

APRIL 2018

Senate Rostrum

A person with dark hair, wearing a dark jacket, is shown from the side, speaking into a microphone. Their right hand is raised in a gesture. The background is a stylized, white line-art cityscape with various building shapes and windows, set against a solid orange background with a faint grid pattern.

Honoring Student Voice:

Ensuring Students' Effective Participation in Governance

A New Fully Online California Community College? **p3**

Building a New Road: Faculty Participation on Peer Review Teams for Accreditation **p5**

APPRENTICESHIPS AND THE FACULTY PURVIEW **p8**

UPDATES ON DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS (DACA) EFFORTS **p11**

THE IMPORTANCE OF MAJOR PREPARATION **p13**

FACULTY HIRING PROCESSES **p15**

BUT WE ALREADY DO THAT! WHAT'S NEW ABOUT GUIDED PATHWAYS? **p17**

METRIC FATIGUE **p19**

AND MORE ...

Honoring Student Voice: Ensuring Students' Effective Participation in Governance

by Julie Bruno, President

Students are, and should be, the primary and central motivation for our work as educators. Everything we do, from academics and instruction, to support services, is focused on the success of students. Most, if not all, of the initiatives and programs California community colleges have developed in the past few years have a clearly defined purpose in serving students. Programs such as Extended Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS), Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS), the Puente Project, and Umoja have served our students well for years, as have more recently instituted programs and initiatives such as the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), Student Equity Planning, the Foster Youth Success Initiative, and Veterans Services. When one adds to that mix the guided pathways frameworks and college promise programs that our colleges are designing and implementing, our strong commitment to the success of our students is without question.

Critical to the success of any effort to improve student success is ensuring that the student perspective is honored, embraced, and valued. We may too easily fall into thinking that we know what our students want or need to be successful in college. As educators, we interact daily with students, formally in the classroom and our offices, as well as informally when we see students around campus: relaxing in the quad, having coffee at the café, or studying in the library. As we spend significant time with students, we might come to believe that we know them well. Consequently, and with all good intentions, we might make assumptions about what would be good for them based on our perceptions and our certainty in our ability to anticipate their needs or wishes. Unfortunately, assumptions can lead to faulty and flawed decisions. When the urge to assume strikes, we are often wise to check ourselves, step back, and seek out the student voice.

Our governance system in the California community colleges is designed to ensure that all perspectives are represented when we engage in decision-making at our colleges. When discussing effective participation

in governance in the California community colleges, administrators, classified staff, and faculty are usually aware of the role that the academic senates hold in governance at both the local and state levels. Less familiar is the role of students and student senates. Just as statute and regulation define the role of faculty and the academic senate, so too is the role of students and the student senate defined in regards to effective participation in governance at the local and state level.

PARTICIPATION MATTERS

EDUCATION CODE

In establishing effective college governance, participation matters. State law and regulation are clear that all campus groups are to be provided the opportunity to participate in college governance. Education Code §70901 and §70902 requires the Board of Governors to establish “minimum standards” and local governing boards shall “establish procedures not inconsistent” with those standards to ensure faculty, staff, and students the right to participate effectively in district and college governance, the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level, to ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration, and the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.

Further, Education Code §76060 provides the opportunity for the governing board to authorize the students of a college to form a student association, most commonly referred to as the student senate or student association.

TITLE 5

The Board of Governors codifies the implementation of Education Code through Title 5 regulations. Just as Title 5 recognizes the role of faculty and the primacy of academic senates and requires collegial consultation regarding academic and professional matters, it also recognizes the role of the student senates and students

in college governance and requires governing boards to provide the opportunity for students to participate in decision-making processes.

Title 5 §51023.7 identifies the associate student organization as the representative body of students to offer recommendations and opinions and requires that “students shall be provided an opportunity to participate in the formulation and development of policies and procedures that have a significant effect on students. This right includes the opportunity to participate in processes that involve jointly developing recommendations.” The regulations also state that the recommendations and positions developed by the students shall be given every reasonable consideration.

In this same section, the policies and procedures that may have a significant effect on student are defined as follows:

1. grading policies;
2. codes of student conduct;
3. academic disciplinary policies;
4. curriculum development;
5. courses or programs which should be initiated or discontinued;
6. processes for institutional planning and budget development;
7. standards and polices regarding student preparation and success;
8. student services planning and development;
9. student fees within the authority of the district to adopt; and
10. any other district and college policy, procedure or related matter that the district governing board determines will have a significant effect on students.

Clearly, many of the student “9+1” overlap with the academic senate areas of purview in the 10+1. The fundamental difference within the college governance is in the definition of “consult collegially” so that the governing board must either rely primarily on the advice or judgment of the academic senate or reach mutual agreement between the governing board and the academic senate, whereas the students must have the opportunity to participate in governance matters that affect them. Despite this difference, Education Code and Title 5 establish a clearly defined and important role for students in college governance.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS STANDING ORDERS

Participation by the Student Senate for California Community Colleges in system-wide governance is outlined in the Board of Governors’ Standing Orders¹. Consultation with the Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Governors is described in Chapter 3, Article 3 of the Standing Orders. Article 3 specifically calls out the roles of the Boards of Trustees, the Chief Executive Officers, the Academic Senate, and the Student Senate as well as defining of Consultation Council. Section 333 recognizes the representative role of the Student Senate by declaring the following:

The Board of Governors recognizes the Student Senate as the representative of community college students in conjunction with the associated student organizations in the Consultation Process and before the Board of Governors and Chancellor’s Office.

As such, the Student Senate has a clearly defined role in the consultation process at the system level to ensure that their elected officials represent the voices of students throughout the system.

IMPLICATIONS

Our established governance processes offer an excellent mechanism through which students may be heard and included in both local—and system-level decision-making processes. Designed to ensure that the various constituency groups are represented, our governance structure is well designed for thoughtful engagement. However, as local and statewide leaders have a responsibility to ensure that the promise of collegial consultation and effective participation is realized, we cannot ask students to let us know when they have something to say; rather, we must seek out and honor their voice throughout our processes.

If we are truly committed to the success of our students, then we must seek their guidance in providing what they need to meet their educational goals. Trusting our governance processes to work through the issues at hand, including the implementation of guided pathways, AB 705, and college promise programs, as well as other present and future efforts, will ensure the success of our current and future students in all their academic and career endeavors. 🐦

1 *The Board of Governors Standing Orders may be found on the Chancellor’s Office website at: <http://extranet.cccco.edu/SystemOperations/BoardofGovernors/ProceduresStandingOrders.aspx>*

A New Fully Online California Community College?

by Cheryl Aschenbach, ASCCC North Representative

Last fall, in response to a request from Governor Brown, Chancellor Oakley put together the Flexible Learning Options for Workers (FLOW) workgroup to “develop a plan to provide three to five options that enable the community colleges of California to better deliver on student success goals”¹. In practice, the workgroup was really asked to provide feedback on proposals presented by consultants from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) based on existing fully online institutions like Western Governors University (WGU) and Arizona State University Online (ASU Online) rather than develop its own recommendations. At the ASCCC 2017 Fall Plenary Session, delegates took action to support the idea of innovation and expansion of online education, but supported leveraging the efforts of existing colleges and the Online Education Initiative (OEI) rather than development of a new, separate online college.

Most of the elements highlighted in the NCHEMS proposals and in presentations by leaders from Western Governors University Nevada and ASU Online to the FLOW workgroup were present in the budget trailer bill language² that accompanied the Governor’s Proposed Budget in January 2018³. Whether the Governor’s proposal for the California Online Community College District comes to fruition or not, senate leaders should be aware of what the proposal entails and give thought to ways to address some of the elements at their own colleges and within the California community college system.

Overall, five elements of the proposed online community college are of particular interest because of their relation to current practices and senate purview under the 10+1:

- Target population;
- Short-term, on-demand competency-based course offerings to meet student need immediately and shorten time to completion;
- Sub-associate degree certificates and credentials to assist students with workplace promotion;
- “Unbundling” of the traditional faculty role; and
- Proposed governance structure.

TARGET POPULATION

The target population for the proposed fully online college is the 2.5 million working adults aged 25-34 who have a high school diploma but no college certificate or degree, although they may have completed some college courses. This population tends to be lower income and are predominantly underrepresented minorities. According to information on the CCC Online Community College website⁴, these Californians are not able to access traditional higher education because of work, family obligations, transportation limitations, and the cost of education. Further, they are expected to rely primarily on their cell phones for their education, so courses would need to be developed in formats optimized for mobile devices. The analysis provided in the Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review Overview of the Governor’s Proposal to Create an Online Community College⁵ suggests that individuals in this population

1 FLOW Workgroup, <http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/ForCollegeLeadership/FlexLearningOptionsforWorkers.aspx>

2 Trailer Bill Language, Education: California Online Community College, http://www.dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer_Bill_Language/documents/CaliforniaOnlineCommunityCollege.pdf

3 Governor’s Budget Summary – 2018-19, page 44, <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2018-19/pdf/BudgetSummary/HigherEducation.pdf>

4 CCC Online Community College, <http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/FullyOnlineCommunityCollege.aspx>

5 Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review Overview of the Governor’s Proposal to Create an Online Community College, February 8, 2018, <http://sbud.senate.ca.gov/sites/sbud.senate.ca.gov/files/FullC/02082018SBFRHearingAgenda.pdf>

“seek educational assistance outside of California or through for-profit institutions, paying tens of thousands of dollars but too often just ending up buried in debt.” To meet the needs of this working population, the online college is proposed to have a Career Technical Education (CTE) focus.

FLEXIBLE, ON-DEMAND COMPETENCY-BASED EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

The interest of the Governor and the Chancellor, consistent with the Vision for Success, is to have students complete courses quickly to benefit both the student and employers. One way is to offer courses in more flexible, self-paced formats which the student can access immediately upon demand rather than having to wait for traditional semester or quarter start dates. The courses can also be taken at the student’s pace rather than be structured with defined start and end dates. Rather than pay the current \$46 fee for each unit, use of a to-be-determined subscription-based fee is proposed to incentivize completion of as many courses in a given time period as possible. To further speed student time to completion, all instruction is proposed to be competency-based, meaning that a student can skip instructional modules while earning credit for them if the student meets the identified outcomes via targeted assessments at the beginning.

SUB-ASSOCIATE DEGREE CERTIFICATES AND CREDENTIALS

Despite confusion about intentions expressed in different venues and documents, in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chancellor Oakley asserted that the focus of the online community college would be on micro-credentialing, including badging and industry-supported certification, but not on associate degrees. However, trailer bill language does state that the online college “shall leverage existing and/or develop new articulation agreements or develop new ones with other California Community Colleges, the California State University, University of California and other accredited public and independent institutions to facilitate stackability into credit-bearing courses.”⁶

“UNBUNDLING” TRADITIONAL FACULTY ROLES

As explained to the FLOW workgroup and expressed in proposed trailer bill language, the role of faculty with the online community college will be different than

is the current standard. Faculty will be “segmented by the distinct skills need of the college” to fill roles such as designing courses and developing course materials, mentoring students as they proceed through each course, and evaluating student assessments. All of these roles within each of the courses are currently handled by a single faculty member for most courses taught at California community colleges.

PROPOSED GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The proposed online community college would be established as a new district under the governance of the Board of Governors for California Community Colleges, the same group responsible for setting regulations for the entire system. Responsibilities of the governing board would transition in the future to an independent board comprised of representatives appointed by the Governor.

WHAT DOES THIS ALL MEAN?

Much of what is captured within the proposal for the online community college is very different than what exists at our colleges today. There may be some aspects of the elements described here that are currently in use, such as local and regional Strong Work Force efforts to prepare more Californians for employment, the flexibility of open-entry/open-exit courses, and the competency-based structure of noncredit. Yet, not enough is being done. It is time for local and statewide conversations to occur in areas including innovation in online education, further partnership with industry, more flexible scheduling formats for online and in person sections, expansion of competency-based education in face-to-face and online courses, and expanded use of stackable certificates, badging, and other micro-credentials. Some of the constraints to updating instructional methods and deliveries may be regulatory, including attendance accounting disincentives to shorten online courses, or areas related to accreditation, including concerns about regular substantive contact between instructors and students in instructional formats such as those used at Western Governors University. It is critical that faculty leaders be aware of the innovations proposed and engage in dialog to promote change; to not consider changes in the way students interact with education is to allow our colleges to stagnate and students to suffer. Even if faculty are opposed to the idea of a fully online college, it is important to consider potential implementation of some of the practices proposed that may work towards increasing student success. 🐦

⁶ Trailer Bill Language, Education: California Online Community College, http://www.dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer_Bill_Language/documents/CaliforniaOnlineCommunityCollege.pdf

Building a New Road: Faculty Participation on Peer Review Teams for Accreditation

by **Irit Gat**, Accreditation Committee, Antelope Valley College

Ginni May, Accreditation Committee Chair, ASCCC Area A Representative

and **Steve Reynolds**, Vice President, ACCJC

Accreditation is an assurance to the public that an educational institution is meeting or exceeding acceptable levels of quality. In particular, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), the regional accreditor for California community colleges, encourages and supports institutions to improve academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and student success through a process of review by higher education professionals and public members. The evaluation of institutions by the ACCJC assures the educational community, the general public, and other entities that an institution has clearly defined objectives appropriate to higher education; has established conditions under which their achievement can reasonably be expected; appears in fact to be accomplishing them; and is organized, staffed, and supported so that it can be expected to continue to do so.

In Title 5 §53200, item seven of the “10+1” provides that local academic senates and governing boards consult collegially in establishing “faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports.” One can easily argue that faculty participation on accreditation peer review teams is not only beneficial to the faculty member’s college as well as the college undergoing the review, but crucial to the entire accreditation process.

One of the most personally and professionally enriching experiences for college faculty is to participate as a member of a peer review team for a college that is undergoing its comprehensive evaluation visit for accreditation. Serving as a member on a peer review team is a unique professional development opportunity during which one can observe and learn about successful practices in teaching and learning through initiatives and programs that support student achievement, and in areas of organizational behavior and development of higher education at institutions similar to one’s own. Participating on a peer review team gives one a broader perspective and greater appreciation for the complex and diverse ways in which community colleges serve their students and communities. However, until recently, the road for faculty participation has seemed pitted with potholes, and for some faculty, washed away completely.

The Accreditation Institute is an annual professional development event planned and organized by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) to inform faculty on accreditation issues, policies, and effective practices. In February 2012, the Accreditation institute was held in partnership with the ACCJC in an attempt to begin constructive conversations around issues of mutual concern, including increasing the number of faculty in the ACCJC’s

database who participate on visiting teams. While the ACCJC occasionally participated at the Accreditation Institute in the intervening years, not until the most recent Accreditation Institute in February 2018 did such a partnership begin again. This year, the ACCJC was a sponsor of the Accreditation Institute and in collaboration with the ASCCC, offered a pre-session consisting of two trainings: one for new peer reviewers and one for new accreditation liaison officers. The New Peer Reviewer Training was one result of many changes taking place within the ACCJC over the last year or so, due to the recommendations from Workgroup I, established by the Chief Executive Officers of California Community Colleges (CEOCCC), to begin work with ACCJC commissioners in order to make significant improvements in the structure and functioning of the ACCJC and to address long-standing concerns of its members¹, and an ASCCC Resolution 2.01 F16 Local Recruitment and Nominations Processes for Accreditation Teams².

The rebuilding of the road to faculty participation on peer review teams has begun. This new Peer Reviewer Training was an all-day interactive session consisting of presentations, group activities, and broad dialog. Participants learned about the basics of serving on an evaluation team while having an opportunity to discuss the philosophy of accreditation and peer review, review the standards and sections of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER), use case studies to prepare a simulated team report section, and discuss some of the situations that are commonly faced by evaluation teams. In addition, they were provided with information about how to be considered to serve on an evaluation team.

1 *Improving ACCJC Structure, Function, and Relations:* https://www.ccleague.amz1.securityserve.com/sites/default/files/pdf/resources/accreditation/WG%201_%20Sept%202017%20Report%20to%20CEO%20Board_9-20-17.pdf

2 <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/local-recruitment-and-nomination-processes-accreditation-teams>

Peer Review teams typically consist of 8-12 members including a CEO, CIO, CBO, researcher, at least three faculty (discipline, librarian, counselor, DE Coordinator and/or SLO Coordinator, or other faculty leader), and deans, depending on the size and complexity of the institution. The members of a team are generally selected for their expertise in learning outcomes, library and learning resources, career and technical education, distance education, planning, research, and broad experience as appropriate to the institution being evaluated. For colleges with baccalaureate degrees the team will include expertise in baccalaureate education.

A RECENT FIRST TIME TEAM MEMBER'S EXPERIENCE—IRIT GAT, ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

ASCCC Accreditation Committee member Irit Gat, a faculty member at Antelope Valley College, recently participated on her first peer evaluation team. Her experiences around the preparation for the visit and the visit itself are recounted below:

I became interested in serving as a faculty member on a peer review team after my college went through a recent accreditation visit. As the Academic Senate President at that time, I contributed to several standards of our Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) and was interviewed on a number of occasions during the team visit over four days. My experience during the interviews was unlike some of the descriptions that I heard from other colleges' experiences of previous teams. I felt the visiting team was open, supportive, and genuinely eager to learn about our college. I also saw how hard they worked throughout the visit. This sparked my interest in serving because I wanted to give back to another college in this manner.

In order to qualify, I went to the ACCJC website and located the Bio Data Form for New Peer Reviewers.³ I brought the form to both my vice president of

3 *Bio Data Form for New Peer Reviewers:* <https://accjc.org/forms/>

academic affairs and college president, both of whom eagerly supported me and signed the form. They both told me the experience would be incredibly valuable for my professional growth. And they were right! After submitting the form, I received a call several months later from the ACCJC inviting me to take part in the New Peer Reviewer Training, a general training. This was a one-day training covering the standards and procedures for being on a visiting team. We were given scenarios, worked in groups, and were provided with a lot of valuable information. When speaking with my colleagues who had been through previous ACCJC trainings, we noticed a big transformation from previous training sessions—there was a shift in ACCJC. From ACCJC presenting the team visit as a way to “police” the colleges to that of understanding the team visit as a more open and supportive way to help colleges grow while also recognizing their hard work and unique programs and processes. It was positive and upbeat.

A few months after that general training, I received an email inviting me to serve on a team the following semester, and I gladly accepted. I was eager to apply what I had learned and also contribute professionally at this level. My experience was more than I expected in so many ways! The next step was to attend another one-day training to meet my team colleagues and the team chair. At this training, we as a team, received direction and information pertaining to the college that was undergoing the comprehensive self-evaluation review. Our team chair asked us which standard we wanted to focus on, and what further information we would need to complete our review prior to our visit in a month. I filled out a general information form and then two assignments which covered our specific college’s ISER. This forced me to read over the entire ISER in order to be familiar with the college under review. For the second assignment, I focused specifically on the standard I was assigned to. The best advice I received was from my college vice president and president, who have served on many teams and who encouraged me to prepare and write as much of the report on my section as possible prior to the visit. I also prepared a list of groups or individuals I wanted to interview during our team

visit and additional documents that I needed in order to make an assessment as to whether the college had met the standards.

The visit, although a very busy time of intense work, was the best part of the entire process. I met so many wonderful colleagues, learned about another school in detail that no other opportunity could have afforded me, and also was privileged to work with an amazing group of colleagues on my team from other colleges. As a first-time team member, I was supported and mentored, and I learned so much about the accreditation process that will serve to help me when my college goes through the next accreditation cycle.

Is it a lot of work? Yes, but it is well-worth it both personally and professionally. As a faculty member, will you miss classes? You will since the team visit is a week-long experience. That is why it’s important to have the support of your dean, vice president, and president. They will need to authorize substitutes or alternative assignments. I had ample time to find substitutes and to make sure my classes would not fall behind. I am eager to serve on another team because I know I will continue to learn and meet hard-working colleagues with different experiences and with ideas for programs that I can bring back to my college. There were also pockets of time to have fun with the team members during short breaks and meals—so there is some down (fun) time. And I was treated like “royalty” during the entire visit from the college we were reviewing.

I highly encourage faculty to go through this experience on both a professional and personal level!

If Irit’s account has spurred your interest in serving on a team, or you have been considering it for a while, you should consider completing the Bio Data Form for New Peer Reviewers, which can be found at <https://accjc.org/forms>. Faculty may also contact Steve Reynolds at sreynolds@accjc.org for additional information. 🐦

Apprenticeships and the Faculty Purview

by **Craig Rutan**, ASCCC Curriculum Committee Chair

and **Thais Winsome**, Mission College, ASCCC Curriculum Committee

Apprenticeship programs are partnerships between a college and a program sponsor, usually a trade union or employer. The college provides the apprentice with credit or noncredit courses in a vocational field, which are combined with on-the-job training provided by the sponsor. Upon completion of the program, the apprentice becomes a journeyman or other rank within the trade. Apprenticeship programs may include certificates of achievement or associate degrees if they are part of a credit program. Students in apprenticeship programs generally enter the program through an application process with the sponsor, although they may also become fully-matriculated students at the college while completing their coursework.

Apprenticeship programs provide excellent opportunities for students who might otherwise never enroll in college. At the same time, they help the college establish a presence in the community and serve the needs of student equity and other important components of the college mission.

For faculty involved in curriculum, minimum qualifications, and other areas of faculty purview, apprenticeship programs present their own set of unique challenges and opportunities. Below we will address some of the questions a college might wish to ask before implementing an apprenticeship program. Our purpose is not to provide a “how-to” manual for implementation, but simply to acquaint the reader with aspects of the process that may not be immediately apparent.

IS THE COLLEGE ON BOARD WITH THE PROGRAM?

Apprenticeship programs often find their way to campus through workforce outreach or other avenues and may not follow the “normal” progression of curriculum and program development. This may result in little or no direct involvement with the faculty or any prior approval from the academic senate. This is never the way it’s supposed to happen, of course, but it can and sometimes does happen this way. The senate is then put in the uncomfortable position of either having to protest the adoption of the new program on procedural grounds or “going along to get along” for the sake of the students but in the process, abdicating its purview over program development and approval. For colleges that have contemplated or are contemplating adding apprenticeship to their offerings, one way to ensure academic senate involvement is to include language in the senate constitution and curriculum committee bylaws that specifically include apprenticeship programs as something that must go through the existing program development and approval processes prior to being adopted by the college.

The Local Educational Agency (LEA) Agreement is a document that establishes the contract between the college and the apprenticeship sponsor, and as such, it is a critical component of a successful program. Both the curriculum committee and the academic senate need to be involved in the review and approval of the LEA, preferably in direct

consultation with the sponsor as well as with the college administration. If the apprenticeship program will involve any additional work on the part of a classified employee, the appropriate bargaining unit and classified senate should be consulted as well. The role of classified staff in implementing apprenticeships is not trivial; for example, a college may find that a new apprenticeship program carries an unanticipated increase in workload for personnel in Admissions and Records to deal with larger-than-usual processing of positive-attendance records.

IS YOUR COLLEGE AWARE OF THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS REGARDING APPRENTICESHIPS?

There are a large number of relevant statutes and regulations regarding apprenticeship programs. As educators, we immediately think of the Education Code and Title 5, but apprenticeships must also meet requirements spelled out in state and federal Labor Codes. Relevant statutes and regulations include, but are not limited to, California Labor Code sections 3070 – 3098 and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Division 1, Chapter 2, Subchapter 1.

Apprenticeship programs have traditionally been funded with Related and Supplemental Instruction (RSI) funds, referred to as Montoya Funds. These funds are categorical funds that are dedicated to covering costs related to the apprenticeship programs. As the number of apprenticeship programs in the California community colleges has increased, there hasn't been enough RSI funding available to properly fund the new programs. The Chancellor's Office is currently seeking to permit apprenticeship programs to claim apportionment, just like the other programs currently offered at colleges. If this shift occurs, it will become even more important for the local academic senate to take a leadership role in the establishment of new apprenticeship programs.

Finally, it's important that there be good communication and coordination between all departments on campus that will deal with the apprentices and their records. The success of the program depends on each group being aware of its role and how it fits into the overall goals of the program. For example, course scheduling for apprenticeship programs may not conform to the regular academic calendar, and students may need to have attendance records processed quickly to allow them to progress to the next set of courses. Failure to notify the Registrar's Office or Admissions and Records well in advance so the appropriate personnel can be put in place to do the work can delay or even derail an otherwise successful apprenticeship program.

DOES YOUR CURRICULUM COMMITTEE HAVE A GOOD WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PROGRAM SPONSOR?

All apprenticeship curriculum requires good coordination between the college curriculum committee and the program sponsor. Many colleges do not have faculty with specific expertise in the trade, so the only source of expertise comes through the program sponsor. The program sponsor may submit a full curriculum that was developed at some point in the past through a joint effort of the trade union, the California Apprenticeship Council, and an industry advisory group or other body. This allows for consistency across similar apprenticeship programs in other parts of the state and spares the college from having to "reinvent the wheel," but also requires that the curriculum committee exercise some due diligence by comparing the proposed curriculum with that offered in other programs to ensure that it includes the required elements. In order for the curriculum to be approved or chaptered by the Chancellor's Office, the program sponsor must supply documentation that the curriculum has been approved by the industry. This is usually a letter from the Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS). Failure to include this documentation will result in delays

in curriculum approval, so it's important that the sponsor provide this documentation as early as possible in the program development process. Finally, apprenticeship courses should always be assigned a Student Accountability Model (SAM) code of "A" for apprenticeship, so that the correct attendance accounting method can be applied and the college can legally restrict enrollment to those students enrolled in the program.

Conversely, the program sponsor may not have a strong understanding of the Title 5 requirements regarding units, hours, and other curricular elements. Unless both the curriculum committee and the program sponsor work hard to educate one another, there can be miscommunication that results in delays during the curriculum approval process. It's also important to recognize that the apprenticeship curriculum is treated the same as any other type of curriculum where it comes to chaptering (or approval if the apprenticeship program is in noncredit) by the Chancellor's Office. It must also meet the same statutory requirements for inclusion in the college catalog and class schedule.

Apprenticeships may include Occupational Work Experience coursework as part of the credit program. These courses can serve as capstone courses if they are taken only once, near the end of the credit program, or they can be taken on an ongoing basis throughout the program. As work experience courses, these courses must adhere to all statutory requirements; namely, a maximum of 8 units per semester and 16 units overall, with a limit of 4 repetitions. As with other apprenticeship courses work experience must be assigned a SAM Code of "A" for "Apprenticeship."

DOES YOUR COLLEGE HAVE A PROCESS IN PLACE FOR OVERSIGHT OF THE FACULTY IN THE APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM?

The role of the college in regards to apprenticeship faculty is one of the most difficult aspects of any apprenticeship program. Per statute, the sponsor is responsible for recruitment, hiring

and compensation of the faculty; however, the sponsor must also adhere to Faculty Minimum Qualifications for Apprenticeship Programs and college policies regarding evaluation (Title 5 §53413). It's also important to note that the faculty in apprenticeship programs usually belong to their trade unions, not to the faculty union. Both the college and the sponsor have a lot of flexibility regarding apprenticeship faculty, but it's important to agree, in advance, to what arrangements will be made and who will be responsible for the work. As the central agreement of the partnership, the LEA should include ALL of the requirements the college and sponsor have agreed upon regarding apprenticeship faculty, including procedures for recruitment, hiring and evaluation of instructors, as well as any policies on code-of-conduct, bullying, sexual harassment, and academic freedom.

Another issue the college must decide is whether to assign a faculty member to serve in the role of department chair/program coordinator over the apprenticeship program or assign that role to an instructional dean or other administrator. For colleges that have specific roles for department chairs as part of the collective bargaining agreement, this may involve discussion or negotiation with the faculty union. No matter how the college addresses faculty management in apprenticeship programs, the academic senate should be consulted before final decisions are made.

In this brief article, we have tried to acquaint the reader with some of the issues that may arise with the implementation of an apprenticeship program. Apprenticeship programs provide an excellent opportunity to help students find a career and they can be extremely successful programs for the college. The potential challenges discussed above can be avoided if all constituency groups join the discussion early in the process and work together to plan and implement the program. 🐦

Updates on Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Efforts

by Dolores Davison, ASCCC Secretary, Equity and Diversity Action Committee Chair

On September 5, 2017, President Donald Trump announced his administration's intent to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which was put into place in 2012 by President Barack Obama. The administration announced that the program would end on March 5, 2018, with individual DACA recipients being allowed to stay through their allowed time (up to two years) past that date.

Well, March 5 is upon us, and DACA remains. The government has seen two shutdowns and countless meetings to try to resolve the issue, with no solution in sight. Fortunately, DACA is not the only program under which students in California can be protected; Assembly Bill 540, better known as the Dream Act, also provides similar protections to students and other Californians. In addition, the California government is renewing efforts to actively pursue solutions to protect undocumented students.

In February, 2018, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Legal Counsel issued a legal interpretation of two recently passed bills: Senate Bill 54 (DeLeon, 2017) and Assembly Bill 21 (Kalra, 2017). Both bills address issues around the protections of students within public educational institutions and institutional roles within the purview of sanctuary state status in

California. Senate Bill 54, as interpreted by the Chancellor's Office, "...eliminates state and local law enforcement discretion to use money and personnel to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons, or to conduct other activities for immigration enforcement purposes." This does not apply if a serious crime has been committed. It applies to community college police as local law enforcement. This bill became law on January 1, 2018, and the California Attorney General's Office is expected to publish model policies around this legislation by October 2018.

The second piece of legislation is Assembly Bill 21, which, according to the Chancellor's Office interpretation, "places a number of affirmative obligations on community college districts to prevent student, staff, and faculty from participation in federal immigration enforcement efforts 'to the fullest extent consistent with state and federal law'." The bill is intended to protect the state's students, faculty, staff, and the public by ensuring that everyone in California has an opportunity to pursue an education free from intimidation and without fear or undue risk. This bill spells out a number of different requirements for the community colleges, including requiring districts not to disclose personal information about students, faculty, and staff; requiring districts to notify colleges if immigration officials are on, or

expected to be, on campus; and requiring districts to identify a single point of contact on each campus to whom immigration officials would report.

Of perhaps more immediacy for faculty is that Assembly Bill 21 requires that districts hold undocumented students harmless. The bill states that, “In the event that an undocumented student is detained, deported, or is unable to attend to his or her academic requirements due to an immigration enforcement action, the college district shall make all reasonable efforts to assist the student in retaining any eligibility for financial aid, fellowship stipends, exemption from nonresident tuition fees, funding for research or other educational projects, housing stipends or services, or other benefits he or she has been awarded or received, and permit the student to be re-enrolled if and when the student is able to return to the college.” For faculty, that would mean allowing students who are detained, deported, or otherwise unable to attend their classes to make up work, take exams late, or provide other assistance or accommodations for students. To this end, faculty could also use the new non-evaluative “Excused Withdrawal (EW)” symbol, which was recently approved by the Board of Governors in January and created for cases where a student’s withdrawal occurred beyond his or her control. More details about both bills, including the Chancellor’s Office Legal Division interpretation, can be found here: http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/Legal/Advisories/18-01_Sanctuary_Jurisdiction_Advisory.ADA.pdf

Other legislation also intends to protect undocumented students. Senate Bill 183 (Lara, as of March 5, 2018), would “prohibit federal immigration enforcement agents, officers, or personnel from entering a building owned and occupied, or leased and occupied, by the state, a public school, or a campus of the California community colleges, to perform surveillance,

effectuate an arrest, or question an individual therein, without a valid federal warrant.” In addition, with a warrant, the officers would be limited to dealing with only the individual for whom the warrant was issued. That bill was read in the State Assembly in January 2018 and is still active as of this writing.

Finally, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which is comprised of representatives from the University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), and California Community College (CCC) academic senates, sent a letter to UC President Janet Napolitano and Chancellors Timothy White of CSU and Eloy Ortiz Oakley of the CCC to request that they “...jointly explore the possibility of expanding these support services and, if feasible, allow DACA and Dreamer students to use the support facilities and services at any UC, CSU or CCC campus statewide, regardless of their enrollment in a different system, without fear of repercussion or retribution and without need for payment.” All three system leaders have agreed to engage in these discussions; their responses, along with the original letter, can be found on the ASCCC DACA resources page (<https://www.asccc.org/resources-daca-and-undocumented-students>). These responses, as well as the legislative efforts and ASCCC responses mentioned above, will be part of the ASCCC Equity and Diversity Action Committee (EDAC) regionals held in April; information can be found on the ASCCC.org website.

As faculty leaders, providing a safe environment for our students is essential for student success. The continued efforts by the leaders of the California Legislature and the three segments of public higher education are encouraging and hopefully will send a clear message to our students that they are valued, appreciated, and crucial to the future of California. 🐦

The Importance of Major Preparation

by **Leticia Hector**, San Bernardino Valley College, ASCCC Curriculum Committee

Craig Rutan, ASCCC Curriculum Committee Chair

and **Aimee Tran**, Saddleback College, ASCCC Curriculum Committee

A primary mission of the California community colleges is to meet the needs of our transfer students. It is our responsibility to remove barriers that may interfere with the transfer process and create a clear pathway for our students. When creating successful pathways, colleges must create courses that meet the major preparation requirements expected by transfer institutions, ensure those courses are accessible to our students, and offered in a way that will allow them to complete their program of study in a timely manner. California community colleges continue to face budget challenges which may impact the ability to offer certain courses, particularly specialized courses that typically have lower enrollments. As a result, colleges may not offer courses that are needed for our transfer students to fulfill the requirements of their chosen major thus, hindering the ability of our students to transfer.

Due to campus impaction and increased competitiveness for transfer admissions, it is to the students' advantage, and in many cases a requirement, that lower division major preparation is completed prior to transfer. Admission is often dependent on the completion of all lower-division general education and pre-major courses prior to transferring. California community colleges are encouraged to offer major preparation courses at least once every two years, to ensure students

have the opportunity to meet impaction and competitive admission selection. This is especially important for rare courses or courses that have sequence.

Access to major preparation courses in a timely manner is critical. Otherwise, it can negatively impact a student by delaying transfer, causing students to seek enrollment at other colleges, accumulating unnecessary units as students remain at a California community college, and increasing time to completion. Delaying the transfer process also increases the financial burden placed on our students.

Recently, the California Legislature has taken steps toward improving transfer pathways. For example, there has been improved communication and collaboration between the California State Universities (CSU) and our California community colleges to develop and implement the Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). A report by The Campaign for College Opportunity, *The Transfer Maze: The High Cost to Students and California*, published in September 2017 (<http://collegecampaign.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/CCO-2017-TransferMazeReport-27.pdf>) indicated that the development of Associate Degree for Transfers has decreased the time for students to complete a bachelor's degree. The report indicated that only 27% of traditional transfer students were able

to complete a bachelor's degree two years after transfer, while 48% of students who completed an Associate Degree for Transfer were able to obtain a bachelor's degree two years after transfer. The ADTs, with their more clearly defined major preparation requirements, have provided clearer pathways that have improved student completion and success.

Faculty need to be aware of the discipline courses UC and CSU require of our students to ensure we are offering the appropriate courses and meeting the needs of our students. For example, in a presentation on UC Transfer Pathways and C-ID Participation at the 2016 ASCCC Curriculum Institute, Monica H. Lin and Dale Leaman stated that only 32 California community colleges had complete articulation agreements for the UC Transfer Pathway in Biology. This finding lead to a number of questions: Were the other California community colleges aware of this? Did they lack funding to offer such courses? Were some of these colleges lacking support from administration to hire the appropriate faculty to teach the courses, or did they lack the budget to offer the appropriate courses?

While many faculty are already aware of the importance of major preparation courses, local curriculum committees should work with their articulation officers to educate faculty about the importance of offering major preparation courses, what the requirements are at the local UC and CSU campuses in their area, and how existing courses might be modified to better serve the needs of transfer students. The guided pathways work that many colleges have undertaken aligns well with the discussion of major preparation. As faculty identify various transfer pathways, they will want to work with their articulation officers to ensure that the courses being offered will allow their students to be prepared and competitive when applying for transfer. Additionally, as colleges change their enrollment management to accommodate the completion of identified

pathways, faculty will be equipped to articulate why certain courses must be scheduled and offered, even if enrollment is limited. When Resolution 9.04: *Ensuring the Availability of Major Preparation* was adopted in 2012, budgets were tight and many of the essential courses to satisfy major requirements were not being scheduled due to limited resources. Colleges are still facing budget challenges, but the initial guided pathways work has created an increased focus on what students need to take to order to achieve their educational goals.

Curriculum committees should also consider the importance of major preparation when approving new and revised courses. It is very common to discuss how a new course will meet the major requirements for students, but committees don't always ask if revised courses still serve the needs of students. Curriculum committees should establish an expectation that faculty have consulted with their articulation officer and reviewed existing articulation agreements on ASSIST website before submitting a revised course for approval. Universities often change their expectations for transfer students and it is important that faculty ensure that courses continue to meet those expectations.

As the implementation of guided pathways continues and transfer to CSU and UC campuses becomes increasingly competitive, faculty and administration must work together to ensure that students are provided with the opportunity to enroll in courses that will satisfy the major requirements in their field of study, make them as prepared as possible before transfer, and assist them to realize their goal of transfer to a university. Through improved collaboration between faculty and administration, we can allow far more students to complete the courses they need, earn the degrees they are seeking, and move into careers or transfer to the institution of their choice. 🐦

Faculty Hiring Processes

by Dolores Davison, ASCCC Secretary, Equity and Diversity Action Committee Chair

When faculty are asked about their most important roles on campus, responsibilities such as curriculum, teaching, and mentorship are most likely to be mentioned. An area that can be overlooked, but that should be on the minds of faculty throughout the year, is the role of faculty in hiring, particularly since there have been significant changes in the past three years around hiring in the California Community College system.

In 2015, the Statewide Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Diversity Advisory Committee and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) Legal Division developed a new EEO Fund Allocation Model. Prior to that time, EEO Funds were allocated based on Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES), but with the change to the allocation formula, funds are now allocated to districts that meet "multiple methods of measuring success in promoting equal employment opportunity" as per Title 5 §53030(b)(2). A legal memo, found here (http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/Legal/EEO/12.11.15_Allocation_Model_Memo.pdf), detailed to colleges what these multiple methods were. However, the Chancellor's Office realized that while the memo was detailed, examples and effective practices would be more helpful to colleges. To this end, the EEO Advisory Committee began work on an *Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Best Practices Handbook*. Published in 2016, the handbook covers topics other than hiring, but hiring practices are its focus. Changes to the funding structure of categorical funds such as Basic Skills helped lead to the creation of this handbook, which spells out the hiring processes and procedural requirements that colleges and districts need to meet in order to secure EEO and other categorical funds.

The *Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Best Practices Handbook* spells out each of the requirements for districts to receive EEO funds. In addition to compliance with the multiple methods, each local district's Chief Human Resources Officer, Chief Executive Officer, and Board of Trustees must annually certify compliance with these multiple measures to receive funds. As of 2017-18, the handbook spells out the nine possible measures and provides effective examples of each from districts around the state. The measures are as follows:

1. The district must convene an Equal Employment Opportunity committee and demonstrate the convening through the use of minutes or other records. That committee, in accordance with local processes, must create and submit an Equal Employment Opportunity Plan to the Chancellor's Office. It must also submit expenditure and performance reports for the prior year. This step is mandatory for all districts.

Districts must also comply with five of the following eight measures in 2017-18:

In the pre-hiring process:

2. The district must demonstrate that it has adopted board policies and resolutions that show a commitment to diversifying hiring processes and procedures.
3. The district must provide incentives to hire in hard-to-hire disciplines or areas.
4. The district provides focused outreach and publications that demonstrate a commitment to diversifying hiring.

In the hiring process:

5. The district has established processes and procedures for addressing diversity throughout all steps and levels of the hiring process.
6. The district has provided consistent and ongoing training for all members of all hiring committees.

In the post-hiring process:

7. The district will provide professional development focused on diversity.
8. The district will ensure that diversity is incorporated into the tenure and evaluation process.
9. The district will actively pursue the creation of “Grow Your Own” programs, seeking to hire students who attended California community colleges.

Beginning in 2016-17, districts were required to demonstrate that they met five of the above multiple measures, in addition to the required measure, in order to receive EEO funding. In 2016, 77% of districts were able to demonstrate compliance by meeting at least five of the measures, and in 2017, that number rose to 94%. In December 2017, the EEO Advisory Committee agreed to increase the number to six of the multiple measures in order for colleges to receive EEO Funding for 2018-19.

While the data that has been gathered by the Chancellor’s Office is limited (see chart*), there are some interesting and encouraging trends. Most significantly, the data demonstrates that between Fall 2014 and Fall 2016, the percentage of newly hired tenure track faculty who indicated that they belonged to an underrepresented minority group (defined by the Chancellor’s Office as Black, Hispanic, Native American and Pacific Islander) rose by 10%. Districts were provided significant funds to hire new faculty during this time, and it appears that these hires were more diverse than hires in the previous years.

The data from the Chancellor’s Office also dispels a frequently touted myth: that part-time faculty are more diverse than those employed full time. While this had been true in some years, the difference has never been statistically significant (no more than 2%) until Fall 2015, when the percentage of underrepresented full-time faculty was almost 7% higher than that of part-time faculty. In Fall 2016, the percentage of underrepresented part-time faculty increased but still remains 5% below that of full-time faculty. While the numbers continue to remain significantly below the percentage of California community college students who are underrepresented, the increase in full-time hires from underrepresented groups provides encouragement that colleges are beginning to diversify their faculty hiring.

In addition to its participation on the EEO Advisory Committee, the ASCCC has worked to revise its paper on faculty hiring. In Spring 2017, the ASCCC plenary delegates passed resolution 3.01, which stated, “Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update the paper *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures* and bring it to the Spring 2018 Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.” This year, the ASCCC Equity and Diversity Action Committee revised the paper, including effective practices around hiring, from the formation of the hiring committee to mentoring and retention of new hired faculty. That paper will be brought to the Spring 2018 ASCCC Plenary Session for adoption by the body.

While service on a hiring committee can be time consuming and occasionally frustrating, it is essential that faculty serve in order to ensure that the faculty hired are the most qualified and most promising. The use of multiple measures, coupled with faculty involvement, may help provide diverse pools for faculty hiring, both in the short and long term. * 🐦

** Please refer to the online version of this article to view the graph titled Under-Represented Minority percentages by Student and Employee Types First-Time Hires and First-Time Students*

But We Already Do That! What's New About Guided Pathways?

by Jeff Burdick, ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force

The first comment after hearing about guided pathways nearly always seems to be this one: “But we already do that!” That is true, and that is not true.

It is true that many of the component aspects of guided pathways are in place because we built them over the past decade and integrated them into our larger college plans and operations: the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), Course-Identification Numbering System (C-ID), Associate Degree for Transfer (ADTs), Student Educational Plans (SEP), Equity plans, Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), pathways into the Historically Black Colleges and Universities, California State Universities, and University of California, et cetera – even unto exhaustion. We have programs that support each of the major principles of designing and implementing a guided pathway framework (IEPI.cccco.edu) to:

- Create clear curricular pathways to employment and further education
- Help students choose and enter an educational pathway
- Help students stay on their educational paths
- Ensure that learning is happening with intentional outcomes.

And what wasn't built by state-mandated or college initiatives has often been implemented through the hard work and dedication of professionals on individual campuses or within

individual departments – and sometimes by single practitioners who have had an idea and brought it to fruition.

We're proud of what we've accomplished, we're proud of our work – and rightly so. We look through our campus support services and programs and we see a fully-formed highway to success.

But if “We already do that,” and all our supports and programs are in place, then why do we cringe when we look at our Scorecards, which record actual student successes, which are not nearly as pervasive as we'd like, and which often show that student failure is more likely than success? Why do we especially cringe when we recognize that our most vulnerable students are the most likely to fail? We pride ourselves on being a system dedicated to equity, yet achieving equity continues to remain beyond a distant horizon.

“If only,” we say, “students would avail themselves of our services.” “If only they'd study more.” “If only they'd come to our office hours.” Yes, student self-advocacy is part of the problem. Faculty know from experience that students, especially first generation and traditionally underserved students, are often reticent to ask for help or don't know how to study. They are often intimidated or confused or stressed to a point where it is easier to walk away than to walk in.

Are there ways to teach self-advocacy and study skills and confidence? If your answer to that is yes, then those efforts might well be part of a college's guided pathways framework.

All students struggle through their educational endeavors: The confusing application process is often a major barrier to getting started. Choosing a major while still in high school seems impossible. Placement and class scheduling seem like they might be easier with a Ouija board than with a catalogue. Work conflicts with school. Stress and depression often undermine the best of intentions. What is a student to do when a new career suddenly becomes a dream – and all the Student Educational Plans in the world can't seem to create a clear track forward without repeating similar classes?

And each single student has a personal story, personal barriers and challenges, as well as personal ambitions and dreams. Often, those various barriers and challenges lead to stop outs and fail outs – and every one of those lost students has lost part of their current and/or future aspirations.

Are there ways to clarify these paths, remove or reduce barriers, provide way-finding tools, and stay in touch so bumps in the road don't become brick walls? If your answer to that is yes, then those efforts might well be part of a college's guided pathways framework.

One way to look at our programs is the metaphor of a jigsaw puzzle. When we look at our colleges, we see well designed supports and programs that seem to fit together, each piece offering students the support they need or the program they want or the safety net that will rebound them back on track.

All students struggle through their educational endeavors: The confusing application process is often a major barrier to getting started.

Each of the 114 colleges has committed to creating some version of a guided pathways framework, but no one has a template.

But to students, that jigsaw puzzle often looks like it was just dumped out of the box, and there aren't any straight-edged frame pieces evident and no reference photo of the completed puzzle. They simply don't have the resources to put it all together.

Putting it all together is our job. Finding gaps and creating new pieces is our job. Teaching students to find their way is also our job. But negotiating the clearer path with the tools we provide is our students' job—we need not become a helicopter in loco parentis.

As faculty, we want our students to succeed. That's why we do these difficult jobs after all. So, when we look at the puzzle from the point of view of a student and recognize that there is ongoing work to be done and that we can do it, we are not only working towards our students dreams, but our own.

Each of the 114 colleges has committed to creating some version of a guided pathways framework, but no one has a template. There are no rainmakers or software programs or magic genies that will “pathway” your college. Your mission, vision, values, and culture are where your pathway begins, and your strategic planning structure is where it will be built. Since this is a faculty-driven project, this is our chance to point our individual colleges toward excellence.

True, we are already doing this. Now view it all through the eyes of students...and mind the gaps. 🐉

Metric Fatigue: Reforming Metrics to Facilitate Meaningful Institutional Dialog

by John Stankas, ASCCC Vice President

In the ever-expanding desire for data-driven discussion and accountability, every new initiative tied to funding has produced another set of metrics to measure our colleges' effectiveness. The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) work group on indicators counted 86 distinct metrics used throughout our system as required by the Strong Workforce Program, Student Equity, Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), Basic Skills, Chancellor's Office accountability measures and system goals, and IEPI indicators, each that can be disaggregated by equity measures. While it is useful to have a variety of data cataloged and accessible to inform college discussions, it is unreasonable to expect 86 different measurements to effectively drive meaningful institutional dialog in strategic planning and improvement.

In December, the IEPI Indicators workgroup recommended to the Chancellor's Office that simplifying the metrics provided to colleges is an important reform if the desire is to use metrics to facilitate local goal-setting and improvement. The recommendation is not to delete data, but organize data and identify just a handful of meaningful areas to require evaluation by the colleges. A small number of metrics can drive significant institutional dialog and planning.

The Chancellor's Office responded to IEPI's request by forming the Metrics Simplification Workgroup headed by Vice Chancellor Omid Pourzanjani with representation from consultative bodies including the Academic Senate. The Workgroup agreed to the following set of values:

- Metrics should shift the emphasis from recording activities, to highlighting student journeys, from recruitment to completion.
- Metrics should incentivize behavior that leads to desired student outcomes, with the goal of identifying the highest-leverage data points that will foster student progress.
- Metrics should be chosen based on system goals, including the Vision for Success, equity, and Guided Pathways, and not on what has been tracked historically, such as academic divisions or funding sources.

- There should be a limited number of metrics to promote clarity of focus, to replace existing dashboards and the Student Success Scorecard.
- Metrics should be based on data points that come from statewide data systems, such as the Management Information Systems (MIS), rather than being reported by colleges using supplemental systems.

For example, one data element might be a measure of student engagement defined as the proportion of students who participated in one or more comprehensive support services (Extended Opportunity Programs and Services, Umoja, Disabled Student Programs and Services, Mesa, etc.) offered by the college in a given year. When the college evaluates such a measure during institutional planning, it may choose to set a goal for the maintenance or improvement of the proportion of students participating in these programs. To inform such a decision, the underlying data per support program would be available to guide institutional dialog about where such an improvement may occur in a multidimensional data tool.

In addition, equity and institutional conversations around equity need to be infused throughout any college planning dialog and not in just one committee or in one report. It is challenging to make progress on addressing equity gaps without ensuring every institutional planning conversation driven by a metric evaluation can also be displayed by various student populations. For example, when evaluating our measure of student engagement in the context of institutional planning and goal-setting, the measured percentage should be able to pivot into an array of data sorted by student population. This may better guide dialog about who is underserved by existing structures of the college and where resources and innovation may need to be directed to improve.

The Metrics Simplification Workgroup is expected to complete its recommendations by May 2018. There are interactive webinars and conversations scheduled for various constituent groups throughout this term, with the final webinar scheduled for April 30. 🐦

Minimum Qualifications for Apprenticeship Instructors: On the Road to a New Relationship Between the Academic Senate and the Apprenticeship Community

by **John Freitas**, Treasurer, ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee Chair

and **Lorraine Slattery-Farrell**, South Representative, ASCCC CTE Leadership Committee Chair

Beginning in fall of 2016, the Academic Senate has been engaged in conversations and negotiations with representatives of the Chancellor's Office and the California Apprenticeship Council (CAC) regarding the minimum qualifications for apprenticeship instructors, which are established in Title 5 section 53413. The current apprenticeship minimum qualifications were established in 1990 following the passage and implementation of AB 1725. Apprenticeship minimum qualifications are being revisited as a result of the recommendation 14(f), in the 2015 Strong Workforce Task Force report¹ which called for convening "representative apprenticeship teaching faculty, labor organizations, and other stakeholders to review the appropriateness of minimum qualifications for apprenticeship instructors." While the initial conversations between the statewide Academic Senate, representatives of the California Apprenticeship Council, and the broader apprenticeship community were tense, the ongoing dialog resulted in greater understanding between the Academic Senate and the California Apprenticeship Council of their respective roles in the establishment of apprenticeship instructor minimum qualifications and the promise to engage in other matters of mutual concern. As a result of this dialog, agreement was reached on revisions to the minimum qualifications for apprenticeship instructors in Title 5 section 53413 to be presented to

the delegates at the Spring 2018 Plenary Session for support, and to the Board of Governors for review and action. Moreover, a new and positive relationship has been established between the statewide Academic Senate and the California Apprenticeship Council and the apprenticeship community it represents.

As stated earlier, the minimum qualifications for apprenticeship faculty are established in Title 5 section 53413,² for both credit and noncredit apprenticeship courses. In the fall of 2016, representatives of the Chancellor's Office worked with representatives of the California Apprenticeship Council, which consists of commissioners from both labor and management in the industrial (or construction) trades, to develop a proposal for revised minimum qualifications. At that time, the Academic Senate expressed concerns over not being consulted. Furthermore, given the move by the Chancellor's Office to expand apprenticeship programs through the California Apprenticeship Initiative into areas such as child development and health care, the Academic Senate became concerned about potential unintended consequences of changing the apprenticeship minimum qualifications. In January 2017, after the CAC adopted the Fall 2016 proposal for the purposes of making a recommendation to the Board of Governors, the

1 The report of the Task Force on Workforce and a Strong Economy is available at http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/portals/6/docs/sw/BOG_TaskForce_Report_v12_web.pdf.

2 The current apprenticeship minimum qualifications in Title 5 section 53413 are found at [https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I7F687FA0D48411DEBC02831C6D6C108E?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategorizationPageItem&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I7F687FA0D48411DEBC02831C6D6C108E?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategorizationPageItem&contextData=(sc.Default))

Academic Senate engaged with the Chancellor's Office to intervene in the process before any further action occurred.

At first, it may seem puzzling that the California Apprenticeship Council asserted that it not only has a role in recommending minimum qualifications for apprenticeship instructors, but that it also has the primary role in that regard. After all, faculty minimum qualifications constitute an academic and professional matter, and Education Code section 87357(a)(1) states that with regard to minimum qualifications for faculty, the Board of Governors is to "rely primarily on the advice and judgment of, the statewide Academic Senate." However, in that same section it is also stated that "(w)ith regard to minimum qualifications for apprenticeship instructors, the board of governors shall consult with, and rely primarily on the advice and judgment of, appropriate apprenticeship teaching faculty and labor organization representatives."³ It is because of this latter clause that the CAC asserted itself as both the representative of apprenticeship teaching faculty and labor organizations. The latter clause was added to Education Code in 1993 with the passage of SB 343, following the adoption of the current apprenticeship minimum qualifications in 1990. One can reasonably assume that this was a reaction to the change in apprenticeship minimum qualifications that have lacked consultation by the Academic Senate with the apprenticeship community. The point of contention between the Academic Senate and the CAC then became about who represented apprenticeship teaching faculty.

In the spring of 2017, the Office of Academic Affairs in the Chancellor's Office agreed to an expedited version of the Disciplines List revision process which would include the following steps:

1. Academic Senate and apprenticeship instructors meet in April 2017 to develop a proposal to change the apprenticeship minimum qualifications. This meeting occurred on April 6, 2017 and a proposal was drafted. Among other changes, this proposal reduced the general education unit requirement from 18 to 12 units and allowed the general education requirement to be completed within

3 For the complete language of Ed Code section 87357, go to http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&division=7.&title=3.&part=51.&chapter=2.5.&article=2.

two years of employment. This proposal was subsequently endorsed by the ASCCC Executive Committee at its April 19, 2017 meeting.⁴

2. The Academic Senate conducts first hearings in the north and south in May 2017. Hearings were conducted on May 3, 2017 at Los Angeles City College and on May 4, 2017 at the San Jose Marriott.
3. Representatives of the Academic Senate and the CAC meet in a conference committee in the summer of 2017 meeting facilitated by the Chancellor's Office to reach a final agreement.
4. The CAC would take action in fall 2017 at their 4th Quarter meeting and the Academic Senate would complete the process with a second hearing and action by resolution at the fall 2017 plenary session.
5. Following Academic Senate and CAC action in fall 2017, the proposal would go to Consultation Council, and then to the Board of Governors, with final action taken by March 2018.

While steps 1 and 2 occurred, steps 3-5 did not occur as planned. Instead, the CAC established a special work group that convened during the summer of 2017 and worked with representatives of the Workforce and Economic Development Division in the Chancellor's Office to develop a revision based on the proposal developed at the April 6 meeting. The Chancellor's Office did not consult with the Academic Senate on this later work.

In the absence of further information from the Chancellor's Office, the Academic Senate put forward Resolution 10.01 F17 for consideration at the Fall 2017 Plenary Session to recommend the minimum qualifications revision proposed by the April 6 work

4 The April 6 workgroup proposal is available in the Disciplines List summary report prepared for the Fall 2017 Plenary session found at https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Apprenticeship%20MQ%20Disciplines_List_Revision_Proposals_Summary_Fall_2017jaa%20jf.pdf. The summary report also includes the original January 2017 CAC proposal and an alternative proposal prepared by the Chancellor's Office.

group.⁵ The week before the Plenary Session, the Academic Senate representatives attended the October 25-26 4th Quarter CAC meeting and engaged in dialog with the apprenticeship community, including the CAC Chair, regarding minimum qualifications. The latest CAC draft of the apprenticeship minimum qualifications was distributed and had considerable overlap with the recommendation from the April 6 work group that was being brought to plenary for action by the delegates. Because of this, the Academic Senate engaged in further conversations with the CAC Chair about the possibility of continued dialog, to which openness was expressed. Subsequently, a recommendation to submit to the Resolutions Committee a motion to withdraw Resolution 10.01 F17 was brought to the November 1, 2017 Executive Committee meeting, debated, and approved. The motion to withdraw Resolution 10.01 F17 was approved by the delegates on November 4. Also, the delegates adopted Resolution 10.02 F17, which called on the Academic Senate to “continue efforts to engage in sustained and respectful dialog and collaboration with the Department of Industrial Relations, the California Apprenticeship Council, and the broader apprenticeship community to provide the highest quality educational experiences in all apprenticeship programs offered by the California Community Colleges.”⁶

Subsequent to the Fall 2017 Plenary Session, the Chancellor’s Office put forward the draft change to the apprenticeship instructor minimum qualifications that had been developed in the summer on the November Consultation Council agenda.⁷ Ultimately, the Chancellor’s Office agreed to remove the proposal from the Consultation Council agenda until the Academic Senate and the CAC could continue to engage in the dialog started at the 4th Quarter CAC meeting. The Academic Senate met with the CAC Chair other CAC representatives on November 30,

2017 to discuss next steps. In addition to discussions about the minimum qualifications issue, productive dialog occurred about the difference between apprenticeship and career education, and about other concerns within the apprenticeship community, such as curriculum approval. The CAC representatives agreed to consider any remaining Academic Senate concerns through continued dialog and work with the Academic Senate on refining the apprenticeship minimum qualifications. Ultimately, agreement on final language was reached in early January, 2018.

At the 1st Quarter CAC meeting on January 25, 2018, the CAC voted to approve the final language, thanked the Academic Senate for its collaborative efforts, and expressed optimism at building a positive and constructive relationship between the Academic Senate and the apprenticeship community. At its February 2018 meeting, the Executive Committee voted to support the apprenticeship minimum qualifications proposal approved by the CAC and to express that support at the February Consultation Council meeting and at the first reading at the March Board of Governors meeting. Furthermore, the Executive Committee has put forward a resolution in support of final approval by the Board of Governors for consideration by the delegates at the Spring 2018 Plenary Session.

While the proposal for the apprenticeship minimum qualifications being presented to the delegates and the Board of Governors is not perfect, it represents a solid compromise. The proposal is an acknowledgement that apprenticeship is different from other college programs, and that the minimum qualifications for apprenticeship instructors should appropriately reflect the knowledge and skills apprenticeship instructors need to teach apprenticeship classes. More importantly, the continued dialog between the Academic Senate, the CAC, and the broader apprenticeship community has resulted in a positive relationship that will allow both groups to address difficult issues of mutual concern that may arise in the future in a manner that is collaborative, constructive, and respectful. 🐦

5 Go to <https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Resolutions%20Packet%20F17%20Saturday%2011-4-2017%20Final.pdf> for the resolutions presented for debate and voting on Saturday, November 4, 2017.

6 <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/dialog-and-collaboration-apprenticeship-faculty-minimum-qualifications>

7 It turned out that the incorrect version of the CAC MQ proposal was distributed at the 4th Quarter meeting. The correct version was the version the Chancellor’s Office brought to the November Consultation Council meeting.

Guided Pathways and AB 705: What's Noncredit Got to Do, Got To Do with It?

by **Randy Beach**, South Representative, ASCCC Noncredit Committee
and **John Freitas**, Treasurer, ASCCC Noncredit Committee Chair

In the face of broad and unprecedented change represented by the guided pathways movement and legislation such as Assembly Bill (AB) 705 (Irwin, 2017) that supports many of the principles of guided pathways, faculty are looking for opportunities to be creative and student-focused in their responses to that change. Noncredit curriculum and instruction, frequently looked upon as one of the “lesser angels” of a college’s offerings, is enjoying a renaissance of discussion and invention that is only just beginning as college’s begin ramping up discussions around guided pathways and AB 705 legislation.

NONCREDIT IN A GUIDED PATHWAYS FRAMEWORK

Beginning with the 2015-2016 state budget, the apportionment rate for Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) noncredit courses, also known as “enhanced noncredit,” was made equal to that of credit courses. The intent of the legislature was threefold: (1) to support the expansion of noncredit career education programs that typically have higher equipment costs and lower faculty to student ratios, (2) to improve program quality by providing an incentive to hire more full-time faculty in noncredit, and (3) to provide financial incentives to increase the availability of noncredit CTE in order to meet workforce needs.¹ While there are ten allowable categories of noncredit courses, CDCP certificates must consist of noncredit courses that fit within the following four noncredit

categories: elementary and secondary basic skills, workforce preparation, short-term vocational program, and English as a second language/vocational English as a second language. Regardless of the original legislative intent, the increased CDCP apportionment rate provides colleges with an opportunity to use CDCP noncredit instruction as a tool to provide guided pathways onramps into college credit transfer and career education programs for students who are unprepared or underprepared for college-level coursework.

One of the four pillars of guided pathways is to create clear curricular pathways to employment and further education.² While many often think of guided pathways in terms of credit programs of study, particularly those that lead to transfer, CDCP noncredit aligns fully with this pillar of guided pathways. In order for noncredit courses to qualify for CDCP apportionment rate, those courses must be part of either noncredit certificate of competency or certificate of completion programs of study. CDCP certificates provide coherent programmatic pathways that lead to clear, intentional outcomes, such as onramps into credit programs of study in career education or transfer programs (certificate of competency), or directly into the workforce by improving employability (certificate of completion).

For example, at San Diego Continuing Education, a noncredit college in the San Diego Community College District, the Auto Body and Paint Technician

1 See the March 2017 Legislative Analyst Office Report “California Community Colleges: Effects of Increases in Noncredit Funding Rates” at <http://www.lao.ca.gov/reports/2017/3635/CCC-Noncredit-Course-033017.pdf>.

2 For Chancellor’s Office information on guided pathways, go to <http://cccgp.cccco.edu/Guided-Pathways-Electronic-Toolkit>. See also Bailey, Jaggars, and Jenkins, *Redesigning America’s Community Colleges: A Clearer Path to Student Success*, 2015.

certificate program, is designed for entry-level employment in auto body repair. On the other hand, the Automotive Technician Program is designed for both entry-level employment and entry into the credit program at San Diego Miramar College, with the noncredit courses taken at San Diego Continuing Education being articulated for credit at San Diego Miramar College to meet the program requirements.³ At Mt. San Antonio College, the School of Continuing Education offers a certificate of competency in basic skills to improve reading, writing, and mathematics skills in order to prepare students for either the workforce or college-level programs. They also offer certificates of completion in fields such as healthcare, which are intended to prepare students for both direct entry into the workforce and as onramps into related credit degree and certificate programs.⁴ In each of these examples, the intent is to provide necessary onramping for students to succeed in their chosen pathways, with the additional benefit of being flexible and of no cost to students.

ASSESSMENT, PLACEMENT, AND NONCREDIT

In addition to the ways that noncredit may find its way into a local college's guided pathways framework, noncredit is receiving significant attention as colleges grapple with ways to comply with AB 705 (Irwin, 2017). The legislation places restrictions around placement of students into mathematics, English, and English as a Second Language (ESL). Colleges are required to use multiple measures placement that must include high school transcript data and are not allowed to place a student into a course sequence that prohibits them from completing a transfer-level math or English course in one year unless that multiple measures placement data shows they are "highly unlikely" to succeed in the transfer-level course without it. The same restrictions apply to English as a Second Language students; however ESL students are allowed three years to complete transfer-level English.

So how could noncredit fit in? Faculty might consider repurposing existing noncredit coursework or creating new noncredit courses to meet student

needs around developmental education. Noncredit courses may be useful as prerequisites or corequisites to credit courses in the math and English sequence to support students to complete the transfer courses within the one year time frame required by the law. Such courses could be packaged as CDCP certificates so that they qualify for the CDCP apportionment rate, making them cost-effective for the college. While it still remains to be seen how adding noncredit courses as requisites to credit will fit into a developmental education program in terms of the one-year timeline, starting conversations now around the possibilities, the barriers (real and perceived), and the necessary curriculum and resources needed to expand noncredit could prove fruitful in the future.

In addition to the requisite models, support classes in noncredit may also be useful to help students tackle the more strident coursework they might face when college's redesign their placement practices to comply with AB 705. The flexibility provided by noncredit could give rise to modularized coursework that supports students in their English, math, and ESL courses by providing the specialized instruction they need without having to take an entire semester or quarter-length course. And finally, an additional option for supporting students to complete their transfer level courses are student success classes that focus on study skills contextualized to English, math or ESL.

FINAL THOUGHTS TO CONSIDER

In a recent report "The Past, Present and Future of Noncredit Education in California" from the San Diego Continuing Education,⁵ 70% of colleges reported offering noncredit courses and/or programs. 51% offer ESL noncredit while 30% offer adult basic education and another 28% offer CTE coursework and programs. Those numbers indicate that there are promising examples of noncredit in action, even though there is much room for expanding noncredit offerings. Conversations can, in the near future, focus on "scaling up" courses in noncredit that are working while exploring new areas where noncredit curriculum and instruction can support students. 🐦

3 *Catalog descriptions of the noncredit certificate programs at San Diego Continuing Education are available at <http://www.sdce.edu/sites/default/files/sdcecatalog1618.pdf>.*

4 *For more information on Mt. San Antonio College noncredit programs, go to <http://catalog.mtsac.edu/programs/noncredit-programs/programsaz/>.*

5 *This report is available at https://sdce.edu/sites/default/files/iep/The_Past_Present_and_Future_of_Noncredit_in_CA.pdf.*

Supporting Part-Time Faculty for Student Success

by Sam Foster, Part-Time Faculty Committee Chair

Part-time faculty not only make up the majority of all faculty in the California community college system, but provide nearly half of all instruction¹. The success of our students, and ultimately our institutions themselves, depend on supporting the needs of part-time faculty just as we must for full time faculty. While ASCCC along with partners like 3CSN provide some support statewide, including hosting this year's Part Time Faculty Institute on August 2-4, 2018, many of the needs of part-time faculty also require local support.

Part-time faculty are as committed to student success as their full-time counterparts, but often do not have the same access to the tools necessary to ensure that success. Colleges generally want to do well by their part-time faculty, but often fall short of providing adequate support due to a lack of awareness of part-time faculty issues, little knowledge of effective practices to address them, and a perceived lack of resources. Given the increased emphasis on student success and completion, it is imperative that part-time faculty are given the tools necessary to aid them in this critical effort. The relationship between student success and part-time faculty resources makes providing such tools clearly an academic and professional matter and is within the purview of local senates

Even though part-time faculty have equal standing in the classroom with their full-time peers, there is often a significant disparity in the support provided. In fact, some part timers are hired just prior to the semester, receive a course outline and a key, and are expected to begin teaching within a few days. How can we expect reasonable outcomes if this occurs? In this case, both the newly hired part-time faculty member and the students they serve are at a disadvantage.

Following last year's ASCCC Part-Time Faculty Institute, a survey was distributed to part-time faculty in which they express the need for support in four main areas: Onboarding, curricular guidance in their content area, integration into the college culture, and professional development. While many colleges may provide one or more of these areas of support, there is a need to identify effective practices that can be shared.

ONBOARDING

When new part-time faculty are hired, it is important that they understand about critical campus infrastructure (i.e., who to contact for what), including emergency procedures and technology resources. Some colleges offer a part-time faculty handbook that contains this type of vital information that would be useful to any new faculty member on campus; other campuses offer an orientation for new faculty that is open to all faculty who have questions or need more information. A single point of contact,

¹ http://datamart.cccco.edu/Faculty-Staff/Staff_Annual.aspx

such as a mentor or departmental resource, with whom one can connect for general questions is also a good practice.

CURRICULAR GUIDANCE IN CONTENT AREA

Notwithstanding academic preparation or experience, providing curricular guidance to a part-time faculty member teaching a new course at a new school will serve the department well. To maintain quality instruction in any content area, faculty need to understand the department standards for a given course. While the course outline provides a general overview, consistent standards can only be maintained in a department if all faculty understand the breadth and depth at which material should be covered in a given course. This is especially important when a course is part of a sequence needed for a degree, transfer, or certificate as students entering subsequent courses are expected to have a specific set of skills. Some effective practices include providing faculty that are new to a course with sample syllabi, exams, and assignments. Some departments also provide an experienced faculty member as a mentor. This can help ensure the new faculty members' expectations are aligned with those of the department.

INTEGRATING INTO THE COLLEGE CULTURE

There is a correlation between integration of part-time faculty into the college culture and student learning, as demonstrated in the AACU report *A Roadmap to Engaging Part-Time Faculty in High Impact Processes*.² One key way this is done is by having a dedicated space that faculty can use to meet with students. Another important avenue is to provide space for faculty in the campus governance structure. Campus committees and local academic senates generally welcome part-time faculty and many have dedicated senate seats for part-timers. Even without dedicated seats, if the campus has a culture of inclusion part-timers may be happy to join senates or other committees. Anecdotally, some academic senates have reported that 20% or

more of their senators are part-time faculty even without dedicated seats. Providing leadership opportunities is a key of campus integration that may also serve as a form of professional development. As the majority of part-time faculty ultimately would like full-time employment, leadership opportunities may seem especially attractive.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

While there are often numerous opportunities for professional development for full-time faculty, many of those opportunities do not exist for part-time faculty. Moreover, the needs of part-time faculty do not always mirror those of their full-time colleagues. To address this issue a few colleges have initiated an adjunct academy, specifically addressing the needs of part-time faculty. This academy takes place over two days and faculty receive a stipend for participating. In addition, some schools offer up to \$1000 for professional development of part-time faculty that can cover a variety of opportunities including conferences. Other opportunities, such as providing professional development online or at campus centers rather than just the main campus, may also provide additional professional development opportunities for part-time faculty.

Helping our students achieve success is the ultimate goal of every California community college. As part-time faculty provide a significant portion of all instruction, providing them with appropriate tools must be a part of any metric for student success. Although there are effective practices for supporting part-time faculty needs around the state, there is a need for such practices to be shared. Local academic senates should be in the forefront of such efforts on their campuses and leverage statewide efforts such as the Part-Time Leadership Institute to extend their reach. The success of our students depends on having faculty with tools to help them reach their goals. 🐦

² <https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/roadmap-engaging-part-time-faculty-high-impact-practices>

Supplemental Instruction Revisited

by **Randy Beach**, ASCCC Executive Committee

and **Christopher Howerton**, ASCCC Educational Policies Committee

The value of learning support and tutoring services to student success cannot be overestimated given the various levels of preparation our students bring to the classroom. In-person tutoring, online tutoring, embedded tutoring and other academic supports for students have grown in popularity in the California community college system, and colleges are looking at current and prospective learning support models as they build their guided pathways frameworks or look for strategies to address the mandates of AB 705.

A 2015 survey conducted by California Community College's Success Network's (3CSN) Learning Assistance Project, in partnership with the ASCCC and the Association of Colleges for Tutoring & Learning Assistance (ACTLA), focused specifically on the practice of embedded tutoring called

An SI program offers direct support for specific courses where tutors are embedded in course sections and work closely with faculty to support students in the class.

Supplemental Instruction, a program designed and supported by the University of Missouri Kansas City (UMKC). According to the UMKC website, Supplemental Instruction (SI) “is an academic assistance program that utilizes peer-assisted study sessions. SI sessions are regularly scheduled, informal review sessions in which students compare notes, discuss readings, develop organizational tools, and predict test items. Students learn how to integrate course content and study skills while working together.”¹ Several ASCCC resolutions²³ from 2011 in support of SI make now a good time to review the program, especially within the context of recent systemwide changes.

The term “Supplemental Instruction” (uppercase “SI”) refers to the program created and owned by the UMKC. UMKC’s SI program has specific training curriculum and program parameters that SI leaders and supervisors learn during trainings which are provided for a fee. SI training includes procedures for selecting SI courses and training SI leaders as well as effective learning strategies and SI session activities. An SI program offers direct support for specific courses where tutors

1 <https://info.umkc.edu/si/>

2 <https://asccc.org/resolutions/supplemental-instruction-and-student-success-task-force-recommendation-51>

3 <https://asccc.org/resolutions/supplemental-instruction-survey-and-glossary>

Some colleges report thriving and comprehensive embedded tutoring programs that were created without any knowledge of the UMKC model.

are embedded in course sections and work closely with faculty to support students in the class. SI leaders are students who have taken the class, preferably with the same instructor, and have earned at least a B. These embedded SI leaders attend all lectures, act as role models to students, hold study sessions, act as facilitators for student study sessions, and meet regularly with the faculty. Also, in the UMKC model, SI leaders are paid for their preparation time and often create session plans that are hands-on and interactive. Students are highly motivated to attend these sessions since the support work in study sessions is specific to the course.

However, the survey conducted in 2015 shows that many colleges have adopted a variety of approaches under the name of “supplemental instruction” (lowercase “si”) but have not formally implemented the official UMKC Supplemental Instruction model in order to support their local programs. Some colleges report thriving and comprehensive embedded tutoring programs that were created without any knowledge of the UMKC model. Similarities in both the official UMKC Supplemental Instruction and homegrown “si” include: tutors working with faculty to support students in a specific section of a class; tutors receiving training to help students develop their learning skills; and some form of supervision. Tutor trainings vary as well. These trainings may be designed to help students

surface their own existing strategies (rather than modeling strategies) and can also emphasize helping students learn strategies to include: stress management, test-taking, deep breathing techniques and other support. The common theme among all supplemental instruction programs is that they go beyond the one-to-one model traditionally thought of around tutoring.

While the 2015 survey gives some insight into supplemental instruction efforts (lowercase and uppercase) within the system, today’s landscape of change within our system would suggest that a similar survey today would yield very different results. Since 2015, the expansion of Student Support and Success Programs, Equity, and Basic Skills Initiative funding (SSSP /Equity/ BSI), as well as the Basic Skills and Student Outcomes Transformation (BSSOT) program, have provided colleges with much needed resources to explore both upper and lowercase supplemental instruction approaches and to expand what they know is working locally for their students. As a whole, the impact of supplemental instruction has led to more high touch learning assistance models. As the results of the survey were collected before the passage of AB 705, the integration of SSSP /Equity/ BSI, the College Promise program, and the Guided Pathways discussions that have swept through the system, colleges are encouraged to review the foundations of embedded tutoring practices found in all versions of supplemental instruction and to consider student services that provide more high touch, direct support to students where it can really matter, in the classroom.

The results of the California Community College’s Success Network’s Learning Assistance Project survey can be found at the 3CSN website⁴. 🐦

⁴ <http://lap.3csn.org/2017/04/30/2015-survey-results-of-california-community-college-tutoring-learning-assistance-programs/>

Editorial: California Community Colleges—and Inequity?

by Jeff Burdick, Clovis Community College

Our former Chancellor, Dr. Brice Harris, used to open some of his addresses with the line, “California—the Land of Unintended Consequences.” He would follow that with a litany of the latest measures that were designed to empower our colleges or our students but that did the opposite, placing students or our mission in jeopardy.

We are living through a curious period in the California community colleges when a series of measures that are designed to help our students succeed may also threaten our most vulnerable students, the ones who must work to make ends meet, the ones who must care for families, the ones who are underprepared for college, and the ones who struggle with disabilities. All of these measures are based on solid data that tell us that these measures will help most of our students, and that data doesn't lie: accelerating students through basic skills, using better placement mechanisms, and encouraging full-time schedules all work, and I support them.

But each of these measures focus our success on the “normal” student. Not all students fit that statistical norm: the outliers, those little dots on the graph that don't seem to fit, represent our students, too. They have faces and names, stories and struggles. We know them, and we know how hard they work. When we note that X% of students will succeed with a certain intervention, we are also noting that Y% are likely to fail. The unintended consequences of the “average” or “normal” student being the measure of all things has led to placing a significant number of our students in jeopardy. It has put our mission in jeopardy.

As a part of the California Promise (AB19) students who take fifteen units each semester will be rewarded with a one thousand dollar assistance because we know that those students are the most likely to complete their paths. But students who can take fifteen units often aren't those students who must hustle through a long day of work before coming to class, who care for families, who struggle with a learning disability or mental distress. Instead, the recipients of this help are often the students who are most likely already being helped by their parents or who have independent means. What was meant as a help up and an incentive is actually based on a strange logic: we will reward you if you have the means to go to college full-time. That leaves many deserving students outside.

The Governor has proposed a new funding model to reward those colleges that are most effective in the completion agenda: Colleges would be rewarded for the number of degrees, transfers, and certificates earned over a three-year period. This incentivizes us to get our act together, to help students follow a path to success, and to streamline our offerings. Since we want success for our students, this makes perfect sense—except for the unintended consequences: a three-year window for completion is impossible for many of our most vulnerable students who are struggling to make ends meet, who may well be homeless or insecure in their food supply, who have children or parents to care for, who struggle with mental or physical handicaps—especially, students who attend college part-time, which is the clear majority of the students in our system. Those students who struggle the most

and who have traditionally been the targets of our greatest help now become a liability to our colleges because they cannot complete in three years. Aren't these the very students we are dedicated to serve? Should we turn them away in favor of those students who have independent means or whose parents have the wealth to support them through the velocity required? I can't imagine any college turning away from our mission, but I also can't imagine what happens when colleges are punished because their students reach success in four or five years instead of three. How does this serve our most vulnerable students? How does this serve our community or the state?

I am a firm believer in the acceleration of basic skills, and I can speak from experience: not only did I teach basic skills English almost exclusively for the first six years of my career, but I helped write the acceleration model for our college and helped establish multiple measure placement that uses high school grade point averages. Clearly, our students can be accelerated to good ends, and the data is clear that most students do much better with accelerated classes and accurate placement.

But "most students" does not include those who cannot complete basic skills in English or in math in a single semester as required. Certainly, co-requisite courses that support students in classes are useful tools for many students. However, the most vulnerable students among us, those who struggle with the complexities of the English language or with the difficulties of the math sequences, those who have complicated lives, those who are juggling a myriad of problems and challenges, are left behind: they must succeed at the level of transfer-level English and math classes practically overnight (after failing to do so through 12 years of K-12 education). In short, the most vulnerable students must swim in the deep end of the pool or drown.

Lowering standards in our articulated transfer-level classes is unthinkable: social promotion placed these students in jeopardy during the K-12 experience, and compounding that does these students no favors—and it denigrates the value of a California community college education. We pride ourselves

on rigor and quality, and with support, students can meet our standards – but some students require a bit more time and more focused support so they can build confidence and succeed.

What happens to those students who find themselves in over their heads? They go away. They convince themselves that they are not college material. We fail them. We fail our mission. We fail our professions.

The data is clear: Many of our students can succeed with these new measures; a significant minority cannot. We fail our mission if we do not honor the lives they are living by offering them time to develop complex skills, to get their feet under them as students, to become a part of the college community—and time to see themselves in the future we have promised them.

I do not believe that these measures were established maliciously, and I support most of the methods and goals, but the unintended consequences of these measures to increase success for the majority has caused the California community colleges to forget those who do not fit a statistical measure of "normal," and the victims are the students we should be helping the most because economic and personal growth are why we are here.

We can accelerate and place students properly, we can reward full-time schedules, and we certainly can fund colleges for success—but we absolutely should not set up brand new barriers for our most vulnerable students or disincentives for colleges to serve them.

We have focused relentlessly on equity for the past few years to our credit, yet we have recently created new roads toward inequity, punishing those we are pledged to serve. Is that our mission? Can we rally behind leaving our students behind by design? I don't think so.

Jeff Burdick is a Professor of English at Clovis Community College, and a former member of the California Community Colleges Board of Governors. 🐦

The Disciplines List Revision Process is Now Annual and Starts Now!

by John Freitas, ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee Chair

At its Fall 2016 Plenary Session, the ASCCC approved Resolution 10.01 F16 which changed the process to revise the Disciplines List from a biennial to an annual process. This important process begins again and faculty can propose new disciplines or make revisions to those that exist. Proposed revisions to the Disciplines List can now be submitted to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) office for possible consideration by the delegates at the Spring 2019 Plenary Session.

Information about the Disciplines List revision process, including timelines, required forms, and FAQs, can be found on the ASCCC website at <http://www.asccc.org/disciplines-list>. All submissions require a completed form that includes the approval of a local academic senate or professional discipline organization, evidence of statewide need for the proposed change, documentation that the degrees to satisfy the proposed minimum qualifications are available, and an explanation of the impact of the proposed revision delineated as a list of pros and cons. While the support of a local senate is sufficient for submission, having the support of one or more professional organizations may strengthen a proposal. It is also important

that local senates ensure that proposals to change the Disciplines List originate from the affected discipline faculty.

Here are some important reminders about the process:

- Each proposal must be seconded by an academic senate from a different district than the initiating academic senate;
- The initiator or an informed designee is required to be present for both hearings where the proposed revision is presented; and
- If the body has previously rejected the proposal, it may be resubmitted for consideration if it has changed significantly, such as the inclusion of a new rationale and new evidence.

In order to be considered during the 2018-2019 cycle, completed proposals with all required paperwork must be submitted to the ASCCC office and received by September 30, 2018. Proposals submitted after the deadline may be held until the 2019-2020 cycle. For assistance in completing a proposal, please contact the ASCCC office at disciplineslist@asccc.org or the Standards and Practices Committee Chair at freitaje@lacitycollege.edu. 🐦

THE ROSTRUM IS PUBLISHED FOUR TIMES A YEAR AND DISTRIBUTED TO ALL FACULTY THROUGH COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENTS AND BY INDIVIDUAL MAILING.

FOR DEADLINE INFORMATION CALL (916) 445-4753 OR EMAIL INFO@ASCCC.ORG

NOTE: THE ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN THE ROSTRUM DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT THE ADOPTED POSITIONS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE. FOR ADOPTED POSITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, PLEASE VISIT OUR WEBSITE.

YOU CAN FIND THIS AND THE PREVIOUS ISSUES OF THIS PUBLICATION ONLINE AT: WWW.ASCCC.ORG

PRESIDENT: JULIE BRUNO · EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: JULIE ADAMS · CREATIVE DIRECTOR: RITA SABLER