



Discipline List Process Spring 2013

Joseph Bielanski,
Berkeley City College

Kevin Bontenbal,
Cuesta College

Michelle Grimes-Hillman,
Standards, Equity, Access,
Practices Committee Chair



The Academic Senate conducts the formal review of the Disciplines List, which establishes the minimum qualifications for the faculty of California community colleges. This review occurs in a two-year cycle.

This breakout will consist of a discussion about future changes to the list and to brainstorm ideas for improving the process and communication between discipline experts and the Senate.



Review the Process

- Enclosure 1—Discipline List Proposal Process: This document provides you with a guide to the discipline review process.
- Enclosure 2—Discipline List Review Timeline: This timeline provides information about key deadlines. Please pay attention to the hearing dates, as each proposal must be heard in at least one hearing.
- Enclosure 3—Revisions to the Discipline List Form: This form is used to submit revisions.
- Discipline List Summery Report: Updated after every hearing (included SEAP recommendations as well as Executive Committee Recommendations).
- Conditions of DL changes – Paper Update/Handbook

DISCIPLINE LIST PROPOSAL PROCESS

How Changes Are Proposed?

There are two avenues for proposing changes: 1) through a local or district academic senate or 2) through a recognized organization*. Although the process for new proposals remains the same, a procedure for resubmissions has been added. For more detailed information about the process, we highly suggest you review the document “Disciplines List Review Process”, which can be accessed on our website at: [http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Minimum_Qualifications_Handbook_for_2012-2014_\(MB2\)_020212.pdf](http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Minimum_Qualifications_Handbook_for_2012-2014_(MB2)_020212.pdf).

Each proposed change should be accompanied by a rationale and must have as its basis at least one of the following criteria:

1. changes within the profession or discipline
2. clarification or elimination of confusion and ambiguity
3. inclusion of new degrees
4. continual use of the equivalency process to hire under a specific discipline
5. assurance of the maximum degree of flexibility for the discipline while maintaining discipline integrity
6. other reason, as fully detailed and justified in the proposal

Should reasons for not submitting a proposal also be listed in this document? Anything else?

It is the responsibility of the initiator to include pertinent information concerning the proposed change. Failure to include a coherent rationale for the proposed change is grounds for rejection of the proposal.

New proposed changes may be submitted:

1. Through the local/district senate

- a. Any faculty member may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List.
- b. Local academic senates should engage in discussion regarding the proposals among its faculty.
- c. Local academic senates must approve any/all recommendations before forwarding them to the Academic Senate Office. This local senate president must sign the Discipline List Revision Form.

2. Through a recognized discipline or professional organization

- a. Any member of the organization may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List.
- b. The organization should hold hearings or engage in discussion regarding the proposals among its members.
- c. The governing body of the organization must approve any/all recommendations before forwarding them to the Academic Senate Office. The president of the organization must sign the Discipline List Revision Form.

*Recognized organization: an organization that is registered at the Chancellor’s Office as representing a specific discipline, or a regional, state, national, or international organization with a formally adopted constitution or by-laws.

Previously proposed changes that were not adopted at a plenary session, may be resubmitted:

Only if

1. a new justification and rationale are provided, *AND*
2. the Discipline List Revision Form is submitted to the Senate Office by the final deadline – September 30, 2012.
3. a resolution is passed at an Area meeting (prior to the second hearing in November 2012) to include the proposed change in the review and approval process, *OR*

4. through the regular resolution process at 2012 Fall Plenary Session, where the mover must seek approval at the Session to include the proposed change in the review and approval process.

The practice has been that a re-submission must be substantially different from the original proposal. However, this requirement is not specified in this document. Should this still continue to be the practice?

Is it acceptable for an original proposal (without changes) to be re-submitted due to significant lapse of time? If so, how much time should that be?

Example: Statistics

If a proposal can be re-submitted based on lapse of time, what additional information should also be provided?

DISCIPLINE REVIEW PROCESS
2012 - 2014 Timeline

| Month/Year | Process |
|---------------|---|
| February 2012 | <p>Distribution of Process to the field. The Senate Office sends requests for proposals to local senate presidents, college presidents, chief instructional officers, curriculum chairs, personnel officers, and discipline professional organizations informing them of the opportunity to propose a change to the Disciplines List. The material contains information on the process and a timeline for submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rostrum announcement and description of process • Website posting of announcement and description of process <p style="color: red;">Is the Rostrum and Website sufficient for getting the word out about the process? There could be times when these announcements don't happen.</p> <p style="color: red;">Are there other ways we should communicate the process?</p> <p style="color: red;">Should there be Discipline List training for EXEC, SEAP, and potential authors? If so, when would be the best time to have this training (between Aug - Jan), and how should the training be conducted (in person, CCC Confer, Webinar, online tutorials, other)?</p> |

| Month/Year | Process |
|-------------------|---|
| <p>March 2012</p> | <p>Submission of Proposals. Proposals may be submitted to the Senate Office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through Local Senates: Any faculty member may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List. The local senate must approve and forward any such proposals, with the signature of the local senate president to acknowledge local senate support, to the Senate Office. • Through a recognized discipline or professional organization: Any member of an organization that represents a discipline or profession may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List. The members of the organization should discuss proposals. The governing body of the organization must approve the recommendation. The organization’s president must sign the Disciplines List Change Proposal Form. <p>Discipline process is reinforced through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions at Area Meetings • Breakout Discussion at Spring Plenary • Update in <i>Rostrum</i> on the process • Other ways? • Training Webinar? <p>Initial review BEGINS when proposals are received and continues <u>until September 30, 2012.</u> The Standards & Practices Committee performs an initial review of proposals using the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information on the proposal is complete and accurate. • The proposal does not exceed the scope of the Disciplines List review process. • This proposal has not previously been considered and rejected by the plenary session or, if it has, it is supported by a new rationale. • The proposal is not being submitted to deal with a district-specific problem that does not apply broadly. <p>Revising Proposals with Problems. Standards & Practices Committee will contact the maker of the proposal to help resolve the problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to proposals are allowed at this stage of the process. • If problems are resolved to the satisfaction of the Committee, the proposal will be considered. <p>The maker may withdraw a proposal.</p> <p style="color: red;">Should a proposal be “rejected” if condition of need is NOT met?</p> <p style="color: red;">Should there be an earlier submission date (e.g. September 30) so makers can revise prior to the first hearing?</p> <p style="color: red;">Should there be a sub-committee of EXEC/SEAP that handles just the Disciplines List?</p> <p style="color: red;">How do we ensure continuity in the process? More Exec members? 2-year appointments for SEAP? Other ways?</p> |

| Month/Year | Process |
|------------|--|
| April 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process reinforced at Area Meetings. • Prepare <i>Rostrum</i> Article on proposals and process. • The Standards & Practices Committee will prepare summary document to be included in the mailings for the Area Meetings. Summary will not include recommendations from the Executive Committee but instead provide information to the field on the proposals received and to be discussed at the Spring Plenary Session. <p style="color: red;">Is reinforcement of the process at Area meetings enough? Does it happen at your Area? What else could be done?</p> <p style="color: red;">Is a Rostrum article enough? What if this doesn't happen? What else could be done?</p> <p style="color: red;">Should the summary include information about whether the condition of need has been met?</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <p>April 19, 2012</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spring Plenary Session—<u>First Hearing</u> on process and any proposals received. All testimony is collected. <i>[Note: At a minimum proposals must be vetted at one of the statewide hearings]</i> <p>Should the maker be required to attend one or all hearings (or send a designee)?</p> <p>Why is the first hearing before the due date? Is this a first hearing or preliminary hearing?</p> |
| <p>September/ October 2012</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second and final call for proposals this cycle. • Senates and organizations can submit new proposals or revise proposals already submitted that were found to have problems. • The summary document will be distributed and include all proposals (new and updated). Any testimony information will be included in the summary. Discussed at Area Meetings. Should this summary include information about whether the condition of need has been met? • Any interested party may submit written comments to the Committee, via the Senate Office. • Standards & Practices Committee will update summary document with any new proposals, which will be included in the mailing for the Area Meetings. The summary will not include recommendations from the Executive Committee but instead provide information to the field on the proposals received and to be discussed at the 2012 Fall Plenary Session. <p>Should the summary include comments from EXEC?</p> <p>After the final date, should EXEC/SEAP be allowed to “reject” (not move forward to second hearing if condition of need is not met)?</p> |
| <p>September 30, 2012</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new proposals will be accepted beyond September 30th because there’s no other opportunity for publication and hearing beyond the November 11th date. All proposals submitted beyond the September date will be held over to the next Discipline Review cycle. |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| November 8, 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fall Plenary Session—<u>Second Hearing</u> on process and any proposals received. All testimony is collected. <i>[Note: At a minimum proposals must be vetted at one of the statewide hearings]</i>• Prepare <i>Rostrum</i> Article on proposals and process Again, is this sufficient? <p>After second hearing, should there be follow up by EXEC/SEAP or a Disciplines List Task Force?</p> <p>Should the maker be responsible to respond to hearing testimony?</p> <p>How should the testimony from hearings be collected and communicated to the maker(s)?</p> <p>How should pro and con information be disseminated to the field?</p> |
|-------------------------|---|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>January /February 2013</p> | <p>Submission to Executive Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Standards & Practices Committee presents the proposals and associated testimony to the Senate Executive Committee. • The Committee also presents its recommendations (to advance to Spring Plenary or to reject) along with the rationale for those recommendations and any other comments that may assist the Executive Committee in its deliberations. • The Senate Executive Committee considers each proposal and either forwards the proposal for consideration by the body at plenary session or rejects it. • If the Executive Committee rejects a proposal, anyone may still bring the proposal forward to plenary session by introducing a resolution “to reconsider” the proposed change at any of the Area meetings or at the plenary session. • If the Executive Committee rejects a proposal and the author does not bring it forward to the plenary session for reconsideration, the proposal may be reintroduced at a later date. <p>What does/should “reject” mean?</p> <p>Does “reject” mean - resolve not to send forward to BOG? Or does “reject” mean it goes back to the maker(s).</p> <p>Should EXEC/SEAP have the authority to “reject?” Who should?</p> <p>What should be the criteria for “rejection” by EXEC?</p> <p>What should not be considered by EXEC/SEAP as a condition for rejection?</p> <p>What is the responsibility of the maker to a rejection recommendation?</p> <p>Implications of a double negative resolution.</p> <p>Implications of a positive resolution.</p> <p>How can failed resolutions be tracked over time?</p> <p>Should EXEC determine if the condition of need was met or not?</p> |
| <p>March 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary document with Executive Committee positions will be included in the mailings for the Area meetings. • Discussion at Area Meeting – Does this happen? Is it enough? • <i>Rostrum</i> Article (summary of additional proposals) – Does this happen? Is it enough? |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| April 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spring Plenary Session—<u>Third Hearing</u> on process and any proposals received. All testimony is collected. <i>[Note: At a minimum proposals must be vetted at one of the statewide hearings]</i> • Delegates vote on Discipline Changes • No changes may be made to the proposal, even by amendment during plenary session, and proposals may not be withdrawn. [This is because no changes can be made when the field has not had an opportunity to comment on them.] |
| May/June 2013 | <p>Consultation with CIOs, CEOs, and COFO (bargaining units). Informal consultation with personnel officers. This is done through an item on the Consultation Council agenda. Council members comment on the process, not the recommendations.</p> <p style="color: red;">Where does the information go?</p> |
| July 2013 | <p>Submit proposal to BOG (First reading): Each proposal adopted by the Senate is forwarded to the Board of Governors as a recommendation. The Board of Governors considers the recommendations of the Senate and formally acts on them. To date, the Board of Governors has accepted all recommendations of the Senate.</p> |
| September 2013 | BOG (Second Reading) |
| October - January | Should there be EXEC, SEAP, and Field training? |
| February 2014 | Restart process for new cycle. |