District Academic Senate Meeting

Thursday, October 10th, 2013
Los Angeles Mission 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>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Call to order/Approval of Agenda: President Gauthier called the meeting to order at 1:40 pm and thanked Los Angeles Mission College members for hosting the meeting. Agenda was approved (Gaines/Rosow MSU).

2. Approval of May and September 2013 Minutes:
   Minutes of the May 9, 2013 DAS meeting were approved as amended (Freitas/Brent MSU).
   Minutes of the September 12, 2013 DAS meeting were approved with corrections (Gaines/Rosow MSU).

3. Public Speakers: None.

Action Items

4. Emergency Resolution in Support of Reading Discipline and Load: Gauthier explained that this emergency resolution was necessary because the union had filed a grievance over the fact that there are different loads for Reading faculty throughout the district. Gauthier stated that Freitas helped revise the language of the resolution. The resolution’s proposed resolves are below:

   Resolved, That the District Academic Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees the establishment of Reading as a Discipline in the Los Angeles Community College District whose faculty shall be required to meet minimum qualifications as set forth in the state “Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges” (p. 48); and

   Resolved, That the District Academic Senate support LACCD reading discipline faculty and the AFT in their negotiations to establish a 12-unit load that is comparable to the 12-unit load in other disciplines that teach reading, such as Developmental Communications or ESL.

Gauthier recounted that about 12 years ago a vice president at East, allowed the establishment of a reading discipline without following a formal process. For a number of years faculty taught reading classes under the English Department using state Minimum Qualifications (MQs), but without any official notification in the LACCD. Southwest later developed its own reading program modeled after the program at East. He reported
that the AFT was notified on Tuesday evening that the college presidents had withdrawn their objections to
the establishment of a reading discipline. However, it is still unclear whether they would agree to the 12-unit
load for the discipline. Gauthier explained that loads are usually not a senate issue, but when a discipline is
established the senate provides input into the process to determine adequate loads. Rosow asked whether
Course Outlines of Record (CORs) had been reviewed to determine the load. She added that some faculty
teach reading by itself, while others teach it integrated with writing, which might affect the discipline load.
Gauthier replied that these issues were considered and the argument for a 12-unit load was supported by
the fact that many reading faculty also use written assignments in their classes. Rosow questioned whether
English faculty were the most qualified to teach Reading. Beaulieu replied that Rosow brought up an
excellent point and stated this was analogous to English faculty (including himself) not being fully prepared
to teach lower level ESL (English as a Second Language) students.

Immerblum/Hernandez moved to split the two resolves (MSU). Immerblum contended that the two
proposed resolves addressed very different issues. He also objected to the notion that college president’s
would tell faculty what they could or could not teach. Freitas stated he did not understand how the process
of creating a new discipline worked, but state MQs could be used as a guideline. Gauthier replied that he has
been working with interim Chancellor Barrera and former Vice Chancellor of Human Resources Michael
Shanahan to formalize the LACCD process to establish a new discipline.

Mikle called for the question.

First Resolve was approved (Immerblum/Hernandez MSU).

Immerblum proposed an alternate second resolve, which was approved by East’s Senate as follows:

Resolved, That the District Academic Senate support LACCD reading discipline faculty and the AFT in
their negotiations to establish an appropriate unit load that includes nonteaching instructional
support.

Immerblum stated that reading is a new and burgeoning field. He added he would like to encourage colleges
to offer reading courses, but also consider using reading instructors as resources for other faculty. The
reason the resolve was worded this way was to be creative and consider the concept of a load in which
reading instructors also taught their fellow faculty. He added that he didn’t believe the people who are
making the load decision are fully considering the potential impact of a reading instructor on a campus.
Moore stated she was not comfortable having a discussion about a union issue such as load, because she has
battled constantly to keep the AFT from meddling into senate business on her campus. She added that at the
end of the day we should trust our AFT colleagues to make the best decision.

Beaulieu stated that the problem with the alternate resolution is that it makes no reference to 12 units.
Hernandez replied that if the DAS is going to make a recommendation on the load for one discipline, it
should do so for all disciplines. Beaulieu countered that normally the DAS should not specify discipline load,
but the union has asked for DAS input on this. Gauthier pointed out that the alternate resolution specifies
that nonteaching instructional support could be part of the load of reading faculty.

Brent/McMurray proposed amending the resolve proposed by Immerblum as follows:

Resolved, That the District Academic Senate support LACCD reading discipline faculty and the AFT in
their negotiations to establish an appropriate unit load that includes nonteaching instructional
support.

Immerblum spoke against Brent’s proposed amendment. He explained that when he crafted this resolve he
consulted with the English department chair; they wanted to include that reading instructors may do more
than teach reading classes to students. Immerblum stated that he did not want to take out the last clause and argued that nonteaching instructional support should be considered during the load negotiation.

Freitas/Beaulieu (MSU) proposed the substitute motion below to include the word “may” into the motion’s alternate second resolve proposed by Immerblum.

Resolved, That the District Academic Senate support LACCD reading discipline faculty and the AFT in their negotiations to establish an appropriate unit load that may includes nonteaching instructional support.

Substitute motion by Freitas/Beaulieu was approved (MSU).

Rosow/Beaulieu moved to insert “(as requested by the discipline faculty and the AFT)” after AFT into the substitute motion proposed by Freitas/Beaulieu and approved by the DAS. There was an extensive discussion about the history of AFT intrusion into senate matters throughout the District. Rosow stated she wanted it to be clear for the record that the AFT had requested help from the DAS on this matter.

Resolved, That the District Academic Senate support LACCD reading discipline faculty and the AFT (as requested by the discipline faculty and the AFT) in their negotiations to establish an appropriate unit load that may includes nonteaching instructional support.

Amended substitute motion by Rosow/Beaulieu was approved (MSP; 2 nays).

Amended resolution was approved (MSP).

Noticed Motions

Freitas asked to move the agenda vote on the amendment to E-65 first. There was no objection to his request.

5. To amend E-65 to remove DCC membership: Freitas stated an administrative regulation (E-reg) should not have any inclusion of DAS membership, because the chancellor would have to approve any changes to the language. The revised resolution states:

The composition of the Committee is as follows: stated in the District Academic Senate bylaws and may only be changed by approval of the District Academic Senate.

Freitas/Milke moved to approve the proposed revision to E-65. Hernandez asked whether there was urgency for this. Beaulieu replied there was not. The motion was noticed and the DAS will consider it for approval at its next meeting in December.

6. To adopt a revision of Article IX of DAS Bylaws-DCC representation: Freitas presented a draft revision to Article IX (Committees) of the DAS Bylaws. The proposed revision adds the following members to the DCC:

- The Second Vice President of the DAS
- One college articulation officer appointed by the DAS President (resource)
- One student appointed by the Student Affairs Committee (resource)
- One Vice President of Academic affairs (resource)

and removes the following member from the DCC membership:

- A faculty member representing the AFT

Freitas explained that the AFT contract does not require that the District Curriculum Committee (DCC) have a voting (or nonvoting) AFT member. The AFT does specify in its contract that local curriculum committees have one AFT representative. Furthermore, there never has been an AFT representative on the DCC. Pogoler
wondered whether the DAS would want to make this revision now since it could widen the ongoing rift between the AFT and the Senate. Hernandez stated that administrators commonly select articulation officers, who act as resources on DCC and questioned why the DAS president should appoint a college articulation officer member to DCC. Freitas replied he assumed articulation officers were faculty and therefore the DAS should appoint them. He argued that the DAS should make it clear that it controls the membership of its committees. Hernandez replied that he understood these points, but the Vice President of Academic Affairs would not be appointed by the DAS, which introduces a bit of inconsistency. Freitas replied the language does make clear that faculty are appointed by the DAS; administrators are another constituency group and are appointed by administrators. Rosow added that DCC holds publically noticed meetings; on one is being kept out. Beaulieu stated curriculum matters are a bedrock issues for the DAS. Clarity of responsibility is important; we get into trouble when we intrude in other areas. He added that the only weak argument that could be made against the proposed language would be if the AFT had this power before AB 1725; but even so it is clear that curriculum is a senate issue. Webber asked whether it would be reasonable to allow for an AFT representative as a resource. Adajian replied that her concern was that we have to be very careful about inviting the union into senate areas because it has created such chaos. Freitas noticed the revision to Article IX of the Bylaws for December.

7. To approve new discipline naming and load process: Gauthier introduced a draft for a New Discipline Process. Immerblum noted there was no mention in the process of how a proposed new discipline comes to the Curriculum Committee. He expressed concerns about steps 1, 5, and 8 and suggested tabling the item. Hernandez added that he felt uncomfortable putting forward something at DAS to the DCC, talking about Minimum Qualifications (MQs) based on content as it pertains to courses. Gauthier replied that the Equivalency Committee would weigh in as well. Freitas stated that steps 8, 9, and 10 should not be part of our process. Gauthier asked Immerblum to volunteer to help put the process together for December. Pogoler stated that in parliamentary terms it was clear this proposal would come back amended; he doesn’t feel it could be a noticed motion, but the topic could be placed on the next agenda. Rosow asked for clarification and questioned whether this proposal should be emanating from the DAS or the DCC. Gauthier and Atondo replied this is not DCC’s responsibility; it should come from the DAS Executive or Equivalency Committee. Gauthier asked for input and apologized for adding it to the agenda as a Noticed Motion. He asked faculty to take the draft back to their campuses for discussion and input.

Discussion Items
8. BR 8603 Developments: Gauthier reported that DAS revisions to BR 8603 were in limbo because the item was not placed on the latest Board agenda. He added that the process to place items on the Board agenda is not clear. Gauthier has been talking to Betsy Regalado to try to program SIS for the local colleges. Gauthier asked DAS members to send him the names of anyone who would like to participate in this process. Hernandez stated he was disconcerted that the SIS system could not accommodate the changes to BR 8603. His understanding was that the SIS could be modified to accommodate district needs; he argued we should not accept this reasoning. Gauthier replied that the software company charged for each modification to SIS and at this point there is a concerted effort to find an alternative solution. The cost to make the change is about $35,000-45,000 a year and more with upgrades. We have been hearing that other campuses have lost control of curriculum and shared governance processes when adopting software systems. Immerblum stated he did not understand why we couldn’t follow through with the Board. Pogoler stated someone needs to remind the General Counsel and Board of our rights; DAS matters should be a standing item on the Board agenda. Beaulieu maintained the DAS should be able to go to Barrera and get the item on the agenda; any chancellor has to be able to agendize. Freitas said not every senate has a standing spot on the agenda; this is part of our legal right under Title 5. This would allow us to present motions to the Board. However, the Board has designated the chancellor to deal with them, but we should still be able to put an item on the agenda. Other than stupidity, he doesn’t understand what is preventing this from happening.
9. Campus health and safety issues (Foster): Gauthier explained that Foster could not attend today's meeting, but would be present next time to talk about safety. McFall brought up the issue of student conflict resolution. Gauthier asked him to bring the issue to the next DAS Executive meeting. McMurray reported there was a brand new building at Harbor with no public address system. She stated that value engineering has resulted in a long list of safety problems. Gauthier replied he would bring this issue to the Bond Steering Committee.

Immerblum expressed his frustration over the Board approval process. Immerblum/Rosow (MSU) moved that the DAS President ask the Chancellor to put BR 8603 on the next Board of Trustees’ agenda.

Beaulieu replied that BR 8603 has been sticky because the issue does not fall clearly under the Senate’s 10+1 areas. He listed several factors that contributed to the delay including: a former vice chancellor who was erratic, deans of admission who were acting on their own, and an outgoing chancellor who did nothing. He added that now there is an interim chancellor; if she doesn’t get it done we will go to the Board. Additionally, we were told we could customize the SIS, but there is a lot of pressure not to do so. Gauthier reported that Regalado has been working very hard to fix the problems with SIS. Hernandez stated we are dealing with Senate function issues such as administrative barriers to putting items on the Board agenda. Hernandez suggested the absence of the DAS on the standing agenda is another problem. Freitas replied that Board Rule 18105 Section A specifies that recommendations to the Board usually go through the chancellor.

Reports

President’s report

A. Interim VC of Educational Programs Institutional Effectiveness (EPIE): Gauthier reported that the selection committee sent four finalists to the chancellor. Two of those individuals were sent to the Board, which interviewed the candidates yesterday. The interim vice chancellor will be in place until June 30.

B. Chancellor Hiring Report: Gauthier reported that there still aren’t many applications for the chancellor position. He explained that the Board is trying to work out a process in which there is no application, but a consideration of “interested candidates.” The justification is that many candidates are concerned about applying for such a high profile position. Pogoler asked what kind of leadership could be expected from a person who does not have the gumption to apply. Brent asked whether this “touchy feely” process to consider possible applicants is congruent with Board rules. Gauthier replied that there is no established hiring process for the chancellor; the Board’s position is that it gets to choose its only employee however it wants. He added that there are still only two faculty members on the selection committee. Trustee Moreno has asked where the faculty are and Gauthier replied they are busy doing SLOs. Beaulieu recounted that the last time the Board threatened to intrude on the chancellor selection panel, faculty threatened to walk out. He added that it is very disturbing to go from four faculty representatives to two on a selection committee of ten; we tried to get that fixed in many ways but never even got an answer. The Board is using an East Coast based search firm that seems to have a diminished sense of California shared governance. During the last search for a chancellor, there were over four dozen applicants and a good sizeable pool. It is startling that they have done so poorly this time around; the Board promised to have someone in place by last July. It makes no sense that we are not getting a good pool of applicants. Beaulieu stated that chancellors are very bright people and speculated that we may not be attracting strong candidates because the Board is extremely intimidating to them. Gauthier suggested DAS members take a Wednesday afternoon to come to a
Board meeting. In the past he has been appalled by the way the Board treated La Vista, although he probably deserved it. During the last selection process Barrera did not continue as interim chancellor because she planned to apply for the position. At the college level the distinction between interim and acting administrators has broken down; we used to have a policy that was consistent.

C. Professional Development College & Academic Integrity Task Forces: Gauthier announced there is state money to encourage professional development of college faculty in California. This also allows the senate to have more input on the type of training our faculty need. Guidelines are in the works on how to set up shared governance, a constitution, and deal with issues such as academic dishonesty.

D. DPAC Report and SG Council: Gauthier reported that Freitas, Gary Colombo, Deborah Harrington, and Maury Pearl met to talk about the progress that has been made and what needs to happen next. Members inquired whether DPAC is overseeing the Program Review of the District Office and contended we need to have faculty voice in the validation. Gauthier replied there is supposed to be a level of oversight by DPAC. Hernandez stated he was not sure how the validation processes occurred at the District Office and how the proper constituents were involved. Freitas asked whether we have a program review process for the District Office (DO) that has been approved by the senate. Beaulieu replied we did not and suggested this might be a charge of the District Budget Committee (DBC). He added that it would be problematic if DPAC were the only body in charge of program review for the District Office. There are very big questions of efficiency, including how payroll and other areas are working. Gauthier explained that the DO does not have the same accreditation standards as a college. Hernandez argued the DAS needs to have a voice in this process and provide input on requests from the District Office. The validation piece could take place at DPAC, but the committee is not set up for this. We need to zero in on how the District Office is meeting the LACCD strategic goals. Decisions about contracts, budget cuts, and staffing that are occurring at the district level are shortchanging colleges. This is the kind of thing that a validation process should be able to uncover and that would enable the DBC to weigh in on augmentation requests. Beaulieu announced that there is a grievance against the DAS because in 2010 we gave up a secretarial position to fund a second vice president. Three years later, the classified union has filed a grievance against Gauthier claiming we violated the contract, because every unit in the District Office has to have clerical help. However, Gauthier’s position is that the DAS is not a unit.

Rosow/Atondo moved to extend the meeting for 10 minutes

Gauthier reported that Patrick McCallum came to the District to talk about a variety of topics including the expansion of concurrent enrollment especially in CTE areas, career pathways, the new weighted student formula with disproportionate students in traditionally undeserved areas, STEM projects, the automatic apportionment backfill, and the Adult Education noncredit consortium. He added that the District might get about $2.5 million for planning grants. Gauthier reported there is a new statewide education bond to pay for some larger projects on our campuses and mentioned that East made the list this time around.

13. Past President’s Report

DBC Report: Beaulieu reported that the DBC Executive has not met for about three weeks. AFT President Joanne Wadell is joining the DBC Exec as an alternate member. The presidents of Southwest and Valley Colleges attended to request additional funds and they were rebuffed with a strongly negative response. The other important news is on HR equivalency; the auditors only identified four faculty who were teaching inappropriately. The District is facing at some fines, but it could have been much worse. Beaulieu added that the Equivalency Committee is reviewing 300 faculty files, but most violations are correctable. Gauthier reported that a few years ago the District lost $1.9 million in funding from the state because a number of faculty lacked proper MQs. Unfortunately, many adjunct faculty misrepresent their qualifications and it can lead to the loss of student credit for the course as well.
14. 2nd (Curriculum) Vice President Report

a. District Curriculum Committee Report: Atondo reported that DCC has a full agenda tomorrow. DCC is reviewing the current Course Outlines of Record (CORs) and comparing them to the required elements. DCC is also looking at Board Rules on General Education requirements. She stated she would forward Gauthier some of the information on the SIS conversion and issues that have come up during the Fit Gap meetings. The use of wait lists is probably one of the biggest upcoming issues. On October 18, DCC is organizing a Discipline Day, which is targeted toward the science disciplines. They are going to focus on differences in lab/lecture hours among campuses for courses. Atondo reported there are many new curriculum chairs and ECD is having a lot of technical issues and glitches, which has made their jobs more difficult. She is concerned about the integrity of ECD because it is homegrown and we may not be able to maintain the system. The articulation officers endorsed the adoption of Curricunet, which is used by the state and is more dependable and reliable. Webber mentioned that President Martinez asked her about some of the problems with ECD. Atondo reported that DCC is reviewing local General Education (GE) Plans A and B; there is no curricular logic to these plans and no one seems to know why we use them. Out of 67 California Community Colleges Districts, only six have more than one GE plan. Atondo reported that said Pierce lets students use the CSU and IGETC plans.

15. Treasurer’s Report

Immerblum reported that seven colleges have paid their dues, another one is in the process. He added that he moved money to pay a 3% increase in membership to the ASCCC. This year the ASCCC decided to increase our membership dues by 64%. The DAS Executive advised him to refuse and only pay the 3% increase, which is more money than was budgeted for this item.

16. Other Issues

Student Success: Webber reported that at the end of September a team from each college went to a statewide Student Success Act meeting in which a lot of clarification was provided on the new regulations. As a result, the college presidents and vice presidents had a follow-up meeting, along with District administrators including Kimble, Barrera, and Harrington. It was unfortunate that many faculty Student Success coordinators were not invited; however, the meeting was productive and a future meeting was scheduled. Webber encouraged senate presidents to have an implementation team or advisory committee on how to manage the implementation of the Student Success Act. On Tuesday the Student Success Advisory Council released a Request for Proposals for districtwide online orientation for the entire LACCD. McMurray advised DAS members to make sure they were working on their planning processes with the upcoming 2015 accreditation visits. Brent asked Webber to send out a written report of the Sacramento meeting. Webber replied that each member of the team received a flash drive with material and she would send the link.

Area C Meeting: Gauthier announced that Area C would meet at City College on October 19.

Other: Gauthier announced that Tom McFall was no longer a single man.

Adjourn: Pogoler/McFall moved to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.
Minutes submitted respectfully by DAS Secretary Angela Echeverri