District Academic Senate Meeting

Thursday, December 12th, 2013
East Los Angeles College

MINUTES

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Don Gauthier (President), David Beaulieu (1st Vice President), Elizabeth Atondo (2nd Vice President), Alex Immerblum (Treasurer), Angela Echeverri (Secretary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>John Freitas, Dana Cohen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Alex Immerblum, Jeff Hernandez, Jean Stapleton, Lurelean Gaines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>Susan McMurray, William Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Leslie Milke, Curt Riesberg, Madelline Hernandez, Mi Chong Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>Elizabeth Atondo, Janne Zimring-Towne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Allison Moore, Alistair Calleader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Lourdes Brent, Inhae Ahn, Tom McFall, Larry Pogoler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>La Vergne Rosow, Vic Fusilero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Adrienne Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
<td>Al Rios (East/Southgate), Eduardo Vegas (ASO-East), Joseph A. Sandoval (East-EOPS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Call to order/Approval of Agenda: President Gauthier called the meeting to order at 1:32 pm. Agenda was approved (Rosow/McMurray MSP).

2. Approval of October 10, 2013 Minutes:
   Minutes of the October 10, 2013 DAS meeting were approved with a few corrections (Foster/Brent MSU).

3. Public Speakers: None.

Action Items

4. DAS Position on Statement on Adoption of CurricUNET: Atondo discussed the new Student Information System (SIS). She and others met with IT Director Jorge Mata and wrote a paper to try to get the bond to fund CurricUNET, which is linked to the SIS. Mata advised them that if the Legal Department determined bond funds could not be used to pay for CurricUNET, they would need to make an argument to the Chancellor about why we need the software. She added that once SIS is implemented, the LACCD wouldn’t have any compatible curriculum software. Furthermore, the Electronic Curriculum Database (ECD) is fragile. Atondo stated that currently the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) and 70 California community colleges are using CurricUNET. Pogoler inquired about the cost of the program. Atondo replied that CurricUNET had negotiated a master agreement with the CCC Foundation for direct purchase of the software. Hernandez asked how ECD would be linked to Protocol and whether Peoplesoft had an alternative curriculum program. Atondo replied that Peoplesoft did not have curriculum software; SIS would be the scheduling system. Immerblum asked whether CurricUNET would have any implication in the enrollment management system; Atondo replied it would not. Freitas added that some of CurricUNET’s optional features include a program review module and Student Learning Outcome (SLO) tracking ability. Atondo explained that CurricUNET would have the curriculum management and articulation components off the shelf. The program review, SLO, report writing, and catalog modules can be added for more money.
Atondo clarified that they did not ask for the bond to pay for add-on modules. McMurray expressed concern about buying a bare bones program. The resolution following was considered:

“Resolved that the District Academic Senate (DAS) support the purchase and implementation of CurricUNET in the LACCD as a replacement for the current ECD system, and

Resolved, that the DAS urge the District move forward immediately with the procuremnt of CurriUNET.”

The resolution on CurricUNET was approved (Foster/Rosow MSU)

5. Motion to remove DCC membership from E-65: Atondo explained that Administrative Regulation E-65 contains an explicit list of District Curriculum Committee (DCC) members. The purpose of this resolution is to remove the DCC membership language from the administrative regulation. The resolution was modified as follows:

“Resolved that the Academic Senate request a change to the current E-65 that removes DCC membership composition from the language of Administrative Regulation E-65.”

The resolution on E-65 was approved as amended above (Immerblum/Rosow MSU)

6. Motion to exclude voting member status of AFT rep on DCC: Gauthier expressed concern that this resolution might send the wrong signal at this time, since there is a tradition of having AFT on DCC and the AFT has made recent overtures to collaborate with the DAS. Hernandez stated he supported the outcome of the resolution, but did not want adopt it today because the DAS should get the language on DCC’s membership composition out of E-65 first. Pogoler spoke against the resolution, stating that AFT members were also teachers. Brent stated that the AFT is mentioned in Rodda Act of 1975, which predates AB 1725 and establishes collective bargaining for California community colleges. Beaulieu agreed this was not the time to approve the resolution. He added we would be stuck with anything agreed to before 1975; however, since the DCC was not established until the 1990s, it should be separate from the local curriculum committees. He argued there is no history under the Rodda Act and the union has no legitimate business on DCC. Immerblum suggested in the future we should couch this in a positive light and ask the AFT representatives to serve as a resource, non-voting member.

Motion to postpone the resolution indefinitely. Webber-Immerblum MSP (3 opposed).

Discussion Items

7. Discipline Day Issues (levels below transfer, repeatability, standard course description, hours): Gauthier announced that the event would take place at Valley College on 2/28/14 starting at 8:00 am. Atondo explained that Discipline Day would be devoted to working on college-level course attributes that would become district-level attributes. These attributes include course descriptions, levels below transfer, repeatability, hours, and prerequisites. Atondo explained that some of the campuses break up the lecture and lab hours for science courses differently. She added that the data on hours of instruction would be going out to faculty soon. Campus articulation officers will be there to discuss the Course Identification
Numbering System (C-ID) and walk faculty through the process. Echeverri asked whether the same course prerequisites would have to be adopted districtwide. Atondo replied that the latest information is that prerequisites would remain local. However, she added that with C-ID we have pressure to adopt certain prerequisites and we need to have a broad discussion with the discipline faculty. If you have a transfer degree with C-ID courses, you have to submit your courses with the prerequisites and validate them. Pogoler stated we would need more than one Discipline Day to address all these issues. Gauthier replied they plan to have follow-up meetings with different groups as needed. Pogoler expressed concern that Information Technology (IT) is dictating curriculum decisions.

Pogoler asked whether we could use prerequisite validations done at another college. Atondo replied that we could not; Title 5 stipulates that prerequisite validation is a local process. Hernandez asked what happens when faculty cannot validate a prerequisite. Atondo replied with the example of C-ID Economics, which has a prerequisite of beginning algebra. Santa Monica College (SMC) performed a validation study for the course, which didn’t validate the algebra prerequisite. SMC submitted their data and asked how to proceed, but they have not received a response so far. Atondo stated we have to keep pressing for answers.

Immerblum asked who should attend Discipline Day. Atondo replied she hoped the District Discipline Committee chairs and most members attend. Freitas asked about content review for Math and English prerequisites. Atondo replied that content review can be done, but we do not have a clear policy. Previously, the only way you could do it was through a disproportionate impact study. Webber asked whether there is a certain timeframe after prerequisite implementation in which you have to do the study. Atondo replied she believed it was two years. Moore expressed concern about who would collect all this data. Gauthier stated it was important for faculty to hear this information from a number of different sources. Immerblum asked how close we were to accepting that we are moving toward districtwide curriculum. Atondo replied that C-ID dictates curriculum and prerequisites; there has been no transparency about who developed this. She stated she hoped faculty could drive the discussion about what makes the most sense for our students. She added there are some issues that hurt our students regarding transfer requirements and articulation. Immerblum asked what was the purpose of having a local curriculum committee if we move toward districtwide curriculum.

Rosow expressed concern over two issues: first we will have a top-down mandated curriculum (like the K-12 system), which is scary and unprofessional. Second, we are also being pressured to increase class size, which has a profound effect on our disciplines. Gauthier replied we have to figure out how to pay for offering more classes; it is not an easy process. He added there are certain parameters that are required for student success; we have to make a convincing argument that smaller classes help students.

8. **Course Outline of Record, Local A/B degrees, ADT progress**: Atondo reported that DCC is looking at the existing Course Outline of Record (COR) and its required elements. She stated that our current COR is cumbersome and bureaucratic. Immerblum opined that the current COR form is an improvement upon the previous version. He added that one missing area that he would like to address is the concept of self-reflective learning. Atondo replied that there are minimum requirements for the COR that are necessary for UC and CSU articulation, but the colleges have the option of including additional fields. She added that SLOs are not a required element of the COR, but many colleges include them in the COR or as an
addendum. However, many don’t believe this is a good practice because course SLOs should be updated more frequently than CORs. Atondo reported that some colleges have received C-ID rejections because of their SLOs; as a result including them in the CORs can be problematic for articulation. Freitas added that some departments list all activities, exams, and assignments in their CORs and argued departments should not be that prescriptive.

Local A/B Degree: Webber reported that DCC members are in the process of reviewing general education requirements for the associate degree to make sure we have a single General Education pattern.

ADT Progress: Gauthier reported that the Pierce Political Science faculty have committed to developing their ADT degree (they were the one holdout in the District). President Burke sent the Political Science faculty an e-mail that seemed like a directive asking them to explain to the Board why they were not adopting the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC).

9. BoT Move to Revamp Hiring with “Pilot”-BT4 Report from 12/11/13: Gauthier recalled he sent out information earlier on the Board’s pilot’s proposal to revamp the presidential selection process. At the December 11 Board meeting, both the AFT and DAS representatives objected to the proposed pilot and to how it was announced to the community. Freitas and Immerblum crafted letters detailing the importance of open transparent presidential hiring processes. McMurray also addressed the Board about the importance of the public forums to the community. Both the AFT and DAS letters are embedded in the Board minutes. The Trustees had a lot of explaining to do; Trustee Steve Veres claimed he simply wanted a venue to discuss the issue. The Board is going to meet the second week of January and should not vote on this item during the winter break. The DAS Executive is also meeting with interim Chancellor Barrera on Monday for consultation. It is not clear how the Board would collect applications and whether presidential candidates could apply to all three campuses under the pilot proposal. Moore stated that each college should have its own criteria; McMurray agreed stating all colleges have unique needs and constituents.

Immerblum stressed his main concern was that the Board was establishing insular ad hoc secretive committees, which meet and do not report to the full Board. Gauthier stated that Trustee Michael Eng publicly agreed that ad hoc committees should not be used to exclude people from the discussion. Immerblum/Rosow moved to approve a motion enjoining the DAS President write a letter to the Board asking it to follow the guidelines in the Community College League of California (CCLC) Trustee Handbook regarding the creation of ad hoc committees. The consensus of DAS members was that the Board should be open and transparent in its actions. Immerblum argued the resolution was a matter of urgency because the Board could vote to approve the pilot at its next meeting in January. He proposed the following resolution:

“Resolved that the DAS President be enjoined to write a letter to the LACCD Board of Trustees calling for them to be transparent and open in all of their actions.”

The above resolution was approved (Immerblum/Rosow MSU).

10. BR 8603 and Enrollment Management-Special Board Session 12/18/13: Gauthier announced that the Board would have a study session on 12/18/13 (from 1 to 3 pm) and encouraged faculty to attend. The colleges will give presentations on their current Enrollment Management (EM) efforts. He stated that
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campuses that don’t have an EM Committee need to consider establishing one; this will be very important next year, when SB 1456 (Student Success Act) goes into effect. Immerblum stated he hoped other colleges would support East’s position on BR 8603. He expressed concern that the Board would use the study session as an opportunity to support districtwide enrollment.

Gauthier and others met with Betsy Regalado and Bobbi Kimble to discuss three separate options of how the new SIS could set up enrollment. Immerblum explained that the first option presented would be to have college-based manual enrollment, which is not really practical in this day and age. The second option would be to have college-based enrollment with priority lists set up by an outside company (approximate cost $50,000). He added that this would do away with any concept of a districtwide enrollment, which is not what we are asking for. The third option would be having either college or district-based enrollment; colleges could switch back and forth (approximate cost $100,000). Regalado was emphatic that these were the only options available. Immerblum stressed that under this scenario we would never get what the DAS requested: to have a week or two for college-controlled enrollment, then open it up to District students, and then finally to outside students.

Atondo replied she received clarification that they can enroll the legally mandated groups first, then students from each college, followed by district students, and finally outside students. She was informed it would take approximately three weeks for each of the first three groups; a total of nine weeks. Zimring expressed concern that the nine-week period would be too lengthy because of matriculation mandates under SB 1456. She added colleges would have to matriculate students by February for classes that start in August. Brent stated there is no valid reason an outside company couldn’t set up college enrollment over a shorter time; perhaps they need to be informed of the SB1456 requirements and the needs of our students. She noted that the current aging DEC system is able to handle enrollment over a much shorter time period.

Jeff Hernandez stated that the College Effectiveness reports to the Board hinge on resource control and highlight efforts such first year experiences and careful enrollment management. He argued colleges would be best served by adhering to the existing Board Rule, which is college-based priority, and moving away from the current practice which is in violation of this rule. He argued colleges should push registration dates further back to allow for the assessment, counseling, and orientation that need to occur under the Student Success Act. Webber replied that the Chief Instructional Officers (CIOs) have objected to moving registration appointments back, because it is a challenge for enrollment management. She argued we should pass the Board Rule with the current DEC system in mind and address the new SIS issues later. She added it would be very difficult for colleges to comply with the new SB 1465 legislation in the absence of a Board rule. Pogoler questioned why the LACCD was paying millions of dollars for an SIS that could not handle the enrollment and curriculum needs of the colleges. He also questioned how colleges could effectively deliver non-classroom services when many students were receiving a fragmented education by attending multiple campuses. Rosow stated it was ludicrous that the SIS that has been purchased could not handle the colleges’ needs. Gauthier replied the SIS could be configured to handle them, but it would cost more money. Beaulieu expressed his concern about having both a technical discussion about the feasibility of local enrollment management, as well as a philosophical discussion on its merits because of the presidents’ opposition.

Gauthier encouraged DAS members to attend the next consultation meeting on the 18th of December.
Rosow /McMurray moved to extend the meeting for 10 minutes (MSU).

11. DAS Scheduling: Pogoler objected to the scheduling of the DAS meeting during finals week. He argued the DAS should avoid having meetings during the first and last two weeks of classes. Jeff Hernandez recommended this item be further discussed at DAS Exec to see if there are any alternatives for scheduling.

Reports

12. President’s Report

a. Pierce Problems, ASCCC Visit: Gauthier reported that Pierce continues to have problems. The ASCCC has visited the campus to provide technical assistance. Freitas has written an article about the issues that are embroiling Pierce; the paper version of the article is coming out this week in the Rostrum.

b. Chancellor Hiring Report: The chancellor selection committee interviewed candidates on Tuesday. They are still going through the hiring process; another meeting is scheduled for January 14.

c. District News (AFT-classified, Bond Steering): BSC continues to meet and discuss the elimination of Campus Project Managers (CPMs), the assumption of their duties by AECOM, and where the bond money is going. Beaulieu and Gauthier plan to write an article on the issue. Webber asked about savings that were not going back to the colleges. Gauthier replied it was not clear how the savings were being distributed.

Moore inquired about energy savings from solar energy panels going back to the Bond Program and not Program 100. She reported that Southwest saved about $280,000 in utility bills, which is a lot of money for the campus. Beaulieu replied the savings were going back to the colleges, but he was not sure to which fund. Gauthier and Beaulieu will follow up to get clarification.

13. Past President’s / 1st VP Report

a. Energy Oversight/Bond: Beaulieu announced the Energy Oversight Committee would meet in January. The main story is that AECOM is asserting itself to run the bond program in a very centralized manner. Beaulieu reported that Energy issues have been the focus of many of the centralization discussions. Jim O’Reilly wants to run the bond program and the Board wants to have a single responsible party. One of the trustees is alarmed about this; the others seem to prefer things this way. This is a dramatic step; the argument is that this will save money and that the CPMs were wasteful. At this point the savings are dubious; the E-7 program has been dismantled and there are no more student interns. McMurray reported that Harbor has two buildings with punch lists of over 5000 items; she is concerned they are going to run out of money. Beaulieu replied that AECOM would be responsible since they are running things. Pogoler inquired about the projected paybacks for each of the projects. Beaulieu replied that the amount was modest; Trade will have fewer savings because it did not build a power plant.

b. HR Vice-chancellor Selection: The new Vice Chancellor of Human Resources is Albert Roman; he came from Chula Vista and started a couple of weeks ago. This is the first time in four years someone permanent has been in the position. He will be working with the DAS on the Minimum Qualifications (MQs) issue.
c. **Distance Education:** There is a task force examining whether the District should adopt a single Learning Management System (LMS). They have met six times and plan to have a recommendation around March for the Technology Planning and Policy Committee (TPPC). They administered a faculty survey that generated 500 responses and are also conducting a student survey. They task force is developing a list of pros and cons to the adoption of a districtwide LMS. Beaulieu added that the state might develop its own recommendation, which would further complicate matters.

Gauthier mentioned that faculty would get a new LACCD e-mail account, but could also keep their old accounts. The new academic accounts give faculty access to all of the Microsoft software; the current accounts are administrative.

d. **DBC Report:** Beaulieu reported that after a three-hour presentation, DBC agreed to most of the 9-10 positions requested by the District Office, contingent on the money for the positions coming from the LACCD’s general reserve, which was an important concession. Board members Svonkin and others are not likely to favor this. In January the Board may or may not agree to those terms.

14. **Treasurer’s Report:**

Immerblum distributed a written Treasurer report dated 12/12/2013. The DAS petty cash balance is $1890.90, which will run out by the end of the year. Pierce has not paid its dues yet. The DAS is increasing its workload and asking for $8,000 more for the Sustainability Institute and 0.3 raises for COLAS. ASCCC membership dues are going up next year. Immerblum increased the mileage budget and is trying to raise the budget for travel and other expenses.

15. **SIS Report (Atondo/Webber):** Webber reported on the District’s progress on SB 1456. A series of recommendations were approved to identify tasks that need to be completed in order to move forward; one these is BR 8603. Colleges have already started accepting fall 2014 applications. Atondo and Webber will work with Kimble over the winter to develop draft language for the recommendations and collect data on student completion from the various score services.

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