ROSenate trum

ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES NEWSLETTER

Promises to Keep

Waning hours of officedom for academic senate leaders usually involve bitter-sweet moments: to tossing of redundant files and other housecleaning chores, the final bits of wisdom to savor or to share with successors, the enumeration—sometimes in formal reports—of what was accomplished and what could not be accomplished despite one's best efforts. Most poignant of all, we consider the promises we made.

Sometimes we utter **promises on behalf of our constituent groups:** promises as a local senate to review our administrative retreat rights or to formulate a task force to reconsider hiring priorities or the nature of our AA and AS degrees. For the past four years, the Academic Senate has also made explicit its promises. On the basis of the resolutions passed, and in light of circumstantial demands, the Academic Senate's Executive Committee has formulated and adopted its promise[1] to you all: a statement of goals and plans of action.

This year we identified three arenas that encompassed our efforts. We promised that we would

‣ increase and make more visible our service to local senates;

‣ strengthen our leadership in academic and professional matters on your behalf; and

‣ provide leadership and professional development opportunities to faculty and other constituent groups.

Kate Clark, President

[1] The ASCCC 2004-05 Strategic Plan can be found at http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/ExecCom/Strat.htm

Contents

INSIDE

It's Summer and You Have Nothing to Do

Julie Adams,
Executive Director

For most people summer is a time to spend with family, to rest from busy schedules, or to enhance professional skills. However, finding an event where you can accomplish all three of these objectives is at times difficult. We have an idea that might help! Each year the Academic Senate holds our summer institutes—the Faculty Leadership Institute and the Curriculum Institute. These Institutes are held at recreational venues that accommodate family members, while the Institutes provide faculty an opportunity to rest, and more importantly an opportunity to increase your knowledge in the areas of governance, curriculum, and other senate-related topics. This brief article will highlight these two events and describe their benefits.

The Faculty Leadership Institute this year will be held June 23–25 at the Hayes Mansion in San Jose. This Institute is designed to help new local senate presidents and senate officers understand their roles and responsibilities in college governance by discussing such issues as the Brown Act, budget development, senate/union relations, and conflict resolution. Seasoned local senate leaders will also benefit from the Institute through discussions on the 75:25 ratio, the Governor's budget, legislative issues, and current hot topics. Both seasoned and new leaders will benefit through the experience of interaction. The networking opportunity provides seasoned leaders an opportunity to share their experience with new leaders, which in the past has proven invaluable. As we know there are some lessons that are difficult to grasp in theory, but are instead better understood through actual examples. All participants will learn from the many breakouts on a number of pertinent topics. Along with those mentioned above, this year topics will include developing senate leadership, effective communication, noncredit and vocational issues, and a personalized view of your college's budget. The Faculty Leadership Institute has something for everyone. As one attendee said last year, "[The Faculty Leadership Institute was] very helpful to me as a senate officer and faculty member in general;" and another wrote, "While we received a lot of information, the contact I made was probably the most beneficial. Thanks for providing a lot of opportunities for interaction!" All this plus fantastic meals, complete spa facilities, a swimming pool, and beautiful grounds in which to relax. We hope that you will join us this year.

Another summer event that is offered by the Senate is our Curriculum Institute. This year the Curriculum Institute will be held July 14 – 16 in San Diego at the Hyatt Islandia. The goal of this event is to train those most closely connected to the curricular process—administrators, faculty and staff. This team approach has proven very successful in the past. The structure and the topics of this Institute provide all involved in curriculum with an interactive experience that includes development of learning outcomes/objectives, determining and documenting pre-requisites, articulating the outcome for curriculum review, and much more. This year the format will be different than past Institutes. Each breakout will have a syllabus, text, learning outcomes, and learning objectives. The Senate Curriculum Committee hopes these additional materials will reinforce those topics discussed at the Institute. Be assured that your participation in this event will be a valuable and enlightening experience. And as with our Leadership Institute, the Hyatt Islandia provides great food, beautiful grounds, a swimming pool, and a spectacular view of the waters off San Diego.

So, if you don't have anything promising planned to do this summer, or you want to polish your skills while your family enjoys a beautiful conference facility with many activities and nearby attractions for summer fun, please come join us at one of the Senate's summer institutes. You can find further information about each event and its location on our website at http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us. Bear in mind, though, that you will need to hurry, because these events are filling up fast. I hope to see *you* this summer!

Observing Online Classes

Patricia James Hanz,
Technology Committee

Frank Nigro,
Technology Committee

So you're on a tenure committee and you have to observe a class being taught online. The question is, how does one "observe" a class that's out there on the Web? What do you look for? When do you observe it, and for how long? What if your own web skills are not particularly stellar; will you know what you're seeing when you see it?

With the explosive growth of online courses, many campuses are facing these and many more questions about how to effectively observe and evaluate online teaching. Ultimately, every school must set its own observation protocols, but fortunately much good work has been done in this area, and hopefully no one will have to completely reinvent the wheel. This article assembles some of the best ideas and thoughts on this issue and will raise important considerations. In addition to addressing the question of peer observations of online courses, it also looks at the tricky issue of *student* assessment of online teaching. All articles, peer observation forms, and other resources are available for your perusal by visiting the web address at the end of this article.

WHAT IS "GOOD ONLINE TEACHING"?

Achieving an institutional consensus on what constitutes good online teaching is a crucial first step to observe online instruction effectively. At the web resource page (listed below) you will find documents developed by our colleges (Shasta College and Mt. San Jacinto College respectively) to aid instructors as they prepare to observe their peers' online courses. Colleges approach the development of observation criteria in a variety of ways, but the local senates should collaborate with their association counterparts to determine what works best for them.

In addition to helping in the course assessment process, these documents also serve a formative assessment function for those teaching online. Online instructors can use them as a guideline to design and conduct their online classes.

HOW DOES AN OBSERVER "VISIT" AN ONLINE CLASS?

Unlike visiting a face-to-face class, you can't just walk in the door! How does one visit an online class when the class exists only in cyberspace? Generally they are organized by units or by time blocks. For example, Frank Nigro's critical thinking class at Shasta College is organized into eighteen one-week units. Students have a set number of tasks to complete that week, including a weekly quiz, a weekly class discussion, and an online lecture. An observer could simply choose one of these unit-weeks to observe, and, over the course of the week, examine how the instructor delivers course content and interacts with the students. The observer may also ask to see any email communications with students for that week and evaluate a) whether communication is indeed taking place, and b) if the instructor is responding to student emails in a timely manner.

As part of the observation, the course observer should review the instructor's policies on communication. If an instructor waits 24 hours to respond to a student's email, or if the instructor completely neglects to do so over the weekend, it's not necessarily a bad thing. However, the observer should make sure the instructor has established this as a policy somewhere in the course. In an online course, the information typically found in a syllabus, including course organizational material, may appear in one place, or it may be distributed at key spots throughout the course. The observer should be aware of how the instructor has provided this information and may want to review any start-up or welcome instructions for the course. If you, as an observer, can't figure out where the lecture materials, assignments and learning resources are in the course, it is likely the students can't either!

IN AN ONLINE DISCUSSION BOARD, WHAT CONSTITUTES MEANINGFUL STUDENT/TEACHER CONTACT?

Effective student/teacher contact isn't only one of the key principles of online teaching, but it's required by Title 5 §55211. The notion of "regular

effective contact", while evident in a face-to-face course, is very important to identify in an online course. Key to any successful online course is the degree to which it is made interactive. That connection may happen in one-to-one email exchanges between students and instructor, but equally as important is the interaction between the students and among students and instructor through class discussion.

Some online instructors use synchronous discussion tools known popularly as "chat." Chat requires everyone to be in the chat room at the same time. However, since a chat requirement defeats the purpose of taking online classes (most students take online classes because they cannot commit to meeting at a set time or place), most instructors now use asynchronous discussion boards (also known as bulletin boards, threaded discussions, or discussion forums). With discussion boards, students may check in at their own convenience, as long as they do it within the prescribed time frame.

In an article entitled "Seven Principles of Effective Teaching: A Practical Lens for Evaluating Online Courses," Graham Cagiltay, Lim, Craner & Duffy (2001;) define some features of good online participation through threaded discussion boards (Retrieved May 20, 2005 http://distance.wsu.edu/facultyresources/savedfromweb/7principles.htm). They recommend that participation be both mandatory and graded, that discussion groups be kept small and focused on a task, that threaded discussions always produce some sort of "product" or outcome, and that students be given consistent feedback on their discussions. As with their communication preferences, instructors should post their expectations for discussion and grade the discussion on the quality of the students' participation rather than the number and length of their postings. The instructor's role in the discussion is to read all the students' responses, answer any questions directed at the instructor, and in general moderate discussion as he or she would in a face-to-face class, without dominating the discussion. Class visitors should go to the online discussion board as part of the observation and see if these general guidelines are being followed.

YOU'RE OBSERVING AN ONLINE CLASS BUT YOU'RE JUST NOT THAT INTO COMPUTERS

Colleges should consider offering short, introductory workshops specifically for online class observers. However, in the absence of this, the observer should contact a colleague who is experienced in online instruction and get a quick orientation on how the course management system (CMS) works. Important here is to separate the instructors from the technology. If the instructors are teaching a course online for the first time, they may be less adept at utilizing some of the tools at their disposal than more experienced online instructors. This does not necessarily mean, however, that the students are not enjoying a useful learning experience. Instructors generally adapt courses over a few semesters, incorporating technological tools as they make sense for delivering particular course content.

FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF ONLINE COURSES

At most colleges, tenure-track instructors are observed every semester for several years or more. Instructors who already have tenure are observed much less frequently, perhaps every three years or so, and even then, they are often able to stipulate what classes may be visited and by whom. Observations of part-time instructors vary widely in their frequency and nature. So how often should online courses be observed? Or, to put it bluntly, what if a perfectly abysmal online course is taught for years on end and no one observes it?

Of course, these questions can be applied to face-to-face teaching as well as online teaching situations, and in both cases, the best solution is to provide formative assessment guidelines for online classes as they're being developed.

Summative assessment is generally done as part of the tenure process. It provides end evaluation for an instructor by his peers/administrators as well as by the students. It is intended to evaluate and becomes a condition of continued employment. Formative assessment is assessment provided before and during the course. It aims to help the instructor teach better. It does not become a condition of continued employment, and it is generally not required. However, formative assessment may be especially needed for online classes

given their relative newness and the technological skills needed to teach them well.

Colleges may require that faculty receive a certain amount of training before teaching an online course, or at least demonstrate competency in the online environment. Certainly training on whatever CMS will be used is necessary, but training in web design and how to make web pages Section 508 compliant should also be included. Often such training is available . . . *online!* Cerro Coso Community College, for example, offers an online certificate for potential online teachers; the California Virtual Campus and the System's @ONE program also provide training opportunities at little or no cost to the college or instructor. Your college may choose to require such training for those who wish to teach online. Although the Distance Education Guidelines and Title 5 tell us that our approved minimum qualifications must be used in choosing online instructors, additional standards for online instructors can be developed locally and are becoming more prevalent as online programs grow.

Other formative steps include setting up an online course development timeline to specify how online courses can be put together in a timely fashion. This will help ensure that instructors do not commit to teaching an online course a week before the semester begins. Part of the development process could include requiring that the instructor show portions of the developed course to an advisory team of experienced online instructors or even to an online teaching mentor at some point prior to the course's initial delivery. All of these steps can better ensure the likelihood of a positive online learning and teaching experience.

Quality instructional programs begin with attention to planning details. If your college is just beginning to develop an online program, consider developing standards for courses, for instructor selection, for observation, and develop a strong curriculum review process that starts the course on its way to success.

EVALUATING ONLINE COURSE RESOURCES ON THE ACADEMIC SENATE WEBSITE

Distance Education Guidelines, Published by the System Office in March 2004

Curriculum Session:

PowerPoint Presentation, created by Pat James Hanz and Bob Grill.

Sample Distance Education Addendum in use by Mt. San Jacinto College

Excerpted items from the DE Guidelines, you may want to use this to explain the mandates to colleagues at your school.

General Information Resource Page

Guidelines for Participating in Online Discussions from Bernie Fortenbaugh , CIAT. Copyright, 2001 Towson University

Peer Evaluation of Distance Education Session:

Senate Presentation Works Cited, Excellent resource articles compiled by Frank Nigro, Shasta College and Nasreen Rahim, Evergreen Valley College

How Interactive are your Distance Ed. Courses? Online article with rubric for interactivity.

Peer Observations:

Peer Observation Guidelines for Shasta College

Peer Observation Guidelines for Mt. San Jacinto College

Comments from Butte College

Student Evaluations:

Student Evaluation Tool from Shasta College

Student Evaluation Tool from Foothill College

Student Evaluation Tool from Mt. San Jacinto College (word version of digital survey)

Student Evaluation from Lassen College

To access these and other resources please visit please visit our resource page at http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/Publications/Rostrums/05_05Docs/start.htm

Principles and Pragmatism Once More: Three Educational Policy Breakouts

Ian Walton,
Vice President

Three 2005 Spring Plenary Session breakouts illustrated once again that the successful development and implementation of sound educational policy involves both principles and pragmatism.

TEXTBOOK ISSUES

This breakout centered on the paper *Textbook Issues: Economic Pressures and Academic Values*, which was adopted by the delegates during the Saturday voting session. The paper was inspired both by the recent, intense public debate about the rising cost of college textbooks and by faculty concerns about the textbook adoption process. Educational and ethical issues interact in a complex manner and significantly affect the cost to students for textbooks and other course materials. This cost, along with rapidly increasing fees, has become a major barrier to access for the very students that the community colleges most seek to help.

Educational Policies Committee member Karolyn Hanna summarized the content of the paper and highlighted ways that individual faculty members could help to reduce the cost of textbooks while still protecting their academic freedom to select the educational material most appropriate for their class. Alisa Messer and Paul Setziol then guided participants in a lively, interactive role-playing session to explore how such conversations might unfold at a local campus.

Like many Academic Senate papers, *Textbook Issues* lays out the fundamental principles that frame the issue, but the day-to-day implementation of changes and solutions has to happen at the local campus level. In this case not just local senates must participate, but all faculty members who make textbook adoption decisions must re-evaluate their choices in a larger context. Please help us to share these ideas.

The paper will be available soon on the Academic Senate website at http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us, and in paper form at your local academic senate office on campus.

THE ASSOCIATE DEGREE

This breakout continued a discussion that began at Fall Session concerning the meaning of the associate degree in the California Community College System and the requirements and regulations that control them. The discussion was initially prompted by external pressure such as the desire of the California State University Chancellor that we create a "one size fits all" transfer degree and also by internal pressures to increase degree and certificate production in response to Partnership for Excellence and other accountability measures.

Participants were presented with a range of possible options that varied from "do nothing" to significant changes that would alter the authority of local academic senates to set degree requirements. Presenters Angela Caballero de Cordero, Paul Setziol and Zwi Reznik joined participants to make eloquent, impassioned arguments for a variety of actions. Once again these debates contained elements of principle and pragmatism such as:

Principle: The associate degree is our degree. CSU should not impose requirements for a transfer degree any more than we would tell them what to put in their Bachelor's degree.

Pragmatism: But if the local requirement that determines whether a student receives an associate degree or not is perhaps a single course such as lifelong learning or physical education, are we not better to create a degree option that validates the two years of college level work that the student did in our institution?

Principle: It's wrong to create a separate vocational associate degree because it needlessly tracks students and could be viewed as a "second-class" degree. Vocational students deserve the same general education experience as all other students.

Pragmatism: A degree is valuable to students in terms of employment opportunities and salary. It should be possible to create a degree that combines appropriate general education and a vocational focus.

Questions considered by the participants included:

1) Do you feel the current lack of uniformity in associate degrees is acceptable for California community colleges and needs no changes?

2) Do you feel that it would be beneficial to introduce minor changes to Education Code/Title 5 to make associate degrees more uniform statewide (e.g., uniform use of AA and AS with names of particular majors)?

   Note: Making this mandatory would somewhat reduce local senate autonomy regarding naming and offering associate degrees.

3) Do you feel that major changes should be introduced in Education Code/Title 5 to make associate degrees more uniform (e.g., statewide coordination of actual degree requirements)?

   Note: Making this mandatory would considerably reduce local senate autonomy regarding degree requirements.

4) Do you believe that current Education Code/Title 5 language prohibits the use of a transfer degree (because of the lack of a major) and that colleges currently offering this degree should be required to stop?

5) Do you feel that Education Code/Title 5 changes should be introduced to formalize a transfer associate degree (with a distinct name) that local colleges may offer?

Note: This change would require conversation with UC and CSU faculty to be effective for students. Further, this could be an available option, adopted (or not) by local Boards (similar to adoption of plus/minus grading).

6) Do you feel that Education Code/Title 5 changes should be introduced to permit local colleges the option of offering a "vocational" associate degree (with a new name such as AVE or the existing AAS name, and with potentially different general education requirements)?

   Note: This would be available as an option to be adopted (or not) by local Boards.

Participant responses showed considerable support for the minor changes but a division of opinion on major changes surrounding the transfer and vocational degrees. It is anticipated that Educational Policies Committee will continue work on a position paper to lay out a variety of options for the body to consider at a future plenary session.

75:25 TASK FORCE

The three faculty members of the Chancellor's 75:25 Task Force, Cathy Crane McCoy (President of CCA), Rich Hansen (President of FACCC) and Ian Walton presented a brief history of the 75:25 Title 5 Regulations and some of the district survey data collected by the Task Force this spring. This led to a discussion that ranged from strong faculty support for the principle that 75% of credit instruction should be taught by full-time faculty and that progress toward that goal is long overdue, to perhaps pragmatic echoes of the statewide CEO positions. How can we be expected to make progress without targeted funding? In this regard it is important to note that the Board of Governors goal of 75% predates AB1725 and its promises of additional funding.

Survey data showed that there is enormous variability in district behavior over the past 17 years since AB 1725 inspired the current regulations. There are extremely few examples where a district failed to meet the mandatory compliance mechanism fondly known as the Faculty Obligation Number. But despite that high measure of compliance, some districts have maintained actual full-time to part-time ratios close to 75%; others have seldom exceeded 50%; and others look like a living example of chaos theory.

It was reported at the breakout session that several local academic senates experienced difficulty responding to the survey because they never received it, or they had only a few days to respond to their administration's comments. It is fair to remark that the timeline imposed by the Board of Governors is very tight. Local senates were encouraged to email additional responses directly to Cathy, Rich or Ian.

Since session, the Task Force has continued to work on their report to the Chancellor. It remains to be seen whether they can agree on a package of recommendations that will include both progress towards the system goal of 75% and increased flexibility for the Chancellor.

Making Sense of Accreditation

Greg Gilbert,
ACCJC Liaison

With WASC's activation of the 2002 Accreditation Standards last year, questions arose regarding the definitions of various accreditation and assessment terms as well as with the appropriate roles for faculty in the accreditation process. Though the Academic Senate was (and remains) opposed to the new standards for reasons that are enumerated in resolutions, papers and articles, the Senate has simultaneously accepted the challenge of helping the field to work constructively to achieve positive accreditation reports.

Among the Academic Senate's initial response to the standards, the paper, *The 2002 Accreditation Standards: Implementation* considers the emerging role of corporate accountability in education while setting out general guidelines for faculty with regards to assessment.

Our next paper on the subject of accreditation was approved at the Academic Senate's Spring 2005 Plenary in San Francisco: *Working with the 2002 Accreditation Standards: The Faculty's Role*. This publication is in keeping with the long-standing tradition of Senate papers that accompany substantial changes in WASC's approach to accreditation. As with those earlier papers, this one provides guidance and definitions to the field and discusses faculty involvement in the accreditation process, whether by participating in the self study process, serving on visiting teams or sitting on the Commission. Moreover, the paper addresses an important need in the field by providing definitions for accreditation terminology.

As local colleges and intersegmental groups began to work with the new standards, there was initial confusion about certain terms, particularly those dealing with student learning outcomes (SLOs) and objectives. It soon became apparent that various colleges and groups within our system were creating their own definitions, with a resultant sense of mounting confusion among educators. For example, some organizations decided to add SLOs to intersegmental course descriptors. Various local colleges were uncertain as to whether they should add SLOs or objectives to course outlines. In an attempt to rectify the problem, the Academic Senate examined accreditation and assessment terminology used by every accrediting region in the United States, plus the definitions utilized within the assessment profession and among various intersegmental and professional organizations.

Though the results of our research appear rather commonplace, the intended effect is that accreditation efforts within our courses, programs, institutions and at system and intersegmental levels will operate within a common set of discourse conventions. In addition, earlier this year, Kate Clark and I met with Executive Director Barbara Beno and Assistant Director Deborah Blue of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), a division of WASC, and we came to agreement on terms that are set out in "Working with the 2002 Accreditation Standards: The Faculty's Role." Our agreed definition of SLOs, for example, is:

> Student Learning Outcomes refer to overarching specific observable characteristics developed by local faculty that allow them to determine or demonstrate evidence that learning has occurred as a result of a specific course, program, activity, or process.

Of particular importance are two points, neither of which is at odds with the ACCJC. Specifically, outcomes may be "observable," as opposed to strictly "measurable." In other words, our professional judgment retains its license to assess on factors that may not be readily quantifiable. The second point is that SLOs are locally determined and, hence, not appropriate for inclusion within intersegmental documents or for boiler plating in any manner whatsoever. The importance of this cannot be overstated. If faculty relinquish the right to create, manage and revise their own course outcomes, they slip closer to stasis standardization.

Finally, as to whether SLOs are used in course outlines, the Academic Senate leaves it to local

decision-making but recommends caution. SLOs represent large concepts that may be more appropriate for the course description and the syllabus than as a list of expectations within the course outline. According to "Working with the 2002 Accreditation Standards: The Faculty's Role," the course outline "is a legal document that is developed locally, goes through a local approval process, and may be forwarded to the System Office for approval. Because SLOs have an ongoing relationship to local faculty dialogue and decision making, it is advisable that faculty consider carefully before they concretize SLOs into the COR." In addition, there

is more than enough pressure on the course outline without it having to constantly be reopened for an ongoing review of course outcomes.

Why are such issues of importance? Because at the point where compliance with standardization or the right to determine our own outcomes and measures exists, is the very future of the teaching profession. Likewise, it is advisable that faculty involve themselves actively in all aspects of accreditation and thereby use their influence to strengthen support for quality educational choices and equitable access throughout our community college system.

SPRING SESSION 2005 HIGHLIGHTS

Leon Marzillier is sharing a laugh with his audience during the Second General Session

Norbert Bischof receives a Resolution

John Maddox from Los Angeles Valley College during the Resolution Discussion at the Fifth General Session

Academic Senate President Kate Clark discusses resolution procedure with the Parliamentarian David Mezzera

9

Administrators in Our Midst: Retreat Rights and Evaluation

Mark Wade Lieu, Relations with Local Senates Committee Chair

The unfortunate truth is that faculty generally do not think about administrative retreat rights or administrative evaluation until something goes wrong. This reactive approach is the wrong one to take with either issue because it generally compounds an already bad situation. At the Spring Plenary Session, the Relations with Local Senates Committee presented breakouts on both issues from a proactive perspective rather than the reactive stance that we too often take.

We are all aware of behaviors or actions of administrators for which we faculty had no mechanism or remedy. For example, a particularly unqualified administrator decided to leave the administrative ranks and used your current retreat rights policy to plague the faculty in one of your departments. Another administrator repeatedly ignored the valid viewpoints of faculty; but aside from a vote of no confidence, no mechanism was in place at your college to provide feedback on this administrator's performance. However negative these experiences have been, it is more important to focus on creating mechanisms that support both the work of faculty and administrators and the learning of our students. That's it. Breathe deep and release all that negative energy—let our hostilities go.

ADMINISTRATIVE RETREAT RIGHTS

Let's begin with administrative retreat rights. The first step to making sure your retreat rights policy works is to know what your existing college's policy says and what Education Code says. Your college's policy should reflect Education Code, which has three important provisions. First, only educational administrators have retreat rights (Education Code §87458). Educational administrators are defined in Education Code § 87002b and in Title 5 § 53402 as administrators having direct responsibility for instruction or student services and they must meet certain minimum qualifications as such (Title 5 § 53420). Second, Education Code § 87458 also specifies that such administrators are only granted the right to retreat as a probationary first-year faculty member. Third, the process for granting retreat rights needs to be jointly agreed upon by your board and faculty senate.

What do you do next? If your retreat rights policy needs revision, choose a time when there is no controversial administrator positioning to retreat to the classroom. Choose a time of peace so that you can focus on the actual policy and not an individual. Present to your board your desire to update and clarify your administrative retreat rights policy and explain why it is in the best interest of students and the district to do so. Then consider the following four provisions as proactive ways to make sure that administrators who retreat to the classroom will be positive additions to your faculty and positive contributors to your students' learning.

First, at the time of an administrator's hire, evaluate minimum qualifications if the individual may retreat. This step gives potentially affected faculty the chance to impartially review an administrator's qualifications. Those faculty should also review the locally determined minimum qualifications over the course of the administrator's service, since the administrator may have taken additional course work that may indeed qualify him/her for a faculty position based on local minimum qualifications, or those minimum qualifications for teaching may have been adjusted subsequent to the administrator's hire. Department faculty must also be involved if equivalency needs to be established.

Second, it should be made clear to the administrator what locally determined criteria are in place for moving between departments, which might affect his/her ability to retreat. A common criterion many districts use is recency of teaching experience, often within five years or less. The administrator's ability to retreat recedes if he/she is out of the classroom for too long.

Third, a clear definition of "educational administrator" needs to be in place. At some colleges, a list of positions that qualify as "educational administrator" is included in policy. In all cases, however, the administrator must meet the requirements of Title 5 § 53402(b).

Fourth, local senates may need to work with their bargaining unit to consider protections for current

faculty, both full- and part-time. Some colleges specify that a retreating administrator cannot adversely affect the teaching load of a continuing full- or part-time faculty member.

ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATIONS

Administrative evaluations are a second matter about which faculty give too little proactive thought.[1] The fact is, the lack of ability to evaluate administrators is often the cause of no-confidence votes. Faculty resort to such votes because they have access to no other process to provide feedback to administrators and their supervisors. While Education Code 87633(i) stipulates that the legislature intended the "evaluation of administrators include, to the extent possible, faculty evaluation," Title 5 §51023.7 more concretely provides students a specific right in the formulation of "policies and procedures pertaining to the hiring and evaluation of faculty, administration, and staff."

However, there is no regulation that stipulates that evaluations of administrators *must* take place. Therefore faculty need to make a case for how administrative evaluation is a positive process for both faculty and administrators; further, as few students engage in the active evaluation of administrators with whom they have contact, a mechanism must be considered to include their participation as afforded them by regulation.

Once again, the time to broach the topic of evaluation of administrators is when satisfaction with administrators is generally good. You should also be aware that you may need to start with lower administrative positions and work your way up to evaluations of vice presidents, presidents, and chancellors. Demonstrate a model for constructive evaluation of an administrator that builds upon sound principles and humane treatment—as we would like to receive in our evaluations—offering positive feedback as well as constructive criticism. Positive comments can reflect well on the evaluatee with his/her immediate supervisor or your local board.

As you work out an evaluation process, here are components that you should keep in mind.

---

1   For additional information, you may wish to review two earlier papers:
    http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/Publications/ Papers/AcademicAdministratorEvaluation.htm http: //www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/Publications/Papers/ CEOEval.htm

1. What are the existing policies regarding administrator evaluations? Is the administrator part of a bargaining unit who has established such an evaluation process?

2. Who participates in the evaluation? While groups other than faculty should often participate (and students have rights under Title 5 to do so), decisions about which faculty also need to be made. Is this evaluation appropriate for all faculty? Members of the local senate? Faculty in particular disciplines or divisions?

3. What form does the evaluation take? Evaluation can be very formal or informal. Since the goal is improvement rather than punishment, informality is possible. Evaluation can be written or oral. Specific questions may be asked of all evaluators or less structured conversations can take place in small groups. Many variations here are possible.

4. Who administers the evaluation? This is a pragmatic as well as a perceptual issue. A neutral group should administer the evaluation to avoid any perception of bias, influence, or coercion. The group should also have the time and resources to conduct and compile responses.

5. How is faculty input used? This point should be made clear from the start. Faculty need to know how their responses will be used because this can affect their responses. Such clarity also sends a message that responses are valued, which can improve the response rate.

6. How is the overall evaluation used? Since other groups will be involved as well, everyone wants to know how the overall evaluation will be used. This is an opportunity to stress once again that the evaluation is constructive and not punitive.

7. How often does evaluation occur? A clear timeline for regular evaluation serves both evaluating groups and the evaluatee. It provides time for evaluatees to address concerns from the last evaluation, and it provides a regular mechanism for faculty and others to provide input into an administrator's performance.

In both of these situations that may well shape the futures of individual administrators—their retreat rights and their evaluations—the focus is on creating policies that form a proactive, professional approach to administrators in our midst and reducing the potential for conflict with faculty further down the line. If the climate is positive at your college, this is an ideal time to review these administrative issues for possible action by your local senate.

Web Advising in the Community Colleges

Gail Conrad,
Counseling and
Library Faculty
Issues Committee

As the discipline of Counseling runs to keep up with technology and meet the needs of a growing population of students that "come to college" by logging onto the internet, the Counseling and Library Faculty Issues Committee has been contemplating where we are as a system on this matter.

Ironically, it seems that the ability to survey our colleges and to present current information is the most difficult part of the task. As soon as we send out surveys, we hear of changes and find ourselves behind in reporting the activity of the field.

The process for this survey included a letter to all local academic senates, with a request to solicit assistance from the Counseling Services on their respective campuses. Of the 109 colleges in the system, 74 responded about the online web advising services that they offer, with 35 (or 32%) of the colleges not responding. Of those submitting their survey, 35 (or 32%) do offer this support. These services vary from the low-tech email response to the high-tech web procedures and databases that provide a culture of evidence along with support upon student demand. The remaining 39 (or 36%) of the colleges responded that they have no *official* online or web-advising services, but most added that they do communicate with students via email on a regular basis.

To answer the question "Is this common practice?" we believe that the fact that almost a third of the colleges are responding to student advising needs online predicts that the growth of this practice will be common to all in the near future. What some colleges seem to be waiting for is the direction that the services should take. What the college should include and what liabilities are out there for counselors and students are just two questions that need to be answered.

A number of common concerns were identified in the survey. These pose areas of dialogue for your college. A review of the guidelines presently in place for face-to-face appointments and those established to protect privacy rights for phone conversations are similar distinctions that should be addressed for web or online communications. You may also want to identify differences specific to your college, district, faculty or students; similarly, students would need to know which policies or regulations apply to all students throughout the district. An example would be the probation standards, which would probably be the same for your college as well as other colleges in your district. Students that only connect by distance education or online may have no idea that your services are "district-wide" and this may prevent enrollment with other colleges in your district.

Another common concern is the definition of terms. Although we have professional associations that help us to identify the differences between "advising" and "counseling," our students don't come to us with that ready knowledge. You may choose to use the "counseling" term for all forms of the service if that is the campus culture (a rose by any other name is still a rose). It may be more appropriate to list your limitations of service for online assistance or alert students to when they would need a face-to-face appointment to answer their particular question. Others may be directed to phone calls with a security option to ensure that counselors are indeed talking to the appropriate individual.

Disclaimers, clearly addressing the confidentiality (or limits of same) during online advising, and statements of "information subject to change" are both needed for student understanding. As with all communications, counselors can only respond to questions that are asked and if a student's information is incomplete or time passes before a student takes action, your advising may have unexpected consequences for the student.

Many of the websites developed a set of FAQ's for the student to access during the use of online services. Respondents recommended that schedules be included with the availability of online counselors or timelines for email responses. There were no recommendations specific to 48 or 72

hours being better, but students could make better choices if they knew they would receive an immediate response or would have to check back at a later time for an email response.

Recording this online activity is another area to focus on. Will you keep manual logs of the activity? Or can your college IT system offer the support for a web-based intake? The more sophisticated the system, the better you may be able to accommodate the growing need or use; however, these options require ongoing discussions with your college or district technology committee so that your needs can be advocated for and met.

For additional assistance with code of ethics, standards of practice, or guidelines for electronic communications, check with the American Counseling Association (www.counseling.org) or the National Career Development Association (www.ncda.org), two resources that colleges have already used.

There are also a number of technology resources that you may find helpful. The CVC Online Training has developed a comprehensive student support services resource that you can access at http://training.cvc4.org/ssservices. The login: studserv and password: studserv should allow you to access the information.

An electronic journal, *ijournal* (June 2004, no. 8; Retrieved May 2005 from http://www.ijournal.us/issue_08/ij_issue08_MeyersAndOstash_01.htm), includes Paul Meyer's article "Pulling the Pieces Together: Comprehensive Online Support Services." And finally, many of the colleges referred to training on distance counseling that was provided by Readyminds. You can access their services at: http://readyminds.com/training/dcc_cert.asp

So if you believe that your college is moving into cyberspace and your counseling services don't want to be left behind, what can you do next? You might want to view some of the best practice sites that colleges shared with the committee. If you still have time for some surfing of the Internet, we hope that you check some of these out soon.

https://onlinecounseling.lbcc.edu (Long Beach City College)

http://www.cerritos.edu (Cerritos College)

Both of these sites work with the Region 8 Online Consortium for Online Counseling (Orange County). They have been meeting regularly to develop guidelines for this growing field.

http://www.2bakersfieldcollege.edu/counseling

This is a comprehensive online orientation that includes information for students on getting started, FAQ's and distance education for Bakersfield College.

http://academic.cuesta.edu/counseling/navigation/faqs.htm

This guideline for counselors at Cuesta College gives examples of canned answers for counselor efficiency when responding to students. It is detailed to the specific environment with CalPoly close by, but gives you great ideas.

The committee members want to thank the colleges, counselors, and local academic senates for your hard work in providing the answers to the field of web advising in the community colleges!

Yula Flournoy, Mt. San Jacinto College (Co-chair); Teresa Aldredge, Cosumnes College (Co-chair); Deborah Moore, Glendale College; Lakshmi Ariaratnam, Butte College; Linda-Rosa Corazon, Skyline College; Micca Gray, Santa Rosa Jr. College; and Gail Conrad, San Diego Mesa College.

On the Ledge with Lege

*Dan Crump,
Legislative and
Governmental
Relations
Committee Chair*

The Academic Senate's Legislative and Governmental Relations Committee had two opportunities at the Spring Plenary Session to inform attendees of legislative issues affecting faculty—a breakout on legislative activities and a breakout on Senate Bill 5 and its impact on academic freedom.

SB5, titled by the author Senator Bill Morrow as the "Student Bill of Rights," is seen by many faculty as an attack on academic freedom. The breakout held by the Committee provided an active discussion of the implications of SB 5 on academic freedom and faculty rights and responsibilities. During the breakout, faculty leaders noted that faculty groups testified at legislative hearings

about the processes in place at colleges to protect students from classroom or grading retaliation or retribution for holding beliefs that are different than that of the faculty. During the coming year, the Legislative and Governmental Relations Committee will work on efforts to make campus grievance policies and procedures more apparent to both students and faculty.

Similarly, the legislative update and issues breakout alerted attendees to information about the importance of student participation in the voting process. David Yee (City College of San Francisco faculty member) informed attendees about an initiative spearheaded by students and faculty at CCSF that ties voter registration to the college registration

LEGISLATIVE TERMS OF INTEREST

BLUE PENCIL
The California Constitution grants the Governor "line item veto" authority to reduce or eliminate any item of appropriation in any bill including the Budget Bill. Years ago, the Governor used an editor's blue pencil for the task. An example of blue pencil would be the $31.4 million in PFE appropriations that the Governor deleted from last year's Budget Bill (it is expected that funding will be restored in this year's May Revise).

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE
Usually composed of three members from each house (the Speaker chooses the Assembly conferees and Senate conferees are chosen by the Senate Rules Committee), a conference committee meets in public session to forge one version of a bill when the house of origin has refused to concur in amendments to the bill adopted by the other house. For the bill to pass, both the Assembly and the Senate must approve the conference committee version. The annual Budget Bill is a usually the result of a conference committee.

RECONSIDERATION
a motion giving the opportunity to take another vote on a matter previously decided in a committee hearing or floor session. For example, SB5 failed to get out of the Senate Education Committee, but was granted the courtesy of possible reconsideration sometime in the future.

SUSPENSE FILE
A holding place for bills that carry appropriations over a specified dollar amount. The suspense file is a function of the fiscal committee in both houses. Bills are generally placed in the suspense file before the adoption of the Budget Bill and just before the summer recess.

process. Jonathan Lightman, Executive Director of the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges, then provided an interesting and informative overview of the legislative process. He discussed SB 55 (authored by Senator Alan Lowenthal), and a FACCC-sponsored bill that provides a process for votes of no confidence taken by local academic senates on upper-level college and district administrators to be placed on the agenda of the local board of trustees in order for the board to make "certain determinations" regarding such votes.

Julie Adams, ASCCC Executive Director, showcased the Senate's new legislative tracking system now displayed on the Senate Website http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/Legislative/Legislative.htm. This new tracking system will serve as a new resource for local academic senates to use in monitoring key legislation on academic and professional matters. Faculty can now find up to date information on bills that the Academic Senate is actively tracking at the state level. In addition, each bill is linked to background information, analysis, status, our position and the position of other organizations. Congratulations to Julie and Rita Sabler (Publications Specialist) for the development and design of this useful page.

During the breakout, various pieces of legislation pertaining to fees (AB 473), funding (SB 361 and AB 23), accountability (AB 196 and SB 445), student health centers (AB 982), 75:25 (AB 1425) and career technical/vocational education (AB 1425 and SB 794) were discussed. I urge you to visit our new tracking page to read more back-

"

This is a very busy time for legislative activity—both tracking and advocacy—in the Capitol. By the time this article comes out, we will have heard about the Governor's "May Revise" of the 2005-06 state budget

ground information and see the Senate's positions on these and other bills by going to the Senate's new Lege Tracking Page.

This is a very busy time for legislative activity—both tracking and advocacy—in the Capitol. By the time this article comes out, we will have heard about the Governor's "May Revise" of the 2005-06 state budget that he proposed in January and that will guide much of the legislative deliberations. The appropriations committees of both houses will be busy discussing the fiscal implications of bills and the budget. The Legislative and Governmental Relations Committee will do its best to keep you informed of these activities.

The Forgotten Ones:
Whom Do We Represent?

Jane Patton,
Occupational
Education
Committee Chair

At the recent Spring 2005 Plenary Session, the Occupational Education Committee sponsored a breakout titled "The Forgotten Ones: Whom Do You Represent?" The premise for discussion was that often on our campuses, certain programs and services can be left out of campus discussions, because they are unique in their needs, because they are smaller programs or because the representatives at the table are not informed about the variety of program and faculty characteristics across campus.

While a December 2004 *Rostrum* article addressed occupational programs specifically (programs that are often forgotten) and suggested that faculty leaders need to broaden their knowledge of occupational programs, this article points to the wider range of programs and services that can be ignored or forgotten when college decisions are made.

The discussion at session was organized around five questions. Those questions are listed below with some of the responses generated by the panel and audience. They are offered here informally, as a summary of the conversation we had. Perhaps their discussion will serve as starting point for local discussions you might want to have.

The first question we asked was: Why are we having this conversation? What are the issues? Responses included these points: Senates and shared governance groups have to represent all programs; that is hard. We are physically separated on campus, leading to real or imagined barriers and distance between people and programs. Some of us feel like or are treated as "step-children." We feel we have to defend our programs and ourselves. If our program is labeled as "non WSCH-generating", a negative stigma is attached. Campus meetings are scheduled at times we have work duties (counseling, clinical duty, labs), so we cannot attend them. We're left out. There is a lack of collaboration across programs. Noncredit is not understood; it's a mystery to many people.

The second question we asked was: What do all programs and areas of the college have in common? The audience and panel had the following responses. Students! We all care about student success and retention. We are all at the same institution. We all serve our local community's needs and demands. We each have requirements for accountability and funding. Faculty across disciplines may have similar concerns about trustees or administrators. All faculty have guaranteed powers and authority (via their senates). We have personal lives too!

The third question was: What things are unique to certain programs (e.g. occupational programs, counseling, libraries, noncredit)? The responses included the following. Some work schedules and workloads are different from those of classroom faculty—such as those of Counselors, Librarians, and Coordinators. Faculty in different positions can have different relationships with certain administrators; this can cause friction with other faculty. Some faculty deal with staff issues (as supervisors, doing scheduling, etc). There may be unique funding needs. Accreditation processes and standards may vary. Some programs maintain community relationships and involvement in their programs (e.g. advisory committees). Students in different programs need different kinds of support services and retention strategies. Primary missions of certain programs differ. Student's expectations and goals differ (e.g. fail program=no career). Special programs include internships, Puente, etc. Our counselors are faculty—unlike elsewhere. Some programs have access issues.

The fourth question put to the group was this: What are some strategies senates and senate presidents can use to a) educate themselves, 2) educate the senates, 3) ensure governance committees take broad perspectives and not limited views? These suggestions were made: Remember that you are powerful! Work with administrators. Don't attack colleagues. Think "we" not "they." Ensure faculty

"

When we know people personally, we are more apt to include and defend them

from various programs attend and participate fully. Help them become leaders (e.g. by attending Vocational Leadership Institutes). Look at your governance policies; revise where needed (if not all groups are represented). Be accessible. One senate president's example: he went around his campus to meet each faculty member personally. List the various causes or issues on your campus. Be aware of them. Have a climate of unity. Defend all programs. Do your homework. Research. Prepare. Make a special effort to inform people who did not attend a meeting. Take advantage of networks, listservs and other ways to contact people. Have counselors serve as a liaison to each program or department. Librarians can work with individual departments. Educate the Board and administration about your unique programs (e.g., "A Day in the Life of our Department"). Celebrate people and the good work they do. Get more people to attend governance meetings — not only those on the committee. Informal processes are also important. Be inclusive. Build good relationships between union and academic senate.

The final question put to the group was: What are some terms or labels we use that might inadvertently push people's buttons? Because our language shapes perceptions, what alternate expressions could we use? The first concern was about minimum qualifications. On the Minimum Qualifications list, the terms "master's" vs. "non master's" creates a category that is a "non." An alternative might be a heading that says "degree or education requirement" and the categories can be "master's" or "baccalaureate." The participants then said that there are various terms we use that can needlessly contribute to negative impressions about programs or groups. They listed some of those expressions and suggested alternative language. Instead of

saying "They" we can say "We" because after all, we are all in the same boat. Rather than say "Non teaching" we could say "faculty" because we all are faculty. The term "Non academic" can be insulting. Perhaps this term should be avoided. If someone is comparing, say, occupational programs to transfer programs, those terms are preferable. When one says "Non WSCH-generating," it suggests that services provided by faculty are not all equally valued. And it was suggested that ultimately, all faculty help keep students in their classes, no matter what their role may be. Another expression that people found irritating was "non-transfer faculty." It is the *course* that is transferable, not the faculty member!

In general, the suggestion was to use more specific language when discussing our programs and faculty and to be sensitive to the possible effect that labels can have on our relationships on campus.

This conversation reminds us of several rather obvious principles: When we know people personally, we are more apt to include and defend them. The language we use to define one another contributes to the quality of our relationships. If we all keep talking and learning from one another, we will probably all benefit. As Woodrow Wilson once said, "I not only use all the brains I have, but all I can borrow."

Helping Students to Succeed... Honestly!

By Deborah Harrington and Scott Weigand, with Leon Marzillier, Executive Committee Member

Leon Marzillier, Executive Committee

At the 2005 Spring Plenary Session of the Academic Senate, in the spirit of the themes of the Session, show and tell and accountability-one of the many breakouts addressed two perennial concerns of community college faculty. How do we help more of our students to reach their goals? And, how do we prevent them from taking shortcuts by cheating?

At this breakout, Leon Marzillier introduced two faculty members of Los Angeles Valley College, Deborah Harrington and Scott Weigand, who described a successful program they put together at that college with the help of a FIPSE grant. It is known as the STARS program (Strategic Team for the Advancement and Retention of Students). Following are some of the programs and ideas stemming from this initiative described by Deborah and Scott, but developed by a whole team of faculty, staff, and students at that college. Maybe it will give you some thoughts for putting a like program together on your campus.

In developing the STARS program, Project Director and grant writer Deborah Harrington recognized that faculty and staff are provided with numerous opportunities for professional development where they can meet and discuss different strategies to foster academic success in the classroom; however, in these sessions, the primary stakeholders—the students—are being left out of the conversation. Therefore, the STARS program was designed to provide opportunities where students and faculty could meet regularly both in and out of class in order to discuss and monitor their learning. The idea is that STARS students—with the help of faculty—will learn to set goals for learning and to monitor their learning progress; in this way, STARS faculty will help students to better understand the process of learning itself.

STARS has thus been a vehicle for bringing together students, faculty, and staff to engage in a comprehensive dialogue about academic honesty at Los Angeles Valley College. Over the course of two semesters, STARS facilitated twelve roundtable discussions exploring nearly every aspect of this topic. The sessions began with students and faculty sharing their own experiences and concerns and then discussing how cultural differences as well as transitioning from high school to college can lead to students misunderstanding the conventions of the discourse community at the college level.

In subsequent sessions, the amount of information on academic honesty in Los Angeles Valley College's course catalogue was examined and compared to other colleges. And in doing so, the group discovered the need for more explicit information detailing not only the school's policies, but suggestions for how and where to get help when students are struggling with assignments. Out of this grew an understanding that a primary cause of academic dishonesty is pressure and anxiety. By shifting the focus of the conversation to preventative strategies rather than punitive measures, participants came to understand the importance of shared responsibility. That is, students, faculty, and staff all hold a stake in creating an environment which privileges academic integrity. The work on this topic and others related to academic honesty has highlighted the need for changes to take place in the classroom itself rather than merely providing recommendations for changes in policy. In the case of academic honesty, the importance of instructors specifically addressing how the topic relates to their particular discipline cannot be overstressed.

This has been a central goal of the STARS program—providing students and instructors with practical strategies for fostering academic success in the classroom. The program designers are also busy working on bringing the STARS model to campuses throughout the state; our most current session occurs during the week of August 18th when STARS will be conducting a professional development session at Cuyamaca College in El Cajon. If you'd be interested in finding out more detailed information about STARS work with Academic Honesty or any of the many other topics addressed regarding student-centered learning, or if you'd be interested in scheduling a student/faculty professional development session for your own school, please contact Deborah Harrington at harrindl@lavc.edu or at (818) 947-2811.

Student performance at Thursday dinner showcases local young talents from Skyline college

Becky Hull, Ventura College and Marlon Hall, West Hills Coalinga discussing senate issues during dinner.

Group lesson was a crowd pleaser and gave the faculty a chance to work on some hot moves

David Viar enjoying the conversation at the General Session Luncheon

Salsa! Salsa! Salsa! Students from Skyline college rock the floor

After watching an inspirational salsa performance the session attendees give it a try themselves

On Red Stars, White Guys, and Trailer Trash; Non-random Musings on Owning our Symbols

By Gary Holton, Incoming Executive Committee Member

Random: These are not random musings. They may be disorganized, and perhaps incoherent, but they are not random. They are subject to whatever forces and patterns govern anything else I say or do. I suspect my microwave.

The word "random" seems to be evolving. I notice my students using it more often, and less accurately. One student described her roommate, saying she was dating "some random guy." She seemed to be suggesting that perhaps her friend could have selected her date more carefully. Still, despite his faults, the date was not random.

If dating were truly random, I would have had a social life in High School. But no…evolution displays an insidious bias against males who request briefcases for their sixteenth birthday. Consequently, I had free evenings in which to prepare for speech competitions. This led to a degree in Rhetoric, a career teaching Speech[1], and, eventually, a beautiful wife and two gorgeous children. Take that evolution.

These non-random musings, then, will focus on our need to own honest language that can provoke pride even when intended not to. Red Stars: Recently some of our colleagues at Santa Rosa Junior College[2] had flyers with large red stars pinned to their office doors. The flyers also helpfully provided the Education Code language declaring that no teacher "shall advocate or teach communism with the intent to indoctrinate or to inculcate in the mind of any pupil a preference for communism."

Some of the recipients of the stars felt duly threatened. While people's feelings are their own, I'd have hoped that they might also have felt honored. The red stars were testaments that these teachers had reached their students–or someone's students, who heard from a friend of a friend that something was going on in those classes. The red stars accused these teachers of offering their students a perspective beyond their own narrow experience. These students had then been aroused to action. Misguided and poorly considered action, to be sure, but action none-the-less. Imagine these students in the years to come. I see embarrassment and grudging fondness for those teachers who professed, who had something to say. Where is my red star? Perhaps I haven't earned it yet.

In the interest of full disclosure and a cheap joke to be revealed shortly, I must confess that I am a bit of a red. I am a dues paying member of the Democratic Socialists of America. Barbara Ehrenreich, Dolores Huerta, Gloria Steinem and Cornel West are also members.[3] I paid my Democratic Socialist dues just last month on the DSA web site. I paid with a credit card. Who knew that when reactionary voices spoke of "card carrying" members of subversive groups, that the card would be a Master-Card? Priceless.

And now for White guys: At the recent spring plenary session of the Academic Senate, Wanda Morris of Compton College and the Senate's Equity and Diversity Action Committee introduced a resolution on hiring and diversity. It began, "Whereas, The majority of faculty in California community colleges are white and the majority of students are not…"

No less than four amendments to the resolution were introduced. None of the amendments questioned the accuracy of Wanda's original statement. The resolution as amended reads, "Whereas, The composition of the faculty in California community

---

[1] Thanks to a Senate-initiated change to the Disciplines List, I am now a Professor of Communication Studies. Apparently my students now have to study.

[2] One of two colleges in our system who have retained "junior" in their appellation.

[3] Although we don't hang out as much as I'd like, I'm hoping Cornel can get me a part in the next *Matrix* sequel.

> " *the more clearly we talk about difficult topics, the more likely we are to find solutions*

colleges does not reflect the diversity of the students…" This statement is true. And yes, diversity is more than just ethnicity.

Still, was part of our discomfort with the original language a discomfort with the fact that it made a clear statement? It recognized that the melanin challenged[4] are over-represented. Don't get me wrong. Some of my best friends are white guys[5]. My wife even married one. Still, having a relative surplus of white folks–and white guys in particular–in the faculty is a part of the problem.

I'm not suggesting that come the revolution, we put white guys in line right behind the lawyers. The white guy faculty members I know–and I have met a few–have dedicated their careers to being a part of the solution. I am, however, suggesting that the more clearly we talk about difficult topics, the more likely we are to find solutions. This is one reason why Wanda's clear, strong and kind voice will be missed in the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. I hope to see her back very soon.

And finally, trailer trash: So far, I've been arguing for owning our language, for using honest language and for finding pride in labels others try to use to hurt us. Having said that, language is our most powerful tool, and must be used with caution, with care and with the recognition that our responses to language are not always rational.

I'm the token white guy in my family. My wife is Japanese-American. Our two boys[6] are a beautiful mixture of their mother's finest qualities and their father's ability to subsist and thrive on a diet composed entirely of pizza.

I like being our family's white guy. I can see the humor and hear the love when Diane says, "You're so white," sometimes when I'm not even trying to dance. And yet, several years ago I was reminded of the power of even unintended language to hurt.

In order to support the boys and me in the manner to which we have become accustomed, Diane

works in the private sector. In her office, they're always looking for an excuse to have a potluck. For a while, they were having one nearly once a week. Once it was Aloha Monday, and all the entrees had to feature Spam. The next week, Diane told me she was organizing a Trailer Trash Tuesday.

I was appalled. How dare she call my people trash? She hadn't earned the right. She had never lived in a trailer park. Oh sure, her parents had been confined to tar paper barracks behind barbed wire fences during World War II…but no trailers. It didn't take too long to recognize the absurdity of my reaction. Still, I try to remind myself of that reaction when I'm tempted to criticize someone else's use of language.

And with that in mind, let me extend my apologies to Santa Rosa and Modesto Junior Colleges, to white guys worldwide, and to those who chose the language of diversity over the language of ethnicity because they wanted to reflect the complexity of the issue. And finally, my apologies to real socialists both historical and contemporary. Most had neither tenure, a loving patron amongst the bourgeois, nor their own 401k plan.

---

[4] We prefer the term "you people."

[5] Not that there's anything wrong with that.

[6] Pictures are available on request, or on the slightest flicker of feigned interest.

Viewing the Academic Senate Mission with Appreciative Inquiry

Lynn Welch, Standards and Practices Committee

"Be the change you wish to see in the world." Gandhi

The Standards and Practices breakout on appreciative inquiry introduced its five generic processes. We then had an opportunity to view the Academic Senate mission within that framework. Subsequently, the plenary body adopted a new mission statement as follows:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges fosters the effective participation by community college faculty in all statewide and local academic and professional matters; develops, promotes, and acts upon policies responding to statewide concerns; and serves as the official voice of the faculty of California Community Colleges in academic and professional matters. The Academic Senate strengthens and supports the local senates of all California community colleges.

The five processes include definition, discovery, dream, design, and destiny/delivery. The entire process is a positive approach to change, a way of *being* and *seeing*. Appreciative inquiry assumes every human system has a *hidden and underutilized positive core of strengths* for personal and organizational transformation. It assumes this positive core of strengths also clarifies or enhances a sense of identity, shared values and culture; establishes a climate of continual learning and inquiry; renews group energy, hope, motivation and commitment; and increases curiosity and a sense of vitality.

There are the "positive deviants" within every social, business, educational and community group who use positive energy for problem solving. Appreciative inquiry suggests this positive reframing approach has a dynamic impact on how an organization ultimately achieves its vision.

Inquiry does not have to be oriented around a problem. Appreciative Inquiry allows people to inquire into attitudes, processes, structures, programs, and services that are already working *exceptionally well*. Instead of asking what is wrong, we focus our energy and light on what is right. Research shows that there is a turn-around when we take this approach. That which was identified as *what-is-wrong* shrinks like a radiated tumor, and health, well-being and success begin to grow in its place. As a result, inquiring into successes minimizes the impediment of problems and creates more successes. The appreciation is not just looking at the positive, but also allowing the positive to grow just as money in the savings account appreciates with interest.

For more information about background, research and training in Appreciative Inquiry techniques, here are two resources: http://appreciativeinquiry.cwru.edu

Stetson, N. E., & Miller, C. R. (2003, February). Appreciative inquiry: A new way of leading change in schools and colleges. *Proceedings from International Chair Academy Conference*.

Maricopa Community Colleges, AZ: Retrieved May 20, 2005, from http://centerforappreciativeinquiry.net./schoolcolleges

Promises to Keep

In the annual reports of Executive Committee members to be adopted in August and then posted on our website, you will see how each committee individually contributed to these broad goals and the various objectives under each.

Immediately, however, you might recall some of these elements I will discuss in my President's annual report: our ASCCC membership flyer with its detachable card; the ever-improving website that links all faculty to our activities and publications; my visits to 46 of your campuses—all to make more evident our service to and our desire to serve you.

As an expression of your academic and professional interests, the Academic Senate this year achieved a long-sought objective—a state-level curriculum advisory committee to the system's Vice-Chancellor of Educational Services. We also insisted upon our significant role in system-level budgeting (the new funding formula) and planning (the System's Strategic Plan initiative), in examination of long-held goals (the 75:25 Task Force), and in two forthcoming working groups that will examine non-credit standards and funding.

Finally, as an article in this *Rostrum* reminds readers, we continue to offer challenging plenary sessions and institutes (curriculum, leadership, vocational leadership); we are exploring creating a teaching institute to further your professional development, even when the Legislature or our administrations are unwilling to fund such necessary ventures.

On a personal note: I've promised that on behalf of our organization, we'd look again at the 50% law. I've worked at it, chipping away for the two years of my tenure…it's a problem I have been tackling with a small group, but it's not a problem solved. Yet. I have until July 1, and I intend to use that time, just as all academic senate leaders must continue to lend our energies to the projects that have our personal commitments, regardless of the calendar.

Sometimes we've made promises to our colleagues: to work more creatively to diversify our faculty ranks, to protect their programs, to persuade more faculty in career and technical education fields that

their participation in college and district governance and on regional and state advisory boards is critical to the health of their programs. We promise to serve in the field and to return to campus laden with information that will render our college more vital and vibrant. Sometimes we become the shunned and harried prophets in our own land, but we continue to serve as harbingers.

The ASCCC's promises to our colleagues—the promises the delegates exact from us each year, endure—some are on-going, some are fulfilled, some require the persistence of many. Each session, you are provided an update of the actions we've undertaken to fulfill the obligations of our resolutions. It's among the mechanisms you have to hold us accountable—I hope you'll read them and the annual reports to ensure that we're doing what you have called upon us to do.

Sometimes we also make promises to students: that as a senate we'll provide them with the credit coursework and the mentorship their student governments so often need, and that we will offer them the protection our tenure affords them—to buffer them from the undue influence of administrators or staff. As long as we have students who believe the federal government should censor newspapers or that tenure is unnecessary, we have work remaining. Further, we've promised our students that we'd do everything within our power to assist their plans to transfer to programs of high quality.

The ASCCC has encouraged statewide student leadership, welcomes the student voice at our Executive Committee meetings, offered seminars in participatory governance for their leadership credential, and will pursue in the coming months a comprehensive response to the CalSACC/Student Senate schism that has emerged in the past few weeks.

Some of our promises to those who mean most are hardest for us to keep—and not for lack of trying on our part. Our efforts to address the CSU departure from CAN, for example, are exerted because we fear that students across the state will be further confused and perhaps ill-served by the new CSU LDTP (Lower Division Transfer Pattern) plan; our involvement in the community college response to articulation uncertainties and partly motivated by our students' frustration and because our community colleges are being held responsible for the

enrollment management decisions of baccalaureate-degree granting institutions. In 2003, California community colleges prepared approximately 120,000 students for transfer; only 70,000 were accepted by UC and CSU, with perhaps another 20,000 enrolling in private or public out-of-state institutions. Translation? Tens of thousands of students who dutifully prepared, believed they were transfer ready, had every intention of transferring… were denied that option. That was a promise we made in good faith that suddenly became beyond our ability to fulfill, and we're saddened. But we are neither silent nor passive.

Our Executive Committee has also worked with Chancellor Drummond and his administrators to consider promises they make on behalf of students. Their Memorandum of Understanding reached with National University seeks to ease the transfer issue I have just discussed. But other MOUs now being crafted may address a political moment but not offer the most useful academic and career opportunities for our students. While we continue to work with the System Office, each local senate must be intimately involved when its own college administrators attempt to craft private agreements with transfer institutions that have direct bearing on our resources, our programs, and our reputation.

On a personal note: I have stated publicly and personally—not as an Academic Senate officer but as an individual—that I would continue to advocate for on-going funding that once came from CAN to support local transfer and articulation training and development. And I will continue to lend my energies and efforts to "fix" this mess in a way that best serves our students. I also indicated that someday I'd write an article about these MOUs and private agreements—seeking out noble examples that truly serve students and increase their affordable options, and raising questions (as a recent resolution does) about the efficacy of some plans. That's a promise I won't keep here—it's

an intention I'll pass on to my successors, something on the Presidential To-Do List that is assigned to the office, not the individual.

And sometimes we've made promises to ourselves: promises to become more effective peer evaluators as another article in this *Rostrum* discusses. We may also have promised that each year we would identify someone we'd be proud to serve with, to by led by, to work under. We would exercise patience, or perhaps we would merely exercise. One local senate president, apparently somewhat embittered by his senate experience, commented that the only thing one has to gain by being local senate president is 15 pounds. I truly hope he didn't mean it. I concede readily that the fifteen pounds can be a burden. But the work to take off that weight after our year(s) of service has already been rewarded by the small victories we experience, the new respect we have for faculty we'd not have encountered otherwise, and even the new wisdom to shy away from faculty whose primary function in life seems to be to make others miserable. We have gained a larger picture that makes it impossible for us to be PCP (parking lot-classroom-parking lot) faculty. Today we know better. I know better.

On a personal note: I promised myself I would help to build the leadership skills of my Executive Committee members when they showed interest in doing a job well or seemed they could use a hand or personal encouragement. It's an important promise to them and to the organization; but they can better measure how I have or have not fulfilled that promise. And now? I promise to lose 15 pounds—exercise more and eat regularly and be grateful everyday for the experiences I have had within the ASCCC and the resultant opportunity to work with all of you. But (I apologize to Mr. Frost for invoking him once more and to the reader who suspected all along that I would), I still have promises to keep and some miles to go before I sleep.