

FEBRUARY 2018

Senate **Rostrum**

SOUND DECISIONS BEGIN WITH LISTENING

BY JULIE BRUNO, PRESIDENT



Local Implementation
of AB 705— What
We Know and What
Remains to Be
Answered **p3**

ASCCC Efforts to
Support and Advocate
for Noncredit
Instruction —
A Review **p6**

MYTHBUSTING OPEN EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS	9
UNTANGLING THE KNOTS	11
BUSTING EQUIVALENCY MYTHS	14
FACULTY PRIMACY AND AP CREDIT	16
LOCAL SENATE SUCCESSION PLANNING	18

Sound Decisions Begin with Listening

By Julie Bruno, President

“The greatest compliment that was ever paid me was when one asked me what I thought, and attended to my answer.”

- Henry David Thoreau

We can expect from many indications that 2018 will be a year filled with challenges. Dialogue regarding educational pathways, quantitative reasoning, assessment and placement, curricular innovations, online instruction, and no-cost and low-cost educational resources as well as any number of additional topics will dominate our time and energy at the college and system levels. Many of the decisions will be significant, directly affecting students, faculty, and staff by impacting curriculum, programs, student services, teaching, and learning. Faculty will need to take the lead in discussions dealing with academic and professional matters and work in cooperation with colleagues to ensure effective decision-making processes and sound decisions.

With so much at stake, we must create the conditions necessary to allow all participants to contribute and respond, collegially and respectfully, no matter how difficult the conversations or the decisions. We will by no means agree on every decision or every course of action. In fact, some of the discussions will result in

arguments and disagreements. This situation is not something to be avoided; rather, the conflict that comes from rigorously exploring diverse opinions and perspectives is a critical part of the process of formulating sound decisions. Disagreements are only productive if all involved take the time to understand one another and work through any differences. Fundamental to understanding one another is the ability and willingness to genuinely listen.

THE ROLE OF LISTENING IN DECISION-MAKING

We do not often discuss or highlight the role that listening plays in decision-making, but it is critical

to the effectiveness of the process. When considering the productiveness of our interactions with others, we tend to think about how those we work with are speaking rather than how our listening, or the lack thereof, affects the situation. But consider the reciprocal relationship between speaking and listening; the quality of a conversation depends on both. In a successful conversation, individuals feel that they are respected and their contributions are welcomed and appreciated.

**With so much at stake,
we must create the
conditions necessary
to allow all participants
to contribute and
respond, collegially
and respectfully, no
matter how difficult
the conversations or
the decisions.**

Listening — genuinely, openly and actively — conveys respect and promotes understanding. It does not necessarily result in agreement, but it does acknowledge the value of the other person and communicate that his or her perspective is appreciated. Attentive listening also indicates a commitment to creating

an environment conducive to a genuine and open exchange of ideas, beliefs, and actions. When effective listening is absent or breaks down, the entire decision-making process is profoundly weakened.

Creating and sustaining an environment where ideas and perspectives can be explored and challenged is difficult. Many times, expectations and assumptions may undermine our ability to listen to others and theirs to hear to us. We come to conversations with our minds made up. We believe that we have thoroughly explored the issue, analyzed it from all angles, and determined the best course of action, and we are quite certain that no one will have any information that could alter our thinking. We may easily or without thought dismiss information that does not square with our own beliefs or ideas, and we may resist considering new ideas or information unless we make a conscious effort to do so. This tendency can be especially true when we perceive, rightly or wrongly, that our opinions, and perhaps our expertise or reputation, are being challenged. Other times, the nature of the relationships we have with our colleagues may affect our ability to listen. When we know our colleagues well, we often assume we know what they are saying or will say in a particular situation, and we plan our response accordingly. In all of these situations, the conditions needed for genuine listening are not present. Further, dialogue and deliberation quickly devolve when individuals believe that what they have to say is not valued. Defenses rise, listening stops, and the decision-making process may slow down, be called into question, or in some

Many times, expectations and assumptions may undermine our ability to listen to others and theirs to hear to us.

cases come to a halt. When these situations happen, the conversation may be difficult to move back to a place of productive engagement, but doing so is possible.

GENUINE LISTENING

Genuine listening requires a commitment from individuals and the community, at our colleges as well as in our system as a whole. During

these dynamic times, the latter is more essential than ever, especially in a structure with the scope of California's community college system. At the state level, with layers of decision makers from different constituencies, we all must set aside our egos, preconceived notions, and assumptions and come to each conversation with curiosity, candor, and sincerity, not certainty and superiority. In community, we must commit to establishing and sustaining an environment, based on mutual respect that supports an open and vigorous exchange of ideas without dismissiveness or censorship. By listening to each other and speaking honestly, we confirm the value of the individuals with whom we interact even when the perspectives that are being articulated are not necessarily shared. We should strive for an environment of collaboration and cooperation, valuing all individuals and perspectives.

One of our greatest strengths in the California community colleges is our governance process, intentionally designed to ensure that diverse viewpoints are represented and considered. In our governance work, the tension inherent in holding differing points of view is what ensures the efficacy of decision-making. Controversial opinions should be sought out and discussed, but we cannot work through the discomfort controversy causes without the deep understanding that comes through genuine listening. By listening to one another and to all of our colleagues with sincere, conscious attention and respect, we will be better able to engage in true collaboration and make sound decisions that benefit our students, our programs, and our colleges. 🐦

Local Implementation of AB 705— What We Know and What Remains to Be Answered

By Dolores Davison, ASCCC Basic Skills Committee Chair,

Ginni May, ASCCC Math Task Force Chair,

and Craig Rutan, ASCCC Curriculum Committee Chair and AB 705 Workgroup Member

Educational systems and stakeholders are continually working to improve the courses, programs, and services provided to students and the community. One recent legislated effort is the passage of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017), which requires changes in assessment, placement, and basic skills instruction at California community colleges. However, how best to put the legislated requirements into local practice is not clear for all California community colleges. As a result, AB 705 has many colleges asking important questions regarding the precise nature of its requirements and their implementation, as they plan for how to comply with the new law.

AB 705 became effective on January 1, 2018, and it obligates California community colleges to implement fully its provisions by the fall of 2019. These provisions include mandating the use of high school transcript data—including high school grade point average (GPA), grades in select high school courses, and high school courses completed—in the placement of students into English composition, English as a second language (ESL), and mathematics. Colleges will also be required to maximize the likelihood that students will complete transfer level courses in math and English within a one-year timeframe.

At first glance, AB 705 seems fairly simple, but careful examination of the legislated requirements has generated a number of unanswered questions by community college faculty as they work to comply with the new legislation. Here is a partial list of questions

that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has already received related to the local implementation of AB 705:

- How should a college respond if it does not have access to official high school transcript data?
- What if no high school transcript data is available for a student?
- Are colleges required to place students no more than one level below transfer?
- Is a year defined as a calendar year or as two semesters/three quarters?
- Will part time students have a different definition of a year based on units taken or completed?
- Will colleges be required to enroll students in both math and English during their first year?
- What does it mean to maximize the likelihood of completing a transfer level course in math and English in a one-year timeframe?
- Are all colleges required to use high school transcript data in the same way?
- Will the use of assessment tests also still be permitted?
- What data are colleges required to collect?

- How are corequisite support courses to be validated?
- Is there a unit-limit on corequisite support courses?
- Can corequisite support courses be offered through noncredit?
- What if high school data is no longer relevant due to a significant lapse of time between high school and community college?

In response, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (Chancellor's Office or CCCCO) has formed an AB 705 Implementation Workgroup to develop guidance and regulations to assist colleges with local implementation of the requirements of AB 705. The Chancellor's Office anticipates that the workgroup will conclude its work in February 2018. Recommendations developed by the workgroup will be forwarded to the California Community Colleges Curriculum Committee (5C) for final review and approval. While these recommendations will provide guidance to community colleges for English and math, they will exclude ESL, as high school transcript models have been found to be ineffective in the placement of ESL students. Instead, a separate, ESL workgroup is being formed to develop tools for the accurate placement of English language learners.

In addition to the recommendations of the workgroups, the Chancellor's Office is currently working to establish a data sharing agreement with the California Department of Education to provide California community colleges access to transcript data without going through Cal-PASS Plus. Such a change would be of great benefit to those colleges that do not already have access to Cal-PASS Plus, as these agreements can often take a year or longer to establish.

Yet, even as the AB 705 Implementation Workgroup begins to develop its recommendations, colleges are also under immediate pressure to begin implementation of new assessment procedures and to develop new curriculum to address AB 705. What can colleges do now while the workgroup is developing these guidelines?

If a college does not already have access to official transcript data, the college could request that questions to collect self-reported data be enabled in CCCApply. Under AB 705, colleges that do not have access to official transcript data are permitted, but not required, to use self-reported data or guided placement to place students. Many colleges are already using placement models based on transcript data, like those available through the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP), to place students. While using the MMAP is one option, faculty can (and should) examine this model as well as other models and modify as needed using student data to optimize student success. MMAP models can be found at <http://rpgroup.org/All-Projects/ctl/ArticleView/mid/1686/articleId/118/Multiple-Measures-Assessment-Project-MMAP>. Above all, models used for placement are a local decision.

Once new placement models are in place, colleges are required to monitor student success rates and any disproportionate impact. While the Chancellor's Office has never collected data on the local use of multiple measures, it is possible that colleges will be expected to submit data related to the effectiveness of new placement models based on high school data. Moving from assessment tests to the use of high school data has shown promise, but colleges must determine the effectiveness of their placement models and be prepared to adjust them based upon student performance.

Another factor for colleges to consider are those student cohorts who may not be served by high school placement models. California community college students are of diverse backgrounds, including veterans, international students, refugees, and returning students, many of whom have a significant gap between high school and college. Indeed, for many of our students, high school placement models may prove significantly less effective or impossible. Currently, colleges use assessment tests to place non-traditional populations, yet it is unclear whether assessment testing will continue to be an option once AB 705 has been fully implemented. One option for affected colleges to consider when transcript data is unavailable is guided placement. Two California community colleges, Moorpark College and Mira Costa College, have explored the use of guided self-placement: students answer a series of questions,

and a placement recommendation is generated. This approach is similar to the directed self-placement used by several California State University (CSU) campuses for placement into English. As AB 705 does not define “guided placement,” colleges may determine the method of implementation that will best serve their students.

With full implementation required by fall of 2019, for most colleges, any new or revised curriculum will need to be approved during spring and fall of 2018. To get started, discipline faculty should examine whether their current course sequences make sense for students. While AB 705 requires colleges to maximize the likelihood that students complete transfer level math and English within a one-year timeframe, colleges are not required to place all students directly into transfer level courses, nor are they required to have a single pre-transfer level course. Groups like the Carnegie Math Pathways and the California Acceleration Project have developed accelerated and/or alternative course sequences that reduce the time for students to complete a transfer level course. While this approach has worked well for some colleges, other colleges argue that these models are not effective for their student population, nor viable for their college. AB 705 permits colleges to offer corequisite courses for students as additional support. Colleges may be able to use noncredit courses for the corequisites, which would allow students to access additional support without additional fees or units. Faculty should examine all possibilities and be open to exploring different options to meet the needs of all students to ensure students are equipped to learn and succeed, as they move to a transfer institution or workplace. Too, smaller colleges may have fewer options due to limited resources. As there is no single model that will work for all students or all colleges, faculty should consider developing options and providing guidance to students on the benefits of each of the options. Additional guidelines on possible course revisions and the corequisite support models will be shared by the ASCCC as they are developed.


To examine potential changes to math and quantitative reasoning requirements for associate and baccalaureate degrees, the ASCCC has formed a California Community College Math Task Force with

the California Mathematics Council of Community Colleges (both north and south affiliates). This task force will work to accomplish the following charges:

1. Research the various and diverse perspectives on appropriate content for math/quantitative reasoning education for non-STEM majors;
2. Develop recommendations on math/QR standards for non-STEM majors;
3. Develop a plan for how to provide opportunities for more students to consider STEM fields;
4. Provide a report to stakeholders to consider that includes the research results and recommendations.

Additional information regarding these charges and the group’s progress will be available this spring. In the meantime, we encourage local faculty to discuss possible solutions while avoiding any final decisions until more definitive information is distributed by the Chancellor’s Office.

California community colleges are poised to undergo significant changes in curriculum, as well as student placement and support. Compliance with AB 705 involves changes to many variables, all of which need to be considered by local faculty through a faculty-driven process involving sound analyses of relevant data. To this end, collaboration between local faculty and research staff is essential to determine what data to collect and analyze, as sound data collection and analyses require highly-trained and expensive expertise.

As guidance emerges from the Chancellor’s Office, community colleges will be able to decide which options work best for local implementation. Even so, colleges should continue to collect and analyze data for disproportionate impact to ensure equity and student success. There are no simple answers, and no group knows exactly what will be required to implement fully AB 705. Yet, colleges have enough information to start considering options. Colleges should use this spring term as the time to consider and explore what has worked and not worked and to think about future possibilities, while staying engaged with ASCCC for the most current available information. 

ASCCC Efforts to Support and Advocate for Noncredit Instruction — A Review

By Cheryl Aschenbach, ASCCC North Representative and 2016-2017 Noncredit Committee Chair
and John Freitas, ASCCC Treasurer and 2017-2018 Noncredit Committee Chair

Noncredit courses and certificates have been a hot topic of conversation for the last two years, as colleges explore using noncredit for their Adult Education Block Grants (AEBG) and to take advantage of equalized Career Development College Preparation (CDCP) course funding. With nearly 90% of noncredit FTES being generated by less than 10% of our California community colleges in past years, considerations of noncredit implementation and/or expansion is new to a large majority of our colleges. While much of the state is only now talking about noncredit, the ASCCC has advocated for noncredit curriculum and the support of noncredit faculty for many years. Now, with the increased interest in the development of noncredit, it is important to consider whether local senates are adequately supporting and including noncredit faculty. Past and current efforts by the ASCCC to advocate for and educate local faculty leaders about noncredit instructional programs and their support are reviewed in this article.

NONCREDIT ISSUES ADVOCACY

Since 1990, more than 70 noncredit-related resolutions have been passed by delegates at ASCCC fall and spring plenary sessions. All noncredit resolutions can be found by searching noncredit from the Resolutions link on the ASCCC website. The topics of the resolutions are probably not a surprise to long-time noncredit faculty or administrators. For those less familiar with the long-standing challenges faced in noncredit, a review of common topics and individual resolutions can help to provide historical perspective and a greater understanding of issues

related to the implementation of noncredit, many of which continue to be relevant: funding; accountability measures/progress indicators; the hiring of full-time non-credit faculty; curricular standards; minimum qualifications; student services; and support for professional development.

- **Funding**— Since Fall 1997, when the earliest noncredit funding-related resolution was passed, the ASCCC has been calling for an increase in noncredit funding. Additional funding-related resolutions followed over the years, and the ASCCC used the resolutions to first advocate for SB 361 (Scott, 2006), which initiated enhanced funding for courses designated as career development and college preparation (CDCP, or “Enhanced Noncredit”), and later CDCP funding equal to credit, which took effect July 1, 2015.
- **Accountability measures/progress indicators**— Resolution 13.04 (Spring 2010) advocated for the establishment of regular progress indicator designations for noncredit courses to measure both student progress and program accountability. Resolution 19.01 (Spring 2012) also advocated for training in the use of noncredit progress indicators, an effort that is being considered again with the addition of the Satisfactory Progress (SP) indicator in 2016.
- **Full-time faculty**—Because full-time noncredit faculty are not counted in the Faculty Obligation Number (FON), there has been no incentive for districts to hire noncredit faculty. ASCCC resolutions have advocated for the hiring of

full-time noncredit faculty, for the inclusion of noncredit faculty in the FON, and for the inclusion of noncredit faculty in senate and campus governance. Additional resolutions recognized the disparity in pay and load between noncredit and credit faculty, including 19.01 (Fall 2006) which urged ASCCC “to work with bargaining colleagues, CFT/CCC, CCA/CTA, and CCCI, to seek support for paid office hours for faculty in noncredit instruction and to encourage faculty to negotiate full-time loads for noncredit faculty that permit involvement in curriculum development, classroom preparation, outreach, and collaboration with other departments and college areas and in college governance.”

- Curricular standards—Early resolutions focused on ensuring that noncredit curriculum development is consistent with and utilizes the same processes as credit, while later resolutions focused on guidance for accountability measures, noncredit curriculum, the use of noncredit as prerequisites and corequisites to credit courses, and recognition of the rigor and standards of noncredit offerings.
- Minimum Qualifications— One of the first two noncredit-resolutions available on the website (Spring 1990) urged ASCCC to help establish and define faculty minimum qualifications for noncredit disciplines, while later resolutions urged ASCCC to support the inclusion of the noncredit minimum qualifications into the Disciplines List for consistency with all other disciplines.
- Student Services—The ASCCC has advocated for a wide variety of noncredit student service-related topics, including the alignment of funding standards for noncredit student services to credit standards, the collection of student services data for noncredit students, and the modification of CCCApply for noncredit students.
- Professional Development—Resolution 12.01 (Spring 2017) urged the creation of a noncredit module for the ASCCC Professional Development College. That module is now under development and should be available in spring 2018.

While this may be a historical overview of common themes for noncredit resolutions over the last twenty years and progress has been made for noncredit students, faculty, and programs, the reality is that

many of the same concerns continue to be relevant. Because noncredit can increase access to many students, especially students in the underserved populations identified in equity plans, and can be utilized to support and increase student success efforts while also potentially playing a role in Strong Workforce, Adult Education Block Grants (AEBG), and basic skills efforts at individual campuses, there are few colleges that have yet to contemplate starting or expanding noncredit offerings. Local academic senates should be engaged in all curricular and program development discussions, including those involving noncredit. Therefore, it is important that local academic senates are aware of continued ASCCC noncredit professional development efforts.

NONCREDIT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

As colleges seek to develop or expand noncredit, local academic senates should be aware of professional development efforts and opportunities on noncredit provided by the ASCCC. Resolution 1.03 (Spring 2010) called for the ASCCC to establish a Noncredit Standing Committee, one now charged to “serve as a resource to the President and Executive Committee on issues related to instruction, counseling, student services, and program development in noncredit and the role of faculty in noncredit instruction as related to governance and local participation in academic and professional activities.”[2] The Noncredit Standing Committee regularly presents to and engages the field through *Rostrum* articles, as well as breakout presentations at ASCCC events, including plenaries and Curriculum Institute. The committee also works to promote dialogue on the subject of noncredit across the state, including at annual noncredit regional meetings at which experienced noncredit practitioners mix with curious others to discuss general information and challenges specific to noncredit. Noncredit Committee members also attended the 2017 IEPI New World of Noncredit Conference where they presented on the noncredit efforts of the ASCCC.

Continued ASCCC leadership through regional meetings resulted in a much larger noncredit-related convening in Spring 2017, “Building Bridges”, a first-ever Noncredit Summit. The “Building Bridges” Noncredit Summit was a collaborative effort made possible by the collaboration of partners — Academic Senate, Association of Community and Continuing Education (ACCE), Career Ladders Project, CCC Success Network (3CSN), and multiple divisions of

the Chancellor's Office. Funding was provided by the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI). As a result of the success of the inaugural Noncredit Summit, ASCCC continues to collaborate with its partners to hold an even more robust second summit, including an expanded focus on the role of noncredit in CTE, counseling, and adult education.

One intention of the Noncredit Summit was to launch a Noncredit Community of Practice. As a result, First Friday Noncredit Webinars were initiated during summer 2017. Each webinar includes a sixty-minute presentation on topics in demand by practitioners followed by thirty minutes of question and answer time to foster inclusive dialog between attendees and noncredit experts. Each webinar is archived. Future efforts to sustain the Noncredit Community of Practice include a forthcoming website dedicated to noncredit resources. In the meantime, information and links to archived webinars are available at the ASCCC Noncredit Committee webpage, the Chancellor's Office noncredit webpage, and the ACCE website³.

To address local needs, the ASCCC offers technical visits for diverse topics, including those topics related to noncredit. To assist the ASCCC in technical visits related to noncredit, the Noncredit Committee has noncredit practitioners available. The Academic Senate may also draw on the expertise of the Association of Community and Continuing Education (ACCE), the professional organization that represents noncredit and community service. To request a technical visit, please submit a request at <http://www.asccc.org/contact/request-services>.

NONCREDIT REPRESENTATION ON LOCAL SENATES

Resolution 17.05 (Fall 2015) encouraged local senates to appoint noncredit liaisons to establish a single point of contact for the distribution of noncredit information from ASCCC to local colleges. Possible responsibilities of the liaison are included in the resolution but should be locally determined. Having a noncredit liaison either serving on, or reporting to, a local senate also gives representation to faculty members who teach within noncredit programs, a population that is often overlooked in governance. Local senates that do not yet have a noncredit liaison are urged to consider appointing one as soon as possible.

If a college offers noncredit courses, local senates should give serious consideration to the inclusion of noncredit representation on its body. Given the increased focus on noncredit and the potential impact of noncredit on college efforts in basic skills and strong workforce, the presence of noncredit voices on local academic senates and college committees is more important than ever. There is room for local senates to improve in this area, and at many colleges, noncredit faculty are eager to be included in senate dialog and representation.


NONCREDIT REPRESENTATION ON STATE COMMITTEES — WE NEED YOU!

In recognition of the growing integration of noncredit curriculum into existing credit programs to meet the goals of Strong Workforce, AEBG, and basic skills efforts, the ASCCC is also placing more emphasis on ensuring noncredit faculty are participating on ASCCC standing committees beyond basic skills and noncredit. Additionally, it is more important than ever that the ASCCC make appointments that include noncredit faculty to Chancellor's Office Advisory Committees and other external committees like IEPI Peer Resource Teams and Advisory Committees. Commitments vary depending on the committee. Faculty interested in statewide service, including ASCCC and external committees, should complete the application for statewide service at <http://www.asccc.org/content/application-statewide-service>. Be sure to indicate noncredit experience and/or related expertise to inform your consideration for service.

Since the very first noncredit resolutions in 1990, the ASCCC has worked to represent all California community college faculty on academic and professional matters—credit and noncredit. The ASCCC is committed to continuing its advocacy and support for noncredit efforts, both locally and statewide.

[1] All ASCCC resolutions are available at <http://www.asccc.org/resources/resolutions>

[2] The ASCCC Noncredit Committee website can be accessed at <http://www.asccc.org/directory/noncredit-committee>.

[3] The webinar schedule and past presentations are currently available at <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/AcademicAffairs/CurriculumandInstructionUnit/Curriculum/Noncredit-CurriculumandInstructionalPrograms/NoncreditFirstFriday-WebinarArchives.aspx>. 

Mythbusting Open Educational Materials

By Dolores Davison, ASCCC Secretary

and Michelle Pilati, ASCCC Open Educational Resources Task Force

The desire to reduce the costs of course materials for students in our colleges has resulted in various parallel efforts to decrease costs and incentivize cost reductions. Pressures to offer courses with no associated text costs have also resulted in concerns among faculty who can't envision teaching with materials that are free. The various efforts and concerns have resulted in some measure of confusion. What efforts to reduce costs are underway and what legislation may be creating pressure to consider no-cost resources?

Current efforts include the development of Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) degrees and the use of Open Educational Resources (OER). A number of our colleges are in the process of developing ZTC certificates or degrees, with the goal of developing programs that have no textbook cost to the student. Moreover, while ZTC grants are not system-wide, ZTC efforts often employ the use of OER that are often free and modifiable. To this end, an infrastructure to promote OER use across our colleges has been developed, and the ASCCC OER Task Force is engaged in efforts to identify and address barriers to OER adoption.

Further, efforts to advise colleges on the identification of both no-cost and low-cost resources are underway. As of January 1, 2018, pressure to adopt no-cost resources increased as a result of SB 1359 (Block, 2016). This legislation requires colleges to “clearly highlight, by means that may include a symbol or logo in a conspicuous place on the online campus course schedule, the courses that exclusively use digital course materials that are free of charge to students and may have a low-cost option for print versions.” However, the identification of no-cost resources presents a challenge for some disciplines. To this end, Resolution 13.01 was

presented for consideration at the fall 2017 plenary to “encourage colleges to implement a mechanism for identifying course sections that employ low-cost course materials.” This resolution includes direction for colleges who desire a means of identifying course sections that employ *low-cost* resources. As SB 1359 mandates recognition of no-cost resources, lower cost materials do not meet the criteria of the law and therefore cannot be indicated by the same symbol. Additional information regarding this legislation and related cost-reduction efforts can be found at <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/AcademicAffairs/OpenEducationResources.aspx>.

One obstacle to a wider use of OER materials seems to be common misconceptions about OER materials, including their use and implementation. The faculty in the CCC system are not alone in their confusion and uncertainty about using OER: the 2017 Babson report on OER <https://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/openingthetextbook2017.pdf> demonstrated that only 30% of faculty surveyed nationwide were “very aware” or “aware” of open educational resources. Within our system, in a recent survey of selected disciplines, almost 40% of respondents indicated that they did not know enough about OER to consider its use. There are quite a few myths around OER, and it is our hope that this article clarifies some of them.

Myth #1: Using OER will jeopardize our articulation agreements with our University of California and California State University partners.

Answer: This is not true. Both the University of California Office of the President and the California State University Chancellor's Office have issued statements that allow for the use of OER materials, provided the materials are “stable and publicly

available as published textbooks (and not a list of links)”¹. While articulation to private or out-of-state colleges might be impacted, given the increasingly widespread use of OER, it is becoming more likely that the use of OER will not impact articulation regardless of the college. OER also does not impact C-ID designated courses, provided that the materials used meet the above requirement. It should also be noted that the California State University is subject to the same mandate as the CCCs regarding identification of sections using no-cost resources.

Myth #2: There aren’t OER materials available for my discipline/courses.

Answer: While this lack of materials is true in some areas, it is becoming increasingly less of an issue. While not all courses may have a dedicated text(s) available, more materials are becoming available every month. The change in the availability of text-equivalents and ancillaries over the past few years is staggering in many disciplines.

Myth #3: OER materials are inferior to publisher materials.

Answer: As with the selection of textbooks, the responsibility for determining rigor and quality of OER materials rests with the faculty member. It is true that there are materials touted as OER that lack sufficient rigor, including vanity pieces, self-published materials that have never been peer reviewed, or agenda-driven corporate materials. However, there are many more available materials of high quality worth the consideration of discipline faculty. One such resource is the COOL4Ed page <http://cool4ed.org>, the result of the work of the California Open Educational Resources Council (COERC) which includes OER resources which have been peer reviewed by faculty in at least two of the public systems of higher education in California. The COOL4Ed page provides not only information about the texts, but reviews and peer evaluations of each of the materials evaluated. The website is a good starting point for faculty interested in integrating OER materials into their courses. In addition, if an OER resource is lacking in some way, faculty can typically modify or supplement the materials to address any deficiencies.

Myth #4: OER materials do not have the ancillaries and other materials that I need to teach my classes.

Answer: Again, while this is true in some disciplines, it is more common than ever to find ancillaries where one would normally find them from a traditional publisher. The Open Stax statistics text, for example, includes a test bank of over 1000 test questions, which can be freely used by the instructor who has adopted the text.

Myth #5: The structure of the OER materials available is not to my liking/does not match up with the way I teach/does not cover information I feel should be covered.

Answer: As with picking a traditional published textbook, OER materials may have gaps that need to be supplemented with additional readings, projects, or the like. Other than self-authored materials, it is unlikely that any faculty member has ever been 100% satisfied with an adopted text.

Myth #6: Using OER materials does not really make that big of a difference for our students.

Answer: With most texts costing the same or more than the cost of registering for a course, it is easy to see that OER materials may benefit more students than one might think. The Babson Report indicates that the majority of faculty surveyed had students who did not purchase traditional textbooks based on cost, with an average textbook cost of \$97.00 per course. Texts for many disciplines, particularly in the STEM fields, can run significantly more. Cost savings could (and perhaps should) be factored into a faculty member’s decision regarding adoptions of OER materials.

Ultimately, the decision of textbook adoption is a curriculum issue, and therefore the purview of the faculty per Ed Code and the 10+1. No administrator should be forcing a faculty member to adopt OER materials. However, given that courses with zero costs for textbooks will now be identified in the online course schedule, it is possible that students will vote with their feet, and it might behoove faculty to examine OER options moving forward. Faculty who considered OER in the past and found the available resources lacking are encouraged to explore the available options once again.

[1] <https://www.asccc.org/content/oen-and-ztc-degrees>; quote from email from Nancy Purcille, Transfer Articulation Coordinator, UC Office of the President. 🐦

Untangling the Knots —Minimum Qualifications, Faculty Service Areas, Placing Courses within Disciplines and Other Fun Stuff

By John Freitas, Treasurer, ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee Chair

Minimum qualifications are often at the center of diverse and sometimes contentious topics at local colleges, such as assigning faculty service areas (FSAs), the placement of courses within disciplines, assigning TOP codes, and even the taboo practice of granting single-course equivalencies. Ideally, the understanding and application of minimum qualifications at local colleges should be an independent and consistent process, but the reality is that minimum qualifications are too often conflated with other local issues. This article explains the distinctions between faculty minimum qualifications and these other matters.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS: A BRIEF REFRESHER

The determination of faculty minimum qualifications are independent of local processes. To be qualified for service as faculty at a California community college, one must meet the minimum qualifications as established by Title 5 and as listed in the Disciplines List¹. Faculty must either earn the appropriate degrees and/or complete the required professional service, or they must be granted equivalency by the governing board, prior to being employed in a discipline(s) at

a community college. For example, to be considered to teach Spanish courses within the Foreign Languages discipline, applicants must have earned a master's degree in Spanish, or the equivalent. As another example, to be considered to teach in dental technology, applicants must possess an associate's degree in any subject and six years of full-time professional experience in dental technology, or the equivalent. If a potential faculty member does not meet the minimum qualifications as stated in Title 5 and the Disciplines List, then the local equivalency process can be used to establish equivalence to the stated minimum qualifications, but that process must occur prior to the hiring of the faculty member. Once a faculty member is deemed qualified and is hired to teach or provide service in a discipline or disciplines,

local processes are used to determine to which faculty service area(s) the faculty member is assigned, and what courses that faculty member may teach.

ARE FACULTY SERVICE AREAS THE SAME AS DISCIPLINES?

In a word, no. Faculty Service Areas (FSAs) are established solely for reductions in force

To be qualified for service as faculty at a California community college, one must meet the minimum qualifications as established by Title 5 and as listed in the Disciplines List.

(RIF) should they occur (Education Code §§87743 through 87743.5), and their determination and application is subject to collective bargaining and are likely located in the local faculty collective bargaining agreement. For example, there are some districts that have only a single FSA, restricting any RIF to strict, seniority-based determination. Where FSAs can be confused with discipline minimum qualifications is when district-assigned FSAs align with the disciplines in the Disciplines List. Here, it is important to note that the FSA itself does not determine one's minimum qualifications to serve as faculty in a discipline. Too, while Education Code allows faculty to be assigned to multiple FSAs, local unions should consult with local senates about FSAs prior to contract negotiations.

CAN COURSES BE PLACED WITHIN MULTIPLE DISCIPLINES?

Yes, they can. The placement of courses within disciplines is an academic and professional matter identified under curriculum per Title 5 §53200. Every course must be placed within at least one discipline listed in the Disciplines List. The placement of a course in a discipline is what establishes the minimum qualifications required to teach the course. It is common for curriculum committees to recommend the discipline placements of courses, and it is considered an effective practice to note discipline placements for courses on the course outlines of record (CORs). Furthermore, it is permissible to place courses within multiple disciplines if the curriculum committee determines the content and objectives will serve students taught by faculty trained in those disciplines. For example, English and Reading are identified separately in the Disciplines List; however, placement of English courses in the English discipline and Reading courses

It is common for curriculum committees to recommend the discipline placements of courses, and it is considered an effective practice to note discipline placements for courses on the course outlines of record (CORs).

in the Reading discipline, or the placement of the courses in both English and Reading remains a local curricular matter. Moreover, should the designation on the course outline of record read “English OR Reading,” then faculty meeting English or Reading minimum qualifications may be assigned to that course.

IS PLACING A SINGLE COURSE IN A DISCIPLINE THE SAME AS SINGLE-COURSE EQUIVALENCY?

No, it is not. Sometimes, there is confusion about whether or not placing a specific course in additional disciplines is the same as granting single-course equivalency. The

Chancellor's Office issued Legal Opinion L03-28 in 2003² to explain that single-course equivalencies are not legally permitted because faculty are hired to teach all courses placed within a given discipline. The point of the 2003 legal opinion was to state that faculty are hired based on meeting minimum qualifications for a discipline that is listed in the Disciplines List, not based on qualifications to teach specific courses. In a sense, then, the term “single-course equivalency” is a misnomer as teaching faculty must meet minimum qualifications for the discipline, as well as the equivalent to teach a single-course. Therefore, all faculty members hired to teach courses in a given discipline are deemed qualified to teach all courses assigned to a given discipline, not just a single course assigned to the discipline. For example, a faculty member hired to teach in the Earth Science discipline, which includes courses in geology, oceanography, and mineralogy courses, is deemed qualified to teach all courses within the discipline. The same principle applies to a course assigned to multiple disciplines. Consider a hypothetical English course that is assigned to both English and Reading. **All** faculty who explicitly meet the minimum qualifications for **either** the English or Reading disciplines are qualified to teach the course. Therefore, it is not “single-course equivalency”

because it is about a course that is placed within two different disciplines, not about whether or not a specific individual is qualified to teach a course. Equivalency is about the qualifications of a specific individual and whether or not those qualifications are equivalent to the minimum qualifications of the discipline(s) to which a course is assigned, and is treated on a case by case basis.

DO TOP CODES DICTATE PLACEMENT OF COURSES IN DISCIPLINES?

The Taxonomy of Program (TOP) codes do not dictate the placement of courses within disciplines. The local assignment of TOP codes to courses is a completely separate, unrelated issue as far as the state is concerned. The placement of courses within disciplines and the assignment of courses to TOP codes are locally determined and are only related if a local decision is made to make them related. However, the local assignment of courses to disciplines has no bearing on the reporting of course data to the Chancellor's Office.

FINAL THOUGHTS

In closing, faculty must meet minimum qualifications in a discipline on the Disciplines List, or must be granted equivalency to the minimum qualifications for a discipline, prior to being hired, after which local processes determine the faculty service area assignment and course assignments. While it is not unusual for minimum qualifications to become entangled with various other local issues, some important points to remember are:

- Assignments to FSAs are collectively bargained and can vary from district to district, but districts are allowed to assign faculty to multiple FSAs;
- Assignments to teach courses are a function of the placement of courses within disciplines by the local curriculum committee, and courses may be assigned to a single discipline or multiple disciplines;
- If a course is assigned to multiple disciplines, then faculty who meet the minimum qualifications for any of the disciplines to which a course is assigned may be assigned to teach that course;

- Placing a single course within multiple disciplines is not the same as granting single-course equivalency to an individual faculty member;
- TOP codes do not affect placement of courses within disciplines unless it is locally decided to link course placement within disciplines to TOP codes.

A lack of clarity regarding minimum qualifications can prevent faculty from teaching courses that they would otherwise be qualified to teach, which may not serve our faculty or our students well. Understanding the distinctions between minimum qualifications and the various local issues discussed in this article can help local senate leaders untangle the knots that are often formed at the local level to ensure that well-qualified faculty are teaching courses and that students are well-served.

[1] *The Disciplines List is formally called Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in the California Community Colleges and is published by the Chancellor's Office. The 2017 edition is available at <http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Reports/2017-Minimum-Qualifications-Handbook-r1-ADA.pdf>. All of the relevant Title 5 sections on minimum qualifications are included in the Disciplines List publication.*

[2] *Legal Opinion L03-28 is available at <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/Legal/Ops/OpsArchive/03-28.pdf>.*

A lack of clarity regarding minimum qualifications can prevent faculty from teaching courses that they would otherwise be qualified to teach, which may not serve our faculty or our students well.

Busting Equivalency Myths: An Equivalencies Chair's Perspective

By [Emily Berg](#), ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee Member, Reedley College

As part of my training to take over the Equivalency Committee on our local campus, the outgoing chair mysteriously cautioned me, “You see, the thing about the Equivalency Committee is that everything is fine—until it isn’t.” At the time, I did not appreciate or even understand her warning, but now, with a few years under my belt, I appreciate the veracity of her observations. The Equivalency committee, I quickly learned, can be caught in the intersection of very real funding challenges: administrators put under pressure to maintain or begin new programs; full-time instructors desperate to staff classes without readily available adjunct instructors; and students who deserve access to high-quality classes they need to graduate. This year, I am serving on the ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee, which has provided additional insights into faculty minimum qualifications and equivalency, including aspects of Equivalency that are commonly misunderstood by administrators, faculty, and prospective applicants alike. With hiring season upon us, I wanted to share a quick fact sheet to remind faculty and administrators of the basics of Equivalency and to recommend excellent resources for reference and further study.

Myth #1: “Equivalencies/Minimum Qualifications are used as the sole basis for faculty hiring.”

This is a common misunderstanding, at least on my campus. The current system for establishing faculty minimum qualifications and the allowance of equivalence to the minimum qualifications was established when AB 1725 was signed into law in 1989. The effective use of equivalency allows for the creation of as wide of a pool of applicants as possible. Importantly, given the increase of CTE courses and programs across the state, having a wide applicant pool is often imperative to their success. Make note, however: simply meeting minimum qualifications or the equivalent gets applicants to the gate, not through the gate. Local campuses have separate hiring processes to choose among qualified applicants. In other words,

meeting the minimum qualifications or the equivalent is never to be used as the sole basis for faculty hiring, no matter how dire the perceived or real need is for staffing.

Myth #2: “Equivalent to the minimum qualifications means that nearly equal to the minimum qualifications is acceptable.”

A previous equivalency chair on my campus explained to me that he thought the essential purpose of equivalency was to grant degrees to individuals. While this is not entirely the case, since degrees are not conferred when equivalency is granted and thus equivalencies are not portable to other districts, this perspective was helpful in understanding the importance of the equivalency committee’s role: the review of the applicant’s appropriate academic and professional preparation to determine if the applicant meets (not nearly, but exactly) the equivalent to the minimum qualifications as established in Title 5 and the Disciplines List. As it is imperative that we provide qualified college instructors for our students, and for all disciplines, applicants must show evidence both of depth—the specialized coursework and/or requisite teaching experience—and breadth—evidence of coursework and/or experience equal to the general education component of a college education.

Myth #3: “Conditional or provisional equivalencies can be created as part of the local process.”

Never. Once an Equivalency is granted, it cannot be rescinded. There are provisions for faculty internships (Title 5 secs. 53500-53502); however, these provisions are only used to allow graduate students and industry professionals the opportunity to gain teaching experience as instructors of record while working to complete the academic and/or professional experience requirements to meet the minimum qualifications, while, at the same time, addressing shortages of qualified instructors. At my college, there was recently a faculty colleague working with a faculty intern while the intern pursued their master’s degree. The intern did

not make the filing deadline at his university and would consequently not be granted a degree before the next semester as planned; the amount of time allowed for an internship had also expired. The faculty member wanted to know if our committee would grant an equivalency for the intern, as the intern would file for degree completion the next term and that person was needed to teach in the upcoming semester. The committee determined that the equivalent of a master's degree had not been completed and did not grant this individual equivalency.

Myth #4: “Single course equivalencies are permitted.”

The regulations are clear on this subject as well: they refer to qualifications in terms of discipline, not courses or subject matter expertise within a discipline (Education Code §87357; Title 5 §53410 and §53430). Faculty are hired to teach the full range of courses placed within their disciplines, not to teach only a single course.¹ Therefore, equivalency must be granted for the discipline and not for courses. This is, of course, a double-edged sword: for example, as a post-graduate student, I studied Victorian Literature and Composition Theory. However, while at a previous college, I was assigned to teach Chicano Literature—not my specialty by any stretch of the imagination. Of course, the administration has the right of assignment, and, while I was uncomfortable with this assignment, I made the best of the situation: (it was difficult for me to teach this course, but I do believe I learned a lot about the subject.) Again, it is important to remember that meeting minimum qualifications or the equivalent should not be used as the basis for hiring faculty.

Myth #5: “Title 5 specifies what the local process for granting Equivalencies should be for districts.”

No. Local governing boards may grant faculty equivalency to the minimum qualifications, and every district must have an equivalency process, to include corresponding procedures, criteria, and standards by which the governing board makes its determination: “The process, as well as criteria and standards...shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by ...the [local] governing board and the [local] academic senate” and “that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate” (Ed Code §87359/Title 5 §53430). Outside of these specifications, no process is dictated by Ed Code or Title 5.

Myth #6: “Human Resources Offices should be instrumental in establishing equivalencies.”

A common perception among hiring committees is that human resources have pre-screened the applications for Equivalency. This perception has led to nail-biting

situations with hiring committees that place everyone in an unpleasant situation. Importantly, the role of human resources is not to determine Equivalency. This process is the purview of local boards wherein they rely primarily upon the judgement of local academic senates. Instead, the role of human resources is to help applicants navigate the application process and to collect and forward equivalency applications to the equivalencies committee or the appropriate local body. They are to ensure the completeness of the applications and to record the outcomes of the equivalency process. On our campus, we have developed a template for hiring committees to use to remind them of the local Academic Regulations that govern the process for the hiring committees. The first question on the suggested paper screening application is, “Does this candidate meet the Minimum Qualifications for this position?”

Resources provided by ASCCC have been instrumental for me and my Equivalency Committee. This semester, as we updated our Committee Operating Agreement with our college's new Strategic Directions, the committee met to review the Recommendations from the ASCCC paper Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications (Spring 2016)² to learn what we were doing well, and what we needed to improve. The recent October 2017 *Rostrum* article “Building a Deeper Career Education Candidate Pool—Using Faculty Equivalency Process More Effectively”³ has also given us additional items, including a practical checklist for Effective Faculty Equivalency Processes, to inform future best practices for our committee. Gaps that emerged from these discussions have led us to create a website on our college (for potential applicants, for example), and we are working with our district Human Resources to add this information to their website as well. Our committee has also started to provide professional development workshops to faculty and administrators on a regular basis. Making sure to address the myths listed in this article has been an important part of improving our understanding of this potentially complicated subject on our campus.

[1] See Chancellor's Office Legal Opinion L 03-28 (<http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/Legal/Ops/OpsArchive/03-28.pdf>).

[2] Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications is available at: https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/equivalency_paper.pdf

[3] This document is available at: <https://www.asccc.org/content/building-deeper-career-education-candidate-pool-using-faculty-equivalency-processes-more>

Faculty Primacy and AP Credit

By Randy Beach, Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Committee,

David DeGroot, Allan Hancock College,

and Jackie Stahlke, Victor Valley College

More and more high school students enrolled in the California community colleges (CCC) are requesting course credit based upon passing Advanced Placement (AP) Exam scores. In 2006, 2,266,038 students in the United States took an AP Examination with 405,711 of those exams being taken in California. Ten years later, the total number in the United States rose to 4,559,273 with California accounting for 743,280 of those examinations^[1]. In addition, recent legislation and changes in attitudes around awarding credit for prior learning has led to some confusion about awarding credit based on Advanced Placement Exam scores. The bottom line: the faculty role in determining college credit for AP is clearly a lead role, and it is important for faculty to agree upon a process for regular review of AP credit policies, and to know the resources available to help inform those decisions.

Several elements related to awarding college credit for AP are addressed in Title 5 §55052, including the district's responsibility to award credit for an exam, the faculty role to approve Advanced Placement Exams, and the manner in which AP credit is noted on a student's transcript. Also, with the recent passage of AB 1985^[2] and the development of the CCC GE AP list, as presented in the Chancellor's Advanced Placement (AP) Credit policy, colleges must now award general education area credit for minimum AP Exam scores of three. However, determining how a student's score on an AP Exam translates into specific course credit in the major remains the responsibility of local discipline faculty, and faculty may require a higher score to award credit for a major requirement. The number of units to award for the course or courses aligned with the content and learning outcomes of the AP Exam, and the score a student must earn to receive credit in one or more courses, are just a couple of areas where discipline faculty must take a lead.

Since busy faculty may not always remember, or find the time, to prioritize a review of AP Exam credit standards, it is important to have in place a periodic, scheduled process for reviewing how AP Exam scores are applied at the department or discipline level. The timelines may vary by discipline, based on the frequency of student requests for credit. In addition, AB 1985 requires college districts to have a policy on advanced credit, and faculty should work with administrative partners to establish procedures for ensuring faculty determinations for course credit are made easily available to students in a course catalog and on the college's website. There should be support at the heart of these processes from the local academic senate or the local curriculum committee working on behalf of the senate. The senate and/or curriculum committee's role in approving faculty determinations should be a local decision.

RESOURCES FOR FACULTY

Several important and useful resources are available to faculty to support the conversation around determining proper application of AP Exam scores. There are a number of resources available at the College Board AP Central website³ to support faculty discussions to determine equivalencies between AP Exams and local coursework. The website also provides valuable information about each AP course curriculum framework, description, and exam content. In addition, information about each of the AP Examinations can also be found online at AP Central⁴, including exam development, question examples, and scoring information. These materials provide an invaluable resource to assist community college faculty to determine the comparability and alignment of AP courses and AP Examinations to community college courses.

Another important resource for community college faculty when establishing local AP policies are the policies of the the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC) systems. The CSU

and UC systems have system-wide and local discipline courses specific to AP credit policies, and reviewing these policies can be useful when CCC faculty are developing and/or reviewing local CCC AP policies for credit. For example, if your CSU and UC feeder institutions award course credit for an AP Exam score of three in Psychology and that same course articulates to your college's "Introduction to Psychology," it would be appropriate to award the same credit for a minimum score of three.

Finally, your most valuable resource is your college Articulation Officer (AO), who can access the system-wide and campus-specific articulation agreements for local courses, as well as help research and explain the system-wide and campus-specific AP credit policies. The AO can help faculty understand the implications of awarding local course credit for an AP Exam score of three, as well as other more intricate and complicated questions around articulation agreements, which often vary between a college's local CSU and UC.

EFFECTIVE PRACTICES

Faculty should remember the following important practices when developing an approach to determining course credit for AP.

- Establish a regular review timeline for AP Exams. Curriculum and AP Exam materials change, and the faculty should systematically review for changes that might impact the application of course credit. Is this done in program review? Or does it occur when a course comes up for a regular review? How often a review occurs and who takes part is a local discipline faculty determination.
- Establish your rules. Will you allow multiple course credit for a single placement score? Will you place a cap on the number of units of credit a student can be awarded based on AP scores? Will the sole responsibility lie with discipline faculty to determine how transcripts from other colleges are reviewed and courses determined to be comparable to local courses? Does your college want the determination to be submitted to the curriculum committee and go to the board of trustees for approval? Whatever the decision, make sure it is in board policy.
- Consult with students. Those students who have been awarded credit can be important resources for understanding how their AP experience has

prepared them for college work. Focus groups and surveys of AP students can provide useful information for counseling and discipline faculty.

- Do the research. Faculty should look at AP Exam scores and student performance in subsequent courses to determine how well students with AP experience perform when compared to their peers who did not earn credit with an AP Exam score.
- Know your feeder schools' policies for awarding credit. What will your local UC do with a student's AP Exam score? There are advantages and disadvantages to using AP Exam scores for subject credit only, or unit credit only, or as prerequisite waivers that faculty should discuss. Different UCs and CSUs apply scores of 3, 4, or 5 differently, and it is important for faculty to research **CSU** <<https://www2.calstate.edu/apply/transfer/Pages/advanced-placement-ap.aspx>> and **UC** AP Credit policies and requirements <<http://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/counselors/exam-credit/ap-credits>>.
- Let it be written. It is required by law that each college publish the CCC GE AP Policy and local GE AP list. The law requires this information to be posted on the college's website, and the ASCCC encourages listing this information in the catalog, as well. It is good practice to include in this list all course-to-course AP equivalencies that the college awards. Also, if subject and unit credit are awarded, then, per Title 5 §55052, a notation on the student's transcripts regarding how the credit was earned is also required.

AP RESOLUTIONS, ROSTRUM ARTICLES, AND ONLINE RESOURCES *

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has a long history of resolutions and *Rostrum* articles addressing AP questions. This short bibliography provides a few ASCCC and other resources to help faculty develop a process for establishing a consistent and evidenced-based AP credit policy. 🐦

* Please visit our website at www.asccc.org/publications/rostrum to view the complete list of resources that accompany this article.

Local Senate Succession Planning: Some Considerations

By Dolores Davison, ASCCC Secretary

Unless your local senate has procedures in place for selecting a new president automatically (i.e., a president-elect, or a by-law or constitutional requirement that the vice president becomes the president automatically), succession planning is integral to being a senate president. Yet, succession planning can be one of the more difficult things for a senate president, especially a new senate president, to begin considering. In recent months, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has received a number of inquiries about the ASCCC's view on the "requirements" or qualifications to be a senate president, and, while this article does not represent an official ASCCC position, it does provide some suggestions and effective practices for succession planning and recruiting individuals to serve on your local senate.

One of the most frequently asked questions the ASCCC has received is about the practice of having an untenured faculty member serve as a senate officer or senate president. Unless your college or district has a restriction on electing untenured faculty, the practice itself is allowed, and the ASCCC has not taken a position on the service of an untenured faculty member on the senate executive board at a local college.

However, there are a number of issues to consider based on local practices and views on the tenure process. Is the emphasis in your tenure process on teaching and scholarship, or is there also a service requirement that tenure track faculty have to meet in order to progress in the process? How close is the faculty member to receiving tenure? There is a significant difference between being in

One of the most frequently asked questions the ASCCC has received is about the practice of having an untenured faculty member serve as a senate officer or senate president.

the first year or two of the tenure process versus being in the final phase, and that difference should be a consideration as well. Faculty who are early in the tenure process might have a more difficult time speaking out for fear of retaliation by college administration or even the board. Because the senate is the only organization given the right in statute to address the board, it is essential that the senate president (and members of the executive board, in case of the president's absence) feel comfortable addressing the board, including potentially criticizing or speaking against the administration. Untenured faculty leadership may find direct confrontation more difficult, as they may worry that this action would be used against them in the tenure process. Finally, is the faculty member being considered for the senate executive board someone who has been around the campus for

a long period of time (as a former part time faculty member, for example) and who has been involved and is knowledgeable about the components of the campus? If someone served on the senate as a part time faculty member and already has a relationship with the campus leadership, it might be easier for that individual to step into a leadership position at an earlier time in the tenure process than someone who is new to the campus.

Another consideration to take into account when considering succession planning is the combination of disciplines, modalities, and experiences of the members of the senate overall. Does the meeting time of the senate automatically disqualify members of the faculty from being able to participate in senate meetings and therefore prevent them from not only serving on the senate, but potentially serving as a member of the executive board? Is the size of a department also a barrier for select faculty members? For example, what if a department only has one faculty member, which is often the case in some of our Career Technical Education (CTE) programs, and that individual is also the program director? Or, if meetings are held in the afternoons, and all science labs are held in the afternoons, do senate meeting times preclude science faculty from having the opportunity to serve? If so, is it possible to move the meetings or have interested faculty talk to the department chair or dean to allow them the freedom to attend the meetings? The introduction of the position of the CTE liaison has enabled more career technical faculty to serve on local senates, but these same issues (labs, timing of courses, single person departments) may preclude faculty who want to be involved in senate leadership from having the opportunity to do so. Conversations with

administration, department chairs, and individual faculty about the importance of diversity within the senate in terms of not only ethnicity and race, but also disciplines, modalities, and experience are essential to ensure that all faculty voices are heard.

Finally, what should the role of the outgoing president be once a succession plan is in place? At some campuses and districts, the position of “past president” exists, which enables the former president to assist the incoming president; however, if the former senate president goes into an administrative position (which is happening more and more often), this model may prove too difficult. It is important for former senate presidents to recognize that they are a valuable resource for the new president and to be available for information and questions; however, it may be difficult for the new president to find footing if the former senate president is present at meetings, as the senate may turn to that individual for leadership. Balancing cooperation and mentorship with the ability to let go of the president’s role is one of the most difficult but most important aspects of succession planning.

If your campus does not have a succession plan in place, it might be time to begin to consider adding one to your bylaws or other governance documents. A strong, vibrant, and well-led senate is crucial to the faculty voice for any campus community, and planning for succession, especially in the early stages of a presidency, may prevent issues from arising as a senate president prepares to step down. While change is unavoidable, and indeed important, a smooth transition of leadership can ensure that the senate remains the voice for faculty on local academic and professional matters regardless of who comes into the leadership position. 🐦

THE ROSTRUM IS 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