District Academic Senate Meeting

Thursday, September 12th, 2013
Southwest College

MINUTES

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</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>

1. Call to order/Approval of Agenda: President Gauthier called the meeting to order at 1:41 pm. Agenda was approved (Rosow/Gaines MSP).

2. Approval of May 2013 Minutes: Minutes of the May 9, 2013 DAS meeting were approved with a few corrections (Immerblum/Hernandez MSP). Acting President Yasmin Delahoussaye welcomed the DAS to the Southwest campus.

3. Public Speakers: Kumar and Mata gave a presentation in which they discussed Electronic Content Management (ECM) systems. Students, faculty and administrators have to provide documents that are not digital. These documents need to be digitized, stored, organized, and protected properly. Mata stated that the goal is to acquire a single ECM system that can be shared throughout the district. He predicted that an ECM system would save each college about $100,000 per year. A request for proposals (RFP) is being drafted and a selection process will be developed to select a single platform. Tom McFall (LATTC) answered call for volunteers for faculty evaluators.

Action Items

4. BR 8603 Resolution from ELAC: Gauthier introduced the motion from ELAC, which states:

DAS recommends the immediate approval of the proposed revisions to 8603 with the exception of student athletes and international students and that all constituencies be allowed more time to fully vet the proposal to provide enrollment priority for student athletes and international students.

Beaulieu stated that the DAS has been discussing this issue since 2011. Freitas questioned whether other groups should get to revise a DAS recommendation to the Chancellor. Hernandez replied that other issues (such as priority registration for athletes & international students) do not counteract the DAS recommendation. Gauthier reported that according to Yasmin Delahoussaye, the programming to
implement the DAS recommendation is currently underway and should be in place for the spring of 2014.

Immerblum stated that East’s Academic Senate voted to approve the resolution above. They are concerned that there are a couple of groups that are asking for exceptions and others may do the same. Brent agreed it is a slippery slope and added that priority registration should remain statutory. Rosow moved to table the motion. Hernandez moved the motion forward, Beaulieu seconded. Pogoler stated the DAS needed the original motion.

Hernandez stated this resolution should have been vetted locally. A concern is that other groups will want to get on enrollment priority list. Morris stated that as an athletic counselor, he works with international students and athletes who are required by law to have a certain number of units. Webber stated that the consultation loop was not yet closed on this item; it was supposed to close on Friday. Freitas inquired what Webber meant when she stated that the consultation “closes” on Friday. Webber replied that every constituent group has a chance to say yes or no to proposed changes before they are placed on the Board agenda. She added that the Board rule will have to be reopened because it doesn’t identify what level everyone falls into. Gauthier replied BR 8603 does identify different groups (1, 2, 3, and 4) and this will have to be programmed for 2014. He added that it is not clear where international and athletes will fall, probably in a holder space between groups 2 and 3.

Gauthier explained that subsection B1 of BR 8603 stipulates that veterans, foster youth, active duty military personnel always are in the priority 1 group as required by statute. Beaulieu stated that what is being proposed is to move forward on BR 8603; the discussion on athletes and international students would take place later. The implementation was held up because the legal department wanted to review the changes and submit the proposed changes all at once. Freitas expressed concern that the DAS approved a Board Rule and now many groups are raising issues about it. Hernandez replied we have to discuss some kind of enrollment priority for international students and athletes; the proposed motion would allow for more time to determine the priority for these groups. We could remove the reference to these groups and give more time to vet the inclusion of these groups. Pogoler argued the resolution does not say what Hernandez claims. Immerblum stated he wanted to get back to Freitas’ concern. It is not the purview of the Student Success group or others to report on and weigh in on a DAS recommendation. We may want to strengthen the motion and direct the DAS President to put it on the Board agenda.

Milke/Foster called for question (MSU).

Draft resolution of Board Rule 8603 was approved unanimously.

Immerblum/Miller moved that the DAS President place the revision to BR 8603 on the next Board agenda (MSU).

Gauthier explained that this brings up another issue regarding the consultation process and our on-going frustration with both the pace and numerous ‘interventions’ by other constituencies. At one point in the past VC Dr. Delahoussaye suggested a process used at the state level. There is a first and second reading of proposed resolutions and Title 5 changes. All constituent groups have 45 days to come up with objections or changes, and then there is a final reading, after which the final resolution is voted on. Gauthier said it was his understanding that the other constituent groups need to have their say. Beaulieu replied the approval process is more complicated than that; other groups have a say, but equal to weight is not given to
all groups. He added that different positions have to be reconciled; sometimes administrators are pretty
good about this. The cabinet advises the chancellor, which is perfectly appropriate, but ot do not have the
same role as the Senate. Freitas stated he doesn’t understand the purpose of the second reading and is
concerned Dr. Delahoussaye wants to allow the majority of groups to sway the decision. Beaulieu stated
there must be a way to streamline senate input; these issues should be determined by mutual agreement.
The DAS should not be the only group weighing in on student athletes. Gauthier suggested that the Exec
form a small ad hoc group to discuss this further and bring it back to the full body for more discussion.

5. Draft ASCCC and AFT resolutions: Gauthier discussed two very similar resolutions regarding the ACCJC
(Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges): one from the AFT (American Federation of
Teachers by Carl Friedlander) and another from the ASCCC (Academic Senate of California Community
Colleges). He asked whether the DAS would like to approve one of these or write its own. Immerblum
replied he has not brought these resolutions to his local senate. Beaulieu recounted that the ASCCC went
from a period of very intense opposition to the ACCJC to a period of very close cooperation. He added that
the cooperation is incomplete and we need to give attention to problems. Now the union has taken the
lead and identified problems with the ACCJC. The DAS should have been echoing these concerns, without
taking it so far. The union has a very rear guard attitude; the DAS probably needs to take a more complex
position. We are pushing the ASCCC to be tougher with the ACCJC, without giving up the virtue of
cooperation with them, particularly the joint ACCJC-ASCCC Accreditation Institute. Freitas explained that
September 6 was the deadline to submit a third party statement about the ACCJC’s renewal of
authorization. The AFT and ASCCC requests would delay the ACCJC’s authorization for one year. Rosow
asked what we want out of these resolutions. Beaulieu replied we should discuss them; it may not be wise
to have an LACCD resolution independent of the ASCCC. Beaulieu mentioned Pierce’s FLEX Day in which
President Kathleen Burke and Don Sparks from the AFT talked about accreditation from very different
perspectives. Pogoler stated he liked the first two resolves and the DAS should approve these resolutions.
Gauthier asked that DAS members take this back to their respective campuses and obtain some feedback.
We can also think about developing our own resolution on the ACCJC.

Discussion Items

6. DAS Self Evaluation: Gauthier/Riesberg moved to table this item.

7. Faculty Advising Proposal: Reggie Morris, Chair of LACCD’s Counseling Discipline Committee, reported that
the Counseling chairs meet on a regular basis, usually monthly. Morris stated he has also met with
Gauthier and Beaulieu and has tried to be proactive with several issues affecting Counseling and Personal
Development. He explained that Discipline Committee members have developed a draft “Discipline
Mentoring/Advising Model.” Morris invited Brent, Young, and Webber to discuss the proposal. Webber
stated that the draft proposal had been presented to the Counseling Discipline Committee. Immerblum
replied that he had feedback on the proposal and added that implementation of this model would affect
all campuses and therefore the DAS should provide input as well. Webber asked Immerblum to send her
his comments and she would forward them to others on the committee. Foster inquired about the vetting
process for input from other constituents. Immerblum replied that this proposal would not come back to
the DAS for a vote. Young stated that a similar document was approved by the ASCCC at its Spring 2012
Plenary; this proposal uses the same guidelines. Beaulieu stated that the discussion on discipline advising has been going on for years, mainly in the context of student success. The main issue is how we can solve the problem of having a ratio of 2000 students to one counselor. When Gauthier and Beaulieu met with the Discipline Committee last year, counselors expressed concerns about being out of the loop and were worried that teaching faculty would be writing Student Educational Plan, as actually happened at Trade. Morris argued there should be a clear, vigorous program of teaching-faculty advising students and working as a team with counselors. He added that this model gives counselors some input in the discussion and would help prevent mishaps like the one at Trade. Milke and Beaulieu reported that LAMC has been very successful with its Discipline Advisor Program (DAP) and asked whether the proposal was coming to the body as an informational item. Hernandez stated that this proposal is more of a formalized process than they currently have at East, where advising is treated more as professional development. He expressed concerns about some of the requirements of the proposal, such as having faculty advisors keep a log and provide satisfaction surveys to students. Hernandez stated that this model relies on faculty to do the work of counselors and we cannot get around the fact that colleges need more counselors. He added that he felt the proposal would ramp up advising in a formalized way, instead of helping faculty and students be more successful. Freitas asked whether the proposal was intended to be adopted as a model or policy. Brent answered that the idea was that this would not be a “one size fits all” model. Instead it should be a framework with guidelines so that disciplines and counselors develop practices that work best at an individual college. She added that technology could now be used to track certain activities, such as student-advisor/counselor contacts, that will be related to funding.

Freitas expressed concern that the DAS might endorse this model and then a vice president of Academic Affairs would pressure faculty to follow it. Pogoler stated he was glad the proposal was only a model, because he felt the language prohibits him from giving non-discipline related advice to his students. Others expressed concern that the model is going to require a cumbersome and time-consuming process, which would take away the actual service to students. Gauthier explained that, when SB 1456 is in place in another year, colleges will be getting paid by these contacts and no longer by FTES (Full Time Equivalent Students) alone. Zimring-Towne stated that this is not a policy proposition and they are not asking the DAS to vote on this. There has been a lot of conversation over the years about how to use faculty advisors. For example, Pierce uses advisors, but the process is not formalized. This proposal is not prescriptive and is not intended to be arduous; it is simply meant to be a framework to provide guidelines in a meaningful form. Immerblum stated he appreciates this, but the document talks about a written process for use in the LACCD and therefore needs to have senate input. He also objected to the use of term “non-judgmentally” in the draft.

Morris stated he was pleasantly surprised by the discussion, because some of the feedback he has received before has not been this specific. He added that the draft is intended to prevent people from going beyond their boundaries. He stated that the Discipline Committee members don’t want other faculty to take on counseling jobs and/or give students incorrect advice on how to transfer. He added that advisors should provide information regarding programs, careers, and courses in their discipline. With SB1456 there will be money allocated for every student contact for orientation, assessment, and counseling. There is a lot of room for autonomy; some campuses use the SARS System to track these contacts. McFall expressed concern about noncredit faculty advising students and faculty advisors disseminating the wrong information. He added that students could hold the college liable if they received incorrect information
from an advisor. Hernandez stated he is very concerned that colleges will rely upon Discipline Advisors to meet the student success requirement. The first time he heard this was from former Vice Chancellor Delahoussaye last summer; the DAS has not taken a position on this issue. Hernandez added he is not sure this is the best use of college funds. Gauthier replied that the colleges, not faculty, would get paid for advising contacts. Gauthier announced that there would be a breakout entitled “Student Success: At the Intersection of Matriculation and Instruction,” at the DAS Summit on 9/20/13, that will address some of the issues related to changes brought about by the passage of SB 1456

8. **DAS By-Laws Discussion:** Tabled

9. **President’s Report**

   a. **Pierce Problems:** Gauthier reported that Pierce is going through a great deal of turmoil. Recently-elected Senate President John Zayac resigned over the summer and succession is being disputed between the first and second vice presidents. Gauthier described how a few words in the by-laws could lead to major problems. This wouldn’t have become a big issue if the union had not intruded and filed a grievance against Pierce President Burke over the succession. The campus AFT leadership’s behavior has been very disruptive to the normal functioning of the Pierce Senate. Gauthier, Beaulieu, and Freitas have lost a lot of time and sleep over this issue. Brent pointed out that the senate presence has not been consistent at AFT negotiations. Pogoler stated there was a recent appellate court decision in Orange County that affirmed that the Academic Senate exists independently from the college and added that a parliamentarian would have dealt with this in 15 minutes. Beaulieu stated that we must be fair to President Burke, who insists she is just offering advice directed by Camille Goulet and agreed the union should be ignored. The problem is the local senate had not thoroughly read their by-laws and outside parties are flaming the fires of dissent. Freitas stated that there was a dispute as to whether an email exchange is equivalent to an official resignation.

   b. **Chancellor Hiring Report:** Postponed

   c. **Summit September 20, 2013 at LAVC:** Gauthier stated that the Summit agenda and list of breakouts is included in today’s packet.

   d. **District News:** Gauthier discussed draft Board Rule 6702, *Grade Symbols and Definitions*, which proposes the creation of a new grade (FW) for students who fail to withdraw before the deadline. The proposed language states:

   
   **FW:** *Student has ceased participating in the course after the last day to withdraw from the course without having achieved a passing grade, and not received authorization to withdraw from the course under extenuating circumstances. The “FW” may not be used if a student has qualified for and been granted military withdrawal.*
Part of the reason for this change has to do with the fact that the state wants to tighten financial aid accountability requirements. If students take financial aid money and stop coming to class they will be forced to repay. An “FW” is different than an “F” because it indicates students failed because they stopped attending class and they would have to return any financial aid money received for the course. This explicitly exempts military personnel who may get reassigned in middle of semester. Gauthier asked DAS members to take this back to their campuses and solicit feedback on the proposal.

10. Past President’s Report-Equivalency: Beaulieu reported that the 600 faculty files under review are down to 300 right now. He reported that the outside auditors have pulled the files they requested for review.

11. DBC Report: Gauthier discussed a 5/24/2013 memo from former Chancellor Daniel La Vista titled *DBC recommendations on the Growth Funding Formula Changes*. The memo describes the new formula for growth funds received in 2013-14 and future years. The Board approved the formula, but Veres retained the right to reserve the first 10% for growth. There is not very much money, about $5 million for growth. According to the new formula, 80% of the growth money will be allocated by FTES (the usual way). Another 10% will be distributed based on each college’s share of the total LACCD underserved population. The final 10% will be distributed based on the State Model. The LACCD final budget has increased from $544 million in 2012-13 to $588 million in 2013-14.

12. Treasurer’s Report: Immerblum reported on the DAS petty cash balance. He announced he received dues from three campuses today and reminded others that their dues were required before any funds could be released for attending Plenary.

13. DCC report: Atondo announced there would be a Discipline Day meeting at the Educational Services Center (District Office) on October 18th from 9:00AM to noon. The District Curriculum Committee is meeting tomorrow.

14. Other Issues/Announcements: Gauthier thanked faculty Senate at City College for inviting him to their “Agents of Change” training. He said that this was an excellent model for training senate members and preparing folks for succession within the senate. Participants were given a series of scenarios and were asked to suggest remedies or solutions. Gauthier said there were plans underway to visit campuses with the Interim Chancellor in the coming months. He hoped to be able to meet with campus senates and other faculty leaders separately. He also suggested that the DAS should create some trainings as part of our regular DAS meetings to review faculty roles under the 10+1 and more mundane issues such as how to run a meeting and how to address issues with presidents and administrators. Many of the new DAS members have not been active during the “war years.” Gauthier recounted that Trustee Moreno recently wondered aloud where the faculty were when some of these important issues came up at a Board meeting and stated that in the old days, the faculty would be up in arms about the current state of affairs at the District.

Adjourn: Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.
Minutes submitted respectfully by DAS Secretary Angela Echeverri