to approve the transition of the PDC Task Force into a PDC Steering Committee, which would establish mission, goals, and policy.** (Immerblum/Gauthier MSC). Unanimous.

4. Executive Committee: Gauthier reported that the Executive Committee would discuss moving their meeting to Thursday, Dec. 17 before DAS Consultation. **Motion to extend meeting by 15 minutes.** (Brent/McMurray MSC)

**Reports:**

1. President’s Report:
   a. SIS Presentation: Gauthier reported that Ciber advising should be up by Fall 2016. Training will go live by Fall 2016 (e.g. Mandatory PeopleSoft training will be 1-2 hours in Fall 2016).
   b. Board Meeting, Dec., 9, 2015: Gauthier reported that the board meeting went long; yet they spent too little time on important issues, e.g. district strategic policy. DAS members discussed the Board’s poor behavior (e.g. side discussions) at board meetings. Rosow suggested bringing up this issue to Chancellor. Gauthier will bring up poor running of BOT meetings to Chancellor.

2. First VP Report
   a. Reported on BOT meeting: Echeverri reported on grammatical errors in Board meeting documents and rudeness to local presidents during meetings.
   b. Equivalency Committee: Next meeting will be on Monday, Dec. 14, 2015. Equivalency Committee will discuss all computer-related disciplines. e.g. Computer sciences, Computer Tech, CAOT, and IT.
   c. Discipline Day: Gauthier announced that the District Discipline Day will be held on Feb. 26, 2016. Tentative location, LA City College.

3. Second VP Report

4. Treasurer’s Report:
   Immerblum reported that the current petty cash balance was $1,715.70, which reflects dues payment from eight colleges. Current DAS Fund 10059 balances as of 10/07/15 excluding non-teaching accounts 12100 and 141500:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated Certificated (Account 109100)</td>
<td>$9,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Clerical (Account 213100)</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified-Non-Instructional (Account 239200)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies (Account: 452100)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing (Account: 453100)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership (Account: 583100)</td>
<td>$5*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mileage (Account: 584100)  $3,500
Travel (Account: 586100)  $19,794
Other Expenses (Account: 58900)  $21,000
Equip. Expense (Account: 640100)  $2,000
Low Value Asset: Equipment (Account: 642300)  $2,000

TOTAL:  $71,077

*Indicates changes in specific accounts from previous DAS Treasurer’s Report

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 3:50pm. (Pavlik/Fusilero MSC)

Future dates
Project Match, Monday, Dec. 14, 2015, LA City College, 3rd Fl., 5:30-7:30pm
DAS - Chancellor’s Consultation, Thursday, Dec. 17, 2015, ESC Hearing Room, 2-3:30pm
DAS Exec – Thurs., Dec. 17, 2015, ESC Hearing Room, 10am-1pm
DAS Hiring Workshop, Jan. 29, 2016 @ ESC Board Room, 8:30am Register-12:30pm
CCC Registry, LAX Hilton, Jan. 30, 2016
Discipline Day, Feb. 26, 2016, tentative location, LA City College

Respectfully submitted by Vic Fusilero, DAS Secretary