District Academic Senate Meeting
Thursday, March 9, 2017
Los Angeles Harbor College
MINUTES

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present (Senate Presidents in parentheses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gauthier (President), Angela Echeverri (1st VP), Vic Fusilero (Secretary), Alex Immerblum (Treasurer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dan Wanner), 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), William Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Leslie Milke), Thomas Folland, Mi Chong Park, Curt Riesberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Anna Bruzzese), Joe Perret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Naja El Khoury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhae Ahn, Lourdes Brent, Larry Pogoler, Martin Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVergne Rosow, Vic Fusilero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adrienne Foster), Allison Tom-Miura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda: President Don Gauthier called the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m. The agenda was adopted as amended with no objections (Rosow/Brent MSC). Rosow expressed gratitude for the lunch provided. McMurray said that the food came from Sacred Grounds.

Approval of the Minutes: (Immerblum/Rosow MSC). As edited.

Public Speakers: LAHC President Otto Lee welcomed the DAS to Los Angeles Harbor College. He encouraged the DAS to keep up its good work and to continue to advocate for their campuses in Sacramento. He also personally thanked Gauthier for all his work.

Action items

1. Emergency: Adjunct Hiring Policy.

Gauthier thanked the task force for their work on this adjunct hiring policy. Immerblum walked the senators through the draft document. Immerblum reported that the task force is awaiting language from HR for lines 8-9, 81 of the draft document. Immerblum reported that the only point of contention between DAS and District was that District wants the supervising dean to be a voting member, whereas the DAS task force wants the supervising dean to be non-voting. Immerblum reported from his conversation with the Chancellor on whether the supervising dean should (not) vote: The Chancellor noted that the deans have the liability responsibility; therefore, the deans should have a vote. The Chancellor conceded that deans would not serve as content experts, to which Immerblum responded with the question as to why the deans should then be given a vote. Immerblum also noted to the Chancellor that giving the deans a vote would overstep the accreditation recommendation. Immerblum also noted that adjunct hiring
differs from full-timer hiring. Pogoler suggested allowing the Chancellor to write a best practices document on how supervising deans can participate as non-voting members on adjunct hiring committees, but Pogoler supported not giving deans voting rights. Milke did note that, according to the draft policy, adjunct hiring committees can go forward even if invited deans do not come. Brent noted that liability is not the deans’ purview. J. Hernandez noted that DAS has given ground to District in drawing up the draft adjunct hiring policy. He suggests including a cover letter (see handout: “Transmittal of DAS Approved Adjunct Faculty Hiring Policy, March 9, 2017”). Perret asked for information against giving deans a vote? Gauthier suggested that this goes against the ACCJC recommendation. Both District and DAS are trying to implement a common adjunct hiring policy for all nine colleges in the district. Gauthier also noted that this is senate purview. Pogoler reported on situations in which deans have been retaliatory regarding hiring decisions. Brent has concerns about lines 8-9 of the draft hiring policy; Pogoler suggested changing lines 8-9 to read as follows: “Board policy about the LACCD commitment to diversity and equity will be inserted here.” DAS has voted NOT to give votes to deans in adjunct hiring committees.

**LACCD ADJUNCT HIRING GUIDE**

*District Academic Senate Recommendation Approved Unanimously on 3/9/2017*

*The Board Policy statement about the LACCD commitment to diversity and equity inserted here.*

**The Adjunct Pool**

The District’s established pool refers to a group of applications that have been submitted by applicants to the LACCD Part-Time (adjunct) Faculty Employment portal. The pool shall be considered for each part-time vacancy or possible future vacancy within a twelve month period and includes all currently and previously employed adjunct faculty (internal candidates) and all applicants who have never been employed as adjunct faculty by any college in the LACCD (external candidates). To be entered into the pool, all applicants meet Minimum Qualifications or the equivalent for the discipline in which they are seeking to teach and must have submitted a complete adjunct application. Part of the application will include a check box so faculty can indicate if they are already working in the District and another check box so faculty can indicate the college or colleges at which they would consider working.

An adequate pool is one that contains three or more candidates who meet Minimum Qualifications or the equivalent. The LACCD Human Resources Department (HR) shall keep applications from all candidates on file for a minimum of one year and will annually notify all candidates to request an update of their information should they wish to remain in the pool. Department chairs will be granted access to the pool on an as-needed basis. Adjunct faculty who are already-employed at one or more colleges in the District may be hired at another college within the District without going through an interview, although it is recommended that such an interview is conducted.

**The Selection Committee**
A selection committee must form when applicants new to the District are considered for an assignment. This ensures that more than one faculty member takes part in the interview process to select new faculty members. The division or department chair or his/her designee serves as the committee chair and selects at least one additional faculty member in the discipline to serve. If no other faculty in the discipline at the college are available to serve on the committee, then the chair of the committee may take the following progressive steps to fill the committee vacancy: (1) seek out a colleague in the discipline from another campus in the district, (2) a colleague on campus in a related discipline, or (3) a colleague in the discipline from a college outside the district.

Committee members must be contract or regular faculty full time. The supervising dean of the department shall be invited to attend the adjunct selection committee meetings as a non-voting member, but the absence of the dean shall not prevent the selection process from moving forward.

It is strongly recommended that an EEO representative, possibly from the same department, be present as a non-voting member. Furthermore, all committee members must have participated in EEO hiring committee training or EEO rep training within the previous three years. Other faculty members may be added to the committee as non-voting resources with the approval of the committee chair. The composition of the selection committee is reported to the supervising dean. All members of the committee will review the applications and transcripts for appropriate minimum qualifications.

Note: Equivalency determinations will not be conducted for the selection of adjunct faculty.

**The Committee Chair Responsibilities:**

1. Guides the selection committee through the adjunct faculty hiring procedure according to the guidelines as presented in this document.

2. Facilitates committee discussions.

3. Facilitates the review of applications for minimum qualifications.

4. Leads committee dialog about handling of incomplete applications, paying special attention to equivalency, and the handling of extraneous application materials that were not specifically requested.

5. Coordinates the screening process, schedules committee meetings, manages the logistics of the process (rooms, times, dates), and facilitates the development of questions and demonstration topics.

6. Informs the appropriate administrator of the committee’s decision to send a candidate’s name forward so that HR can confirm the candidate meets MQs.

7. When HR confirms the MQs have been met, contacts the top candidate to inform him/her of the committee’s decision to offer him/her an assignment and sets up an
orientation meeting with the candidate.

8. Via emails, informs remaining interviewees of the decision.

9. Performs all other committee duties as outlined in the “Selection Committee Members’ Responsibilities” section below.

---

The Selection Committee Members’ Responsibilities:

1. Work in partnership with the other participants throughout the process and at its conclusion to reinforce the importance of confidentiality, fairness, understanding individual biases, eliminating unlawful bias, equal employment opportunity, and respect and sensitivity to all cultures, language groups, genders, and other protected classes under the law. (HR will provide more appropriate language here.)

2. Sign confidentiality agreement for selection committee members and comply with its guidelines.

3. Screen applications and participate in the process to select interviewees.

4. Attend all interviews, rate interviewees, and participate in dialog to select the top candidate.

5. Act as agents of the District and obey all laws and regulations related to hiring processes.

6. Observe and monitor the interview/selection process for compliance with district hiring procedures and equal opportunity laws to provide a fair and impartial process.

7. Alert the chair and vice president of any concerns regarding confidentiality, bias, or fairness.

---

Prior to the Interview

The committee is not required to review incomplete applications. The committee shall review and rate complete applications using a rating form developed by the committee. The size and complexity of the rating form shall depend on the number of applications and the discretion of the committee. A minimum rating form that consists of rating categories for sensitivity to diversity and the overall quality of the applicant is available from HR. More complex rating forms could identify categories for work experience, education, training, experience working with diverse groups, etc. The committee shall meet as a group to discuss the candidates’ qualifications. The discussion shall be strictly
confined to each candidate’s qualifications and serves to ensure that no candidate is
overlooked by committee members who may have missed important qualifications of a
candidate during their individual review. The committee will invite the number of
candidates that ensures the most qualified group of applicants is interviewed. There is no
minimum or maximum number of candidates who must be invited to interview. When
deciding who to interview, the committee shall err on the side of inclusiveness.

**Interviews**

The committee chair shall invite selected applicants for an interview. The same questions
must be asked of each applicant, and each applicant must be rated on the same criteria.
HR, the supervising dean, or the committee chair may provide a list of example questions
that serve as a starting point for committees to develop their own questions to ask each
interviewee. Follow up questions that serve to clarify responses or probe further into
answers are encouraged. Each committee member shall individually rate candidate
responses to each of the interview questions.

Teaching positions may require a teaching demonstration during the interview process.
Committees for non-teaching positions may decide to require a demonstration showing
how the applicant would provide appropriate services such as a counseling session.
Instructions for the demonstration shall be given to the applicant at the time he/she is
invited to interview. The instructions should specify the topic to be taught or service to be
provided, the kinds of student who will be the intended audience, and the kinds of
technology that are available. If a demonstration is conducted, each committee member
shall rate the demonstration as part of the evaluation.

**Reference Checks**

The committee chair or designee or supervising dean is strongly encouraged to conduct
reference checks, including former employers. Reference checks shall be limited to
position-related criteria.

**Finalizing the Selection**

The committee considers all of the information it has collected and then selects a finalist.
The supervising dean and committee chair will fill out LACCD Form HR R-130N and
submit it to the local campus personnel office who will forward it to HR after final
approval by the vice president. Once form HR R-130N has been submitted along with
official transcripts to HR and the candidate is cleared, the candidate may visit the local
campus personnel office to fill out additional paperwork.

At the completion of the process, all of the committee’s paperwork, including paper
screening forms and interview rating forms, are turned in to the supervising dean and
kept on file.

**Emergency Hire Procedures**

In the event that, as determined by the committee, there are no district applicants or
there is an inadequate pool, or no suitable candidate has been found within the pool, or if
the vacancy and subsequent need to hire a new adjunct faculty member is the result of an
emergency (i.e. loss of instructor, added course section, etc.), and the time to conduct
formal interviews/find a suitable candidate is prohibitive, a department chair can use
her/his best judgment to hire the best available candidate. The department chair will
need to consult with the supervising dean to ensure that the candidate meets the minimum
qualifications for the position prior to making a job offer. District HR will subsequently
verify the candidate does meet MQs.

(Immerblum/Gaines MSC). Unanimous.

Motion to accept J. Hernandez’ Transmittal Letter (mentioned above) to accompany
the adjunct hiring policy (Immerblum/Pogoler MSC). Pogoler suggested that once the
changes are made to the adjunct hiring policy, the final adjunct hiring policy can be sent
to all nine senate presidents. Immerblum reported that the effective date should be
immediately, once it has been passed by the Board. Gauthier will also ask Vice President
Roman for a breakdown in hiring with regard to diversity, which VP Roman has
previously promised. DAS applauds the work of Immerblum and the task force in
producing this draft adjunct hiring policy.

2. E-64 Program Approval
Milke noted that the document for approval has cleaned up previous language. Gauthier
noted that this document also went through consultation.
(Milke/Immerblum MSC). As amended. Unanimous.

3. Bylaws changes - PDC
Brent noted changes in the makeup of the meeting quorum. Bruzzese expressed
concern that the language expressed that only three of the college liaisons needed to be
present to make a quorum. Foster said that if the PDC is only a steering committee, then
it is not subject to Brown Act requirements. Pogoler noted that the quorum
requirements for the Senate is 50%; the steering committee can determine its own
quorum requirements. Pogoler suggested that we could decrease the number of officers
in order to lower the quorum requirements. Perret: If people don’t show up to
meetings, then the committee members need to ask themselves the reason for this.
McMurray: There is a problem in physically getting to meetings; there is not a problem
in content. Tom-Miura: Moves to amend that the membership of the PDC Steering
Committee be reduced to include: PDC Coordinator, 2nd VP (or designee), and liaisons
(1 from each of the 9 colleges) [for a quorum requirement of 6 members] (Tom-
Miura/Bruzzese MSC). Amendment to the motion: Nays: Brent, Rosow, J. Hernandez. J.
Hernandez: Reported that he will vote against the motion. Brent reminded the senators
that the original PDC Bylaws had already been approved by the DAS, but the PDC Bylaws
were unworkable for various reasons. Gauthier commended Brent on her work on the
PDC. Echeverri asked for flexibility suggesting that liaisons might send designees. Milke
pointed out that the work of the PDC demands heavy work from the DAS Exec, and that
Brent is carrying the brunt of the work of the PDC. (Vote on the original document as amended: J. Hernandez moved to amend the definition of meeting quorum as: “... at least three of the nine college liaisons (or alternate).” Rosow expressed concern that alternates may not know the current status of the work and thus the committee would be less effective. J. Hernandez took Rosow’s point and added that we should not be creating barriers for the PDC to do its work. Bruzzese expressed concern that alternates may not be allowed. Pogoler added that DAS is not allowed to have electronic meetings (according to Brown Act). He agreed with Rosow’s point that the committee may be less effective with alternates, but he would still accept a less effective committee than a paralyzed committee. Immerblum suggested supporting this burgeoning committee with liaisons (or alternates).

**Revision to Bylaws**

**District Academic Senate**

**Recommendation from DAS Professional Development College Steering Committee**

**Article X**

**Subsection 5. Professional Development College (PDC) Steering Committee.**

The Professional Development College (PDC) Steering Committee shall be composed of the following:

- **PDC Coordinator** – selected by the DAS Executive Committee (Committee chair);
- **DAS 2nd Vice President/designee**;
- **Liaisons** – 1 representative (or alternate) from each of the 9 colleges chosen by each college’s Senate.

The DAS PDC Steering Committee will oversee the DAS Professional Development College (PDC), which is designed to improve and/or develop competencies of current and future community college instructors. The DAS PDC Steering Committee shall be responsible for forwarding recommendations to the DAS regarding the scope and direction of the PDC; with the PDC Coordinator, providing status reports to DAS; coordinating the design and implementation of PDC curriculum and monitoring course offerings; with the DAS Treasurer, overseeing budget needs/requests; and promoting and representing the PDC at appropriate venues.

The DAS Professional College Steering Committee reports to the District Academic Senate.

(Rosow/Gaines MSC). Abstention: Bruzzese.

**Old Business/Discussion**

1. **District Consultation Process E-XX**

Gauthier reported that this process originated with Vice Chancellor Cornner and other District officers. Part of this document came from DAS; the other part came from Chancellor’s Directive 70. Pogoler expressed concern that the flowcharts describe parity between groups on the same level within the charts. J. Hernandez appreciated the bidirectional arrows in the first flowchart. Gauthier noted that the Conference Committee was an ad-hoc committee formed when agreement cannot be reached and covered operational matters, e.g. bond steering. J. Hernandez suggested adding definitions that explain what is covered under operational issues. Pogoler asked where
local senates fit here. Gauthier answered that these flowcharts only cover district-wide
issues. Gauthier said that this document is only a first-pass (e.g. a first draft), and
suggests that the senators look at this document. Gauthier called for volunteers to work
on this document.

2. Election Committee Report and Attendance/Verification of eligible voters
Bruzzese asked if there would be a meeting where senators could ask candidates
questions. Gauthier noted that in the past there were never official meetings; instead,
we simply solicited candidates and their statements, which were then circulated. Milke
suggested organizing a forum in which candidates could be asked questions. Immerblum
did not remember any such forum in the past. Bruzzese asked that Fusilero’s list of
eligible voters be sent to all senators. Rosow suggested a grooming process for
candidates as people move up through offices. Pogoler noted that San Luis Obispo
College has incoming officer take a year to shadow current officers, and the remaining
three years were then fully functional. Pogoler asked that candidates be solicited at the
current meeting. Bruzzese reported that nominations for all four DAS offices are now
open. Nominations should be sent to Miller.

Motion to extend meeting by 10 minutes (Foster/Brent MSC).

Gauthier said that one limitation of the Brown Act with regard to Consultations is that it
reduced the informal nature. Bruzzese noted that transparency works in the favor of
DAS. District will always bring all their people to the meeting, but DAS will always have
fewer members present. Gauthier noted that policy is not made at Consultations, which
Bruzzese countered. J. Hernandez suggested that having additional formal meetings was
important, but we also need informal consultations. At local college consultations, we
also have a few members attend. Nothing gets decided at Consultations, but discussed
items are followed-up in local senate meetings. Bruzzese reported that Pierce feels left
out at Consultations. McMurray asked for patience with the current way in which
Consultations are conducted. Brent reminded the members that this item was not an
action item, but rather old business and only warranted a report. Brent asked that the
agenda be moved forward. Gauthier will bring back this topic for discussion. Milke
suggested alternating Consultations: one meeting being informal with just the
Chancellor; the next meeting with the Chancellor and others from his office. Immerblum
agreed with Milke’s suggestion that a meeting with just the Chancellor would be very
helpful. Immerblum suggested moving this topic to DAS Exec.

New Business
1. Gauthier announced a district task force has been formed that will present workshops
called “Know Your Rights” (Mar. 24, LA Trade Tech; Apr. 28, ELAC; May 19, LA Mission
College; June 23, LATT; all 10 a.m.-12 p.m.). The workshops will address policies,
services, and programs impacting our undocumented and DACA students.

Reports
1. President’s Report
   a. Bond Steering: Gauthier reported on discussions on the timeline for the CC-Bond and the rehiring of a possible new construction firm. Immerblum reported that discussion also covered criteria for how to spend bond money will be discussed. Pogoler asked for less waste on the new bond project. McMurray reported that District has said that Harbor is overbuilt. Gauthier noted that there is $130 million left in Prop J.
   b. DW-IT Project: Centered on servers, especially after the ransomware incident at LAVC.
   c. TPPC: Gauthier has met with District Technology Committee.
   d. Adult Ed: An Adult Ed dean has been hired at District.
   e. ECDBC/DBC: Next DBC meeting is on Wed., Mar. 15.

2. First VP Report
   a. Equivalency Committee: Mar. 13: The previous proposal from Pierce is being discussed.
   b. Discipline Day: Went very well. OER, Multiple Measures, Adult Ed were all covered. Board Meeting: students reported a false alarm at ELAC and demanded action from the Board; the students want policies in place for faculty. Immerblum thanked Echeverri for her work on Discipline Day. McMurray reported on a document circulated by Puente on the LAHC campus for how to deal with ICE authorities if they should come onto campus. Gauthier asked McMurray to send this document out to senators. Pogoler said that faculty on a public campus do not have the right to ask for a warrant; federal authorities have an untrammeled right to come onto campuses.

3. Second VP Report
   b. Digital Badges. No report.


5. Standing Committee Reports
   a. PDC: Brent will send info about March classes. They are late start. The first day is March 17. Faculty members are currently experiencing problems that students are also having.
   b. Academic Technology Committee. No report.

Other Items: None.

Noticed for Next Meeting
1. E-79
2. BR 6200
3. BR 6700

Future Dates:
DAS, Thursday, March 9, 2017 @ LAHC 12:30-3:30 p.m.
Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Vic Fusilero, DAS Secretary