District Academic Senate Exec Meeting

Friday, September 16, 2016
ESC Hearing Room, 1st Floor
MINUTES

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Senate Presidents:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Call to Order at 10:07 a.m.

Approval of Agenda as amended (Bruzzese/Fusilero MSC). Minutes from August 16, 2016 meeting approved as amended (Immerblum/Bruzzese MSC).

Public Speakers: None.

Action Items: None.

Old Business:

1. CBT/Intellus (discussion):
Gauthier reported that there will be a presentation on CBT/Intellus at the DAS Summit. Immerblum suggested that Atondo be the point person for discussion on CBT/Intellus. Discussion has been tabled until DAS has more information.

2. Summit Planning and Discipline Days:
Gauthier reported that planning is ongoing. Local Senate presidents should send list of attendees to Gauthier. Dec. 2 is 1st Discipline Day, focused on particular groups (e.g. Computer Science, CTE). Gauthier has sent out a save-the-date announcement encouraging people in those groups to attend.

3. Community College League of California (CCLC) Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Templates:
According to the ASCCC website, The CCLC Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Service is a free service that provides districts with a variety of documents and support services, the most notable of which are the Board Policy and Administrative Procedure
Templates, which are described by CCLC as information that is “legally required, legally advised, or suggested as good practice for boards and districts.” Subscribing districts receive an implementation handbook, semi-annual template updates, and access to an active listserv. Workshops as well as individual assistance are also available to subscribers to help with adapting and implementing local BPs and APs. This collection of services helps keep in-house legal costs down to a minimum.” Local college presidents have been talking about adopting these templates. Gauthier will forward information when it is obtained. Currently there is no one spearheading this move to adopt.

4. Enrollment Problems:
Gauthier reported that most colleges within the district have flat or declining enrollment. Efficiency is also down. Milke reported that students at Mission cannot go online to register for late-start classes, but rather they must go directly to the Admissions Office. Milke asked if this was a District decision. Gauthier will check on whether this inability to register online for late-start classes is a District matter.

5. LA College Promise:
Gauthier reported that District hopes that incoming students will already have dual enrollment classes and will already have financial aid in place (e.g. FAFSA). Because many teaching faculty involved in the program will be adjunct faculty, Gauthier hopes the best adjunct faculty will be involved in order to encourage enrollment. Gauthier reported on the LA College Promise kick-off: Although 600 people were invited, several people were turned away. Dan Wanner reported that he was left outside. Gauthier discussed with Joanne Waddell AFT’s concerns regarding LA College Promise, e.g. number of charter school students involved, books, transportation. El-Khoury asked who will really benefit from this program. Wanner asked if the Chancellor plans to have individual campuses set up their own local Promise programs. Gauthier has concerns that the program will be top-down and District-driven. Gauthier is still waiting for word on a steering committee. Milke said that Mission’s AFT rep has concerns about the program. Immerblum suggested that local colleges not wait for a directive from District to assemble local college teams to work on LA College Promise.

6. Rename DAS Online Education Committee to DAS Academic Technology Committee:
Bruzzese asked where this move to rename the committee had come from. Before Miller had met with Linda Delzeit, Gauthier had asked Delzeit to present at the DAS Exec in July. Gauthier reported that Miller had had a meeting with—among others, Linda Delzeit—regarding changing the name of the committee. Bruzzese asked for the people involved in that meeting. Gauthier had asked for names. Bruzzese asked if Josh’s meeting was an informal discussion about the Academic Technology Committee. Bruzzese had given Gauthier the name of Pierce’s Senate Distance Education Instructional Technology Committee (DEITC) Chair, who was not included. Milke reported that DE stakeholders had suggested changing the committee’s name, rather than forming a new committee. Milke reported that Delzeit had had a meeting with Mission’s DE people, who had previously said that taking on technology was too much, but were now saying that they felt that they could take on technology issues. It was
suggested that electronic badges were a large concern. Gauthier reported that District hoped to have a single point of contact for technology issues and a single committee to make sensible decisions on technology issues, rather than have nine separate college policies. Immerblum summed up the on-going discussion: A District-wide DE stakeholders group had formed a DAS Online Education Committee, which was concerned, not just with online education, but also with academic technology. Milke suggested that Miller report on his conversations and to wait for information before voting on this issue. [This issue had been originally planned as a motion, but because of its untimely announcement, it was moved to discussion]

7. Support Puente Program resolution from LATTC:
Tabled to next meeting.

New Business:

1. HR Audit and HR accreditation recommendations:
District HR had circulated a handout in response to accreditation. Milke suggested that DAS should propose an adjunct hiring policy, rather than District HR. Gauthier reported that HR’s initial proposal was a three-member panel (chair of department, someone from the discipline in question, and a union representative). Gauthier expressed concern about current abuses of departments with high numbers of adjunct faculty. Milke suggested that departmental chairs maintain their own hiring pools in order to be flexible in hiring faculty. Immerblum reported that Ventura’s community college district has a centralized policy, but they only have three campuses, whereas LACCD has nine campuses. Milke suggested sitting with District HR to come up with a policy better than the one described in their handout. Immerblum and Milke suggested that this District HR motion to the Board will not have Senate support. Milke suggested talking to Alberto Roman to stop this process because Senate would oppose the HR motion. Immerblum strongly urged that Senate have more input in this process. Gauthier noted that HR’s action plan timeline does not have anything taking place until December 2016.
Immerblum agreed that hiring guidelines needed to be cleaned up, but DAS needed to take charge of this issue. Gauthier asked for DAS Exec recommendations and concerns, which Gauthier would then send to Roman. Immerblum pointed out that District is not following shared governance guidelines. Immerblum urged that departmental chairs retain flexibility in hiring, cautioning that District HR would be unable to follow through on their own hiring suggestions in the handout. Immerblum suggested bringing together district-wide Chairs of Chairs on local campuses to get together to craft hiring policies. Gauthier reiterated that the centralized hiring pool used for hiring full-time faculty will—in HR’s suggested policy—be used for hiring part-time faculty. El-Khoury welcomed the idea of creating a centralized hiring pool for adjunct faculty. McMurray reported that there were already people in the hiring database who did not meet MQs. Gauthier will communicate all of the above concerns to Roman and Waddell. Immerblum reported that East has hired approximately 100 new probationary faculty over the last four years and expressed concerns that deans could not do their best work while serving on so many tenure review evaluation committees. Gauthier reported that the actual number of faculty that need to be evaluated on an annual basis was around 3800.
2. ITT Collapse:
Gauthier reported that there is now pressure on several campuses to take in ITT’s students. Some incoming students may apply for credit by exams.

3. LACC Rebased:
Wanner reported that LACC was rebased retroactive to 2015-2016, with a loss of 200 classes. Wanner asked about ECDBC’s role in this rebasing. Gauthier expressed shock because usually every attempt is made to avoid rebasing. McMurray reported that Harbor is going through cuts as well, cuts—especially in advanced courses—that were not made with division chairs. McMurray asked for suggestions on how to deal with future cuts.

4. Delay in Common Assessment from State:
Gauthier reported that there was a delay, which meant that either the District did not have to have assessments in place or that these assessments were too complicated to implement. Immerblum expressed concern with these common assessments and its reliance on students to self-place.

5. Discussion of scheduling of DAS events:
Bruzzese expressed concern that Pierce was being excluded regarding scheduling dates for Consultation and Exec Retreats. Bruzzese wondered why no one else had expressed concern about the quick change of dates, which led to the absence of a quorum for these meetings. Gauthier reported that the only date for the Exec retreat had been the week of August 26, 2016. McMurray said that DAS senators already have too many meetings. Gauthier said that people cancelled at the last minute. Bruzzese suggested that a meeting should not have been scheduled if there was not going to be a quorum. McMurray suggested looking at considering online participation in meetings. Gauthier expressed that his intent was not to exclude anyone because he too was interested in having everyone participate in order to have a quorum. Bruzzese expressed concern that Pierce’s absence might suggest that Pierce was not concerned with District business. Immerblum suggested that those presidents unable to attend should send representatives. Bruzzese expressed resentment that only Pierce was asked to send a representative. El-Khoury expressed faith that Gauthier did not intend to exclude anyone. Gauthier expressed frustration in trying to schedule Chancellor Consultations with little input from DAS senators on dates. Milke reported that she too is often unable to come and that she is unable to find a representative. Bruzzese suggested having Consultations on Mondays in one month, and on another day in another month. Milke suggested asking the Chancellor for another day. Gauthier reported that the Chancellor’s secretary is unable to find another day that is free for the Chancellor except Monday to schedule the Consultations. El-Khoury asked about the possibility to use CCIConfer for future DAS meetings. Bruzzese agreed that DAS senators had too many meetings.

6. New Subjects from Pierce sent to ESC Feb. to Apr. 2016: Bruzzese reported that viability studies were concluded before she came on board. Bruzzese urged that Pierce has issues with new subjects being unable to move forward on ESC, and she expressed concern that a new process was being used that had not been vetted. Gauthier said that
Reading was a new subject that was brought in and which had to be brought into the district. Immerblum clarified the issue by remarking that Reading was a discipline in the state, but not in the district. DAS worked with the District to get the E-115 and had met with an alternative arrangement. Bruzzese reported that she and Pierce felt that Gauthier was holding up the approval process. Gauthier replied that the process was delayed because related disciplines needed to respond to Pierce’s request for a new subject name.

Reports:

President’s Report: None.
First VP Report: Equivalency and Discipline Issues. None.
Second VP – Curriculum Report:
E-64 (Program Approval) Dan Keller reported that a draft of E-64 had been brought before DCC. According to the proposal, a college would approve a new program, after which it then goes to district and is noticed to the Board. Afterwards, the new program moves on for statewide approval. Each college defines its own process for approval.
Keller reported that the draft also included a set number of programs: pathways, degrees, certificates, basic skills programs. Furthermore, the draft puts forward four paths for how to approve programs: 1) introduce new programs; 2) changes that require CCCCO approval; 3) changes to program listing in SIS system; and 4) all others. Keller said that the draft reduced the original Title V language to two pages. There are only three steps: notice, vetting the challenge process. ADTs are legally required, and they cannot be challenged. CTE programs are posted, vetted, and approved by the Los Angeles Orange County Regional Consortium (LAOCRC), to make sure that they do not unduly challenge neighboring programs. Keller felt that it did not make sense to allow challenge to non-ADT and non-CTE programs. DCC removed the previous two-month challenge period, so that new programs could move directly from the colleges to the Board. Keller said that those concerned with E-65 would also have misgivings with E-64 and the absence of language delineating how administration could give its input. Keller is considering adding a line to the draft: “Each college shall determine how administration gives its input.” This draft will now go before the entire DAS.
Treasurer’s Report:
The Treasurer previously reported that we were $200,000 over budget. After further investigation, Immerblum reports only a $80,000 discrepancy.

Standing Committee Reports:
None

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Vic Fusilero, DAS Secretary