# SenateRostrum

# Looking Forward:

## The Chancellor's Office Task Force On Accreditation Report

by David Morse

New Options for Professional Development p 4

Quantitative Reasoning at the Baccalaureate Level p 5

also in this issue

# Looking Forward: The Chancellor's Office Task Force On Accreditation Report

by David Morse, President

The Chancellor's Office 2015 Task Force on Accreditation released its final report to the public in late August. As the report itself notes, this task force built on the work of two previous Chancellor's Office task forces from 2009 and 2013 as well as on previous studies and resolutions from the Research and Planning Group, the Community College League of California, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, the California State Auditor, and others. However, the 2015 Task Force Report takes a new direction from those of previous statements and looks toward the future of accreditation in the California Community Colleges.

The task force had a broad representative membership that included the ASCCC, chief executive officers, trustees, bargaining units, chief instructional officers, chief student services officers, and college accreditation liaisons. The representatives from all of these constituencies unanimously agreed to and supported the report's content and conclusions. All agreed that the report should focus not on mistakes or difficulties of the past but rather on the structure of accreditation that is needed and desired by the community college system as we move forward.

The conclusion of the report states in part the following:

> The central focus of accreditation processes should be on providing excellent teaching and learning opportunities and on academic integrity. The current accreditor for the California Community Colleges has failed to maintain such a focus... In addition, developments such as associate degrees for transfer and the beginnings of a community college baccalaureate degree effort have led California community colleges to become more integrated with 4-year colleges and universities. For this reason, the community colleges system would benefit from a closer, more formalized collaboration with the other institutions of higher education in the region, including service on evaluation teams. Further delay in resolving the issues with the accreditor will have adverse effects on our colleges, on our students, and on California's economy and future and will prevent the timely development of the robust accreditation structure that other regions enjoy and that California lacks.

Based on this conclusion, the task force offered the following recommendations to the chancellor and the Board of Governors:

1. The Chancellor's Office should investigate all available avenues for establishing a new model for accreditation, including options such as the following:

    a. Form a combined single accrediting commission with community colleges joining WASC Senior College and University Commission, in keeping with the prevalent model for regional accreditation.

    b. Identify other regional accreditors that could serve the California Community Colleges.

2. The Chancellor's Office should evaluate possible accrediting agents for the California Community Colleges in a thorough yet expeditious manner and, working through the system's established consultation processes, bring a recommendation for action to the Board of Governors by Spring 2016.

3. Until a new accrediting agent for the system is identified, system constituencies should continue to work in a cooperative and proactive manner with the ACCJC to ensure the continuity of the accreditation process for all colleges within the system.

In short, the task force recommended exploration of all options that would allow for a more effective and beneficial accreditation structure that could work in conjunction with other higher education partners while also noting the importance of colleges working with the current commission to maintain their accreditation until such exploration and any subsequent actions or changes can be completed.

### ALL ABOUT US

The report of the 2015 Task Force on Accreditation is not intended as an indictment of the current accreditor, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). It is not a reflection or discussion of the difficulties experienced by City College of San Francisco or any other single institution. It is not a list or analysis of past grievances against ACCJC in either a positive or a negative sense. The report also in no way questions the value of accreditation in general. The community college system and its faculty value an accreditation process based on peer evaluation, and the task force clearly reaffirmed this commitment to a strong accreditation process.

Rather, the report offers a vision of the accreditation structure and process required by the California Community College System at present and moving into the future. With California community colleges now offering baccalaureate degrees, with an increased focus on transfer to the university level, and with greater demand than ever for workforce development, the community college system must have an accrediting structure that works cohesively with partners at both the university and the K-12 level. The system requires an accrediting agency that focuses on academic quality and in which all member institutions have confidence. The task force report concludes by stating, "The task force therefore urges the Chancellor and the Board of Governors to seek other accrediting options that would provide the collaborative and credible approach to accreditation that the California Community Colleges require and deserve." In other words, the report is not about ACCJC or any other accrediting body, nor is it about any individual institution; it is about the California Community College System and what that system needs from an accreditor in order to achieve the mission delegated to it.

### WHAT COMES NEXT?

The task force report was presented to the Board of Governors as a first reading on September 21 and is planned to go to the Board for consideration of action in November. Prior to the November Board meeting, various constituent voices, including the Academic Senate, are expected to discuss endorsement of the report. All such endorsements from all bodies within the system should be forwarded to the Chancellor's Office in order to support the chancellor's efforts to move the recommendations forward.

At the November Board of Governors meeting, Chancellor Harris will recommend further possible actions to the Board. At the September Board Meeting, the chancellor expressed his intent to honor the timeline suggested in the report and bring forward to the Board a recommendation for specific action by Spring 2016.

### NOTHING CHANGES OVERNIGHT

Assuming the Board of Governors provides further direction in November, the Chancellor will begin a process of exploring options and will bring those options forward through appropriate consultation processes. Any actual changes will depend not only on agreement among system partners but also on the cooperation of external agencies. Such a process will take significant time. No change will happen this year, and in fact the system may very possibly be looking at a process that could take six, eight, or even ten years for full implementation.

This extended timeframe has raised concerns with some constituent groups. Certainly a more rapid path toward change would be desirable, but all of us as individuals and as members of our institutions must remain realistic. The process for implementing the task force recommendations depends on too many external factors for anyone to expect instant results. The Chancellor's Office and all other involved parties will work as expeditiously as possible to achieve results, and if all system constituencies endorse the report as expected, then the impetus for substantive change begun by the creation of this report will continue to grow. No one in the system has an interest in postponing or delaying action. But even if work toward a change begins in the current academic year, instituting that change will take time. Without careful planning and implementation, the ability of students to transfer credit and many other important aspects of colleges' programs could be jeopardized.

For these reasons, no institution or individual should expect immediate change, and the task force recommendation that "system constituencies should continue to work in a cooperative and proactive manner with the ACCJC to ensure the continuity of the accreditation process for all colleges within the system" is especially important. All colleges must continue their efforts to maintain positive accreditation status, and for the foreseeable future such work must involve cooperation with ACCJC. All colleges will need to show patience and must continue to meet all current accreditation mandates until the report's recommendations can be implemented.

> With California community colleges now offering baccalaureate degrees, with an increased focus on transfer to the university level, and with greater demand than ever for workforce development, the community college system must have an accrediting structure that works cohesively with partners at both the university and the K-12 level.

## ANY CHANGES WILL INVOLVE MORE PROCESS THAN CONTENT

As colleges continue to work to maintain their accreditation, one important factor to consider is that the ACCJC standards are not significantly different in most cases from those used by other accreditors. The task force report talks little about the standards themselves and more about how standards are applied and decisions are made. Common complaints regarding the current accreditation process have involved lack of transparency, clarity, and consistency in the process rather than the standards by which the colleges are judged.

For this reason, any change that may occur as a result of the task force report will more likely involve the process and structure for accreditation rather than the content. Institutions should be prepared to meet substantially the same standards to maintain their accreditation no matter what body finally takes on the role of the accreditor.

Change will take time, and the basic standards through which institutions are judged will likely remain substantially the same. Until any changes can be realized, colleges must work with the current accreditor to retain their accreditation. Yet the Chancellor's Office 2015 Task Force on Accreditation Report provides an important step toward establishing an accreditation process which will better serve the California Community College System. As the chancellor and the Board of Governors consider the report and evaluate potential avenues for change, the entire system will be watching to see what the future structure of accreditation will be. 🖋

# New Options for Professional Development—The Professional Development College

by Julie Adams, Executive Director

and Craig Rutan, Chair of the Faculty Development Committee and the Professional Development College

Most faculty who have heard of the Academic Senate's Professional Development College (PDC) probably believe that the PDC is all about faculty participating in a year of leadership training. However, the broader plan for the PDC moving forward is to create a centralized professional development resource for faculty. The goal of the PDC is to provide faculty with venue for professional development that they can access from home on topics such as local academic senate effective practices, curriculum development, the "10+1," and pedagogical training.

Two years ago, the PDC began with a pilot dedicated to developing new local senate leaders. This pilot paired participants with mentors who assisted them in developing skills necessary to become informed leaders. Participants worked individually with their mentors to establish goals for the year, create a plan for each ASCCC event they attended, and get individualized assistance if they had specific questions about local issues. The first year of the Leadership Academy was a huge success, and an even larger class of mentees enrolled for the 2015-16 Leadership Academy.

The next component of the PDC is curriculum. In July 2015, members of the Curriculum and Career Technical Education (CTE) Leadership Committees developed modules for Curriculum 101, which is a very basic introduction to the curriculum processes in California community colleges. This component was designed to help people with minimal experience understand the basics of course outlines, course approval, program creation, regional consortia, and Chancellor's Office approval. The presentation is comprised of five modules that include a series of slides with intended learning outcomes for each module, notes, and voice over. The modules are undergoing final touches and will be available in November 2015. Once the materials are posted, interested individuals will be able to access the presentations wherever and whenever they desire. The ASCCC has kept the price for PDC materials low to allow more access to the information.

The Curriculum 101 is a great first step but only represents the beginning of what the ASCCC hopes to offer through the PDC. In the coming months, the PDC plans to develop additional modules covering the basics of academic senates, minimum qualifications and equivalency, inmate education, diverse faculty hiring, faculty orientation to teaching at a California community college, and effective communication. These new components will help to build a strong foundation for the PDC by providing faculty with access to faculty development all of the time, not just when they are able to attend the next event. As new areas of interest are identified, additional components will be added to the PDC website. The ASCCC is excited to launch this new resource for faculty development.

# Quantitative Reasoning at the Baccalaureate Level:
## How We Arrived at This Moment and the Need for Further Dialog among All Faculty

by Ginni May, ASCCC North Representative

and John Stanskas, ASCCC Secretary, CSU General Education Advisory Committee Member

In September, the California State University Academic Senate passed Resolution AS-3230-15, *Establishing a Task Force on the Requirements of CSU General Education Mathematics/ Quantitative Reasoning (B4) Credit,* calling for a task force comprised of many CSU faculty, including discipline experts, and representatives from the community colleges including the California Acceleration Project and the Academic Senate. The charge of the task force is to review and evaluate aspects of the CSU general education requirement for quantitative reasoning. The current standard is written in CSU Executive Order 1100 and requires an intermediate algebra prerequisite to any course satisfying general education area B4.

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF QUANTITATIVE REASONING REQUIREMENTS

From 2003 to 2005, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges debated raising the graduation requirement for quantitative reasoning from the established elementary algebra standard in Title 5. This proposed change was partially in response to increased graduation requirements and the implementation of standardized exit tests for high school students and the pending adoption by the California Department of Education standards that effectively made elementary algebra the high school graduation requirement. At the Spring 2005 Plenary Session, the ASCCC adopted a position that

Title 5 should be amended to require intermediate algebra as the local graduation standard for the associate degree—one level higher than the high school requirement. In 2006, the Board of Governors expressed reluctance to adopt the recommendation of the ASCCC, and the ASCCC promised that it would actively encourage discipline experts to consider and support alternative courses to the traditional intermediate algebra that would satisfy the graduation requirement. The Title 5 language that was finally adopted reads as follows:

> Title 5 § 55063:
> Competency in mathematics shall be demonstrated by obtaining a satisfactory grade in a mathematics course at the level of the course typically known as Intermediate Algebra (either Intermediate Algebra or another mathematics course at the same level, with the same rigor and with Elementary Algebra as a prerequisite, approved locally), or by examination;
>
> The competency requirements for written expression and mathematics may also be met by obtaining a satisfactory grade in courses in English and mathematics taught in or on behalf of other departments and which, as determined by the local governing board, require entrance skills at a level equivalent to those necessary for Freshman Composition and Intermediate Algebra respectively.

## EXPERIMENTATION WITH BASIC SKILLS MATHEMATICS

Since the graduation requirement was changed, numerous efforts have attempted to address basic skills attainment, the length of time students spend in remediation, and the equity disparity in skill attainment and placement. The Basic Skills categorical funding given to community colleges impact these issues through specifically designed programs and services. Many colleges now offer a variety of remediation efforts from Summer Bridge models prior to assessment to compressed class offerings that accelerate time-to-completion to learning cohorts specifically directed toward disparately impacted populations. One of the major issues with offering alternative pathways has been the CSU and UC requirement that intermediate algebra be a prerequisite to transfer level courses in math and science such as statistics.

Two projects that offer alternative math pathways are Statway, established through the Carnegie Foundation, and the California Acceleration Project (CAP), supported by the California Community College Success Network (3CSN). These models are under consideration or at various levels of implementation at a number of California community colleges.

In 2010, the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) for the CSU Chancellor's Office approved a pilot study for five community college districts to use a Statway model. In addition, several CSU mathematics departments were also experimenting with a Statway model for students requiring remediation. Explicit approval was required because Statway attempts to address remediation content and baccalaureate graduation requirement content in statistics concurrently in a year-long sequence, as opposed to the traditional path which

is generally a year-and-a-half long sequence. This model does not include the explicit intermediate algebra prerequisite per CSU Executive Order 1100.

The CAP is a different pathway from the Statway model. Students take a one-semester course designed to prepare them for statistics. This one-semester course has no prerequisite requirement and is not equivalent to intermediate algebra. Therefore, students must use the challenge process to meet the intermediate algebra prerequisite, as permitted by Title 5, in order to take the standard statistics course.

One concern expressed about both models is that students are tracked very early into pathways that prohibit exploration of majors in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. The other concern impacting CSU mathematics departments was that the project relies on small class sizes in a cohort model and may not be scalable to larger class sizes.

In 2014, the Carnegie Foundation presented an update to GEAC, but the data set of completers through baccalaureate attainment was small. The question of student success in upper division general education and non-STEM upper division major requirements seemed positive but was inconclusive due to the limited number of students completing since the 2010 waiver was granted. The waiver to existing districts was extended for one year.

Also in 2014, the American Mathematics Association for Two-Year Colleges (AMATYC) passed a resolution Position Statement of the American Mathematical Association of Two-year Colleges that states Prerequisite courses other than intermediate algebra can adequately prepare students for courses of study that do not lead to

> One concern expressed about both models is that students are tracked very early into pathways that prohibit exploration of majors in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

calculus. This statement has been interpreted in a variety of ways by different groups but seems to indicate that intermediate algebra is not necessarily required to complete courses commonly offered as baccalaureate level general education in the area of CSU-GE Breadth Area B4, like statistics or ideas of mathematics.

### CURRENT STATUS OF CSU GENERAL EDUCATION QUANTITATIVE REASONING REQUIREMENT

In September 2015, GEAC met again to address the question of the Statway waiver for the five participating districts. The data of completers was more robust and the data from the community colleges seemed to be sufficient to state that time spent in remediation and equity disparities were both positively impacted with this project. In addition, more data was presented about graduation and upper division success in non-STEM fields.

The CSU Math Council, however, brought a consensus view of the CSU discipline faculty that the project was not successful for a variety of reasons. The two concerns from before the pilot began were reiterated. Their larger concern seemed to arise from a study of students who engaged in traditional remediation and Statway remediation against a baseline comparison of the Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) requirements of the CSU system. The ELM has a mixture of elementary algebra, basic geometry, and arithmetic questions, and this standard is lower than intermediate algebra. Students in the Statway cohort did not demonstrate mastery of the CSU entry requirements compared to students in other remediation efforts. Thus, the CSU Math Council's contention is that students in the Statway cohort do not meet the requirements for entrance to the CSU, let alone graduation requirements in CSU-GE Breadth Area B4. The Math Council representative asked if this level of quantitative reasoning is acceptable. If so, then EO1100 must be modified; if not, then Statway does not comply with the current standard.

This information led to a serious discussion about what is expected of students in possession of a baccalaureate degree in terms of quantitative reasoning skills. GEAC recommended to the Academic Senate for CSU that this question needed to be answered and should involve intersegmental dialog. Later in September, Resolution AS-3230-15, Establishing a Task Force on the Requirements of CSU General Education Mathematics/ Quantitative Reasoning (B4) Credit, was passed.

While the GEAC meeting was contentious and strong feelings remain around these issues, the fundamental question of what defines baccalaureate level quantitative reasoning is important. As this task force moves forward, the community colleges need to be ready to participate in the dialog. Recent discussions have taken place during breakout sessions at the Spring 2015 plenary session and the 2015 Curriculum Institute regarding the requirements for math for students in the California community college system at both the associate degree level and for those that plan to transfer to a CSU or UC. This dialog should include the California Mathematics Council for Community Colleges (CMC3).

Much work has been done, but clearly more remains to do. This dialog may seem like a concern for the discipline experts in mathematics, and it is; however, it is also a dialog in which all faculty should be prepared to engage. General education and what it means for any student earning a degree is the purview of the faculty of the entire institution or, in this case, the systems at large.

### RESOURCES TO INFORM FURTHER DISCUSSION

A comprehensive summary of the work of GEAC, the CSU Math Council, and Statway can be found in the meeting notes for the September 2015 GEAC meeting at www.calstate.edu/app/ GEAC/documents/2015/sept-2015/06-Statway-presentation.pdf

The CSU Academic Senate Resolution and supporting documentation, including the guiding notes for general education, can be found at: www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/ Resolutions/2015-2016/documents/3230.shtml

The California Acceleration Project website is cap.3csn.org/teaching/ teaching-pre-statistics-courses/

# The UC Transfer Admission Pathways

by Julie Bruno, Vice President

John Freitas, Curriculum Committee Chair

and Ginni May, Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Committee Chair

Transfer students comprise a significant portion of the students in the University of California system, with nearly one-third coming from California community colleges. The transfer pipeline from the CCCs to the UC is a vital pathway to socioeconomic mobility for low-income students and for students who are the first in their families to attend college. Although UC transfer has been a viable option for some community college students, the UC recognized that its transfer admission practices were not providing an equitable opportunity for students to transfer from across the entire CCC system. As of Fall 2012, half of the students transferring to UC came from fewer than 20% of the California community colleges, creating a barrier to ensuring that transfer students represent the full ethnic, racial, and geographic diversity of California.[1]

In an effort to address this problem, University of California President Janet Napolitano convened the Transfer Action Team in the Fall 2013 to develop strategies designed to improve the transfer process for California community colleges students. The recommendations of the Transfer Action Team were published on May 14, 2014 *ucop.edu/transfer-action-team/fact_sheet_Transfer_Action_Team.pdf*. Among the five key recommendations was a commitment to "strengthen and streamline transfer pathways" with the following stated goals:

- Develop transfer-oriented curriculum pathways that clearly map courses students need to be eligible for transfer into their desired majors.

- Make it easier for students to prepare for and apply to multiple UC campuses by making pre-major pathways more consistent across the system.

The recommendations and goals provided additional support for the UC system in collaboration with the UC Academic Senate to develop streamlined transfer pathways. Initial efforts focused on ten of the most popular majors, with discipline faculty from the UC campuses working together to create UC Transfer Pathways in anthropology, biochemistry, biology, cell biology, chemistry, economics, mathematics, molecular biology, physics and sociology. As of June 8, 2015, the UC system approved the pathways.[2]

## WHAT A UC TRANSFER PATHWAY IS AND WHAT IT IS NOT

A UC Transfer Pathway is a standardized major preparation plan for a transfer student who intends to major in one of the ten majors included in the initial effort, regardless of which UC campus or campuses to which the student applies. The intent is to provide advice to potential transfer students on what major preparation coursework they need to complete prior to transfer.[3] This standardization of the major preparation for transfer students across the UC system is a notable step forward for easing transfer to the UC. Currently, if a student wants to apply to transfer to different UC campuses, the student needs to complete the major preparation courses for each campus. For example, major preparation in chemistry for UCLA and UC Riverside contain differences in the course requirements for each campus.

---

1   More specifically, 25% of transfers come from 7 CCCs, 50% come from 19 CCCs, 75% come from 41% of CCCs, and all 112 CCCs sent at transferred at least one student to the UC (D. Nolden and S. Brick, UC Transfer Initiative: Transfer Pathways, presentation made at the ASCCC Curriculum Institute, July 9, 2015).

2   Information about the transfer pathways is available at admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/counselors/transfer/advising/major/index.html.

3   For the chemistry pathway, linear algebra is listed as post-transfer. However, Berkeley, Davis, Merced and Santa Barbara recommend students complete this course prior to transfer in order to be better prepared for upper division study in the major. At the same time, it is stated that students who wait until after transfer to complete this course will not be negatively affected in competitiveness for admission. As of now, chemistry is the only major with this particular distinction.

With the new UC Transfer Pathway, the major preparation coursework for transfer students for the chemistry major at UCLA, UC Riverside, and all of the UC campuses will be the same. Thus, the primary benefit to students who intend to transfer to the UC is that they will be able to develop their education plans around the UC Transfer Pathways with the knowledge that if they successfully complete their major preparation courses prior to transfer, they will have completed the requirements for the major for all of the UC campuses.

However, the UC Transfer Pathway is not an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) to the UC. Although for certain majors some similarities and alignment between the Transfer Model Curriculum and the UC Transfer Pathway may exist, in many cases a UC Transfer Pathway may differ significantly from a Transfer Model Curriculum. Furthermore, a UC Transfer Pathway does not come with a guarantee for admission as an Associate Degree for Transfer guarantees admission to the CSU system. While completion of a UC Transfer Pathway may guarantee a comprehensive review of the student's application, it does not guarantee admission to the UC. The UC Pathways are also not a mandate for UC campuses to change campus-specific admissions criteria. Each UC campus will continue to make its own admission decisions based on its established criteria, such as minimum GPA and other selection factors.[4] Furthermore, while the major preparation coursework is standardized, departments at each campus can continue to set their own minimum grade requirements for specific courses in a pathway. For example, one UC campus may allow completion of a certain major preparation course with a C or better prior to transfer, while another UC campus may require completion of the same course with a B or better. For all these reasons, counselors must continue to work with students to ensure that they understand the admission requirements at each UC campus to which they are applying.

In order for the UC Transfer Pathways to be effective, articulation agreements must be current and well documented. ASSIST is the official repository of articulation for California public colleges and universities and is accessible to the public online at *assist.org*. Note that transferable courses might not be articulated courses.[5]

Articulation Officers must continue to work closely with faculty, including counseling faculty, and admissions staff in California public colleges and universities to maintain articulation agreements.

Some students, especially those with life circumstances that require them to remain in a specific location, may wish to apply to both UC and CSU. Because a UC Transfer Pathway is not an Associate Degree for Transfer, students must be advised of the differences. Counselors will need to ensure that students who intend to apply to both the UC and CSU understand the differences between the ADTs and UC Transfer Pathways for their particular majors and advise the students appropriately. Additionally, discipline faculty should be aware of the differences between the ADT requirements and the UC Transfer Pathway for a given major. Discipline faculty are often knowledgeable of the major requirements at the local CSU and UC campuses and advise students on which courses to take and in what sequence to best prepare them for a major. Furthermore, colleges must offer the necessary courses and schedule them appropriately in order to allow students to complete the necessary coursework for both an ADT and a UC Transfer Pathway. While the ADTs have 60 semester-unit (90 quarter-unit) limits, UC Transfer Pathways do not have such unit limits. Therefore, depending on the major, a student who opts to complete both an ADT and a UC Transfer Pathway in a given major may need to take more courses to complete both.

The UC Transfer Pathways are an important step in helping to simplify the transfer process for our students by providing uniform system-wide advice for major preparation. In addition to the ten initial majors, work will begin in Fall 2015 by UC faculty to create pathways for English/literature, film/film studies, history, and philosophy. Faculty and students must remain aware that UC Transfer Pathways are not guarantees of admission and must understand the differences between these pathways and the Associate Degrees for Transfer. Finally, local senates and curriculum committees must engage in discussions with faculty, including counselors, about the UC Transfer Pathways and how they relate to the ADTs so that colleges can ensure that they are offering courses appropriate to both, that courses are scheduled so that students can complete the required coursework for ADTs and UC Transfer Pathways in a timely manner, and that students are advised appropriately about the similarities and differences between ADTs and UC Transfer Pathways.

---

4   For a list of selection criteria for transfer students, go to admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/transfer/reviewed/index.html

5   Information on Articulation Agreements between among the California public colleges and universities can be found at www.assist.org/web-assist/welcome.html

# Open Educational Resources and the California Community Colleges

by Cheryl Aschenbach, Dan Crump,

and Dolores Davison, California Open Educational Resources Council Members

On September 27, 2012, Governor Brown signed two bills into law that were indicative of the legislature's acknowledgement of high textbook costs and an effort to reduce those costs. The two bills, SB 1052 and SB 1053, authored by Senator Steinberg, called for the establishment of an open educational resources council and a digital open source library. The two pieces of legislation were generated during a year which saw multiple bills aimed at increasing access and success in California community colleges, including SB 1456, the Student Success Act of 2012. In February 2012 a Joint Legislative Audit Committee Hearing was held as legislators investigated causes of and solutions to high textbook costs which negatively impact college students. The use of Open Educational Resources (OER) was expected to provide "students and their families with sorely needed financial relief" (SB 1053). Per the legislation, the CSU would facilitate collaboration among the UC, CSU, and California Community Colleges to design and deliver intersegmental open education resource services for students and faculty of the three segments.

SB 1052 and 1053 apportioned $5,000,000 for the council and digital open source library and directed the CSU Office of the Chancellor to seek private matching funds. The CSU Office of the Chancellor submitted and in Fall 2013 was awarded grants from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to release the state matching funds.

SB 1052 specified that the California Open Education Resources Council (CA OER Council) be established under the administration of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges. The bill called for addition of §66409 to the California Education Code to define the makeup of the council and its responsibilities.

Education Code §66409 (b) states, "The council shall have nine members: three members shall be faculty of the University of California, selected by the Academic Senate, University of California; three members shall be faculty of the California State University, elected by the Academic Senate of the California State University; and three members shall be community college faculty, selected by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges." Additionally, a council chair/ project coordinator selected by ICAS is a non-voting member. Participation of council faculty members, the council coordinator, and support staff is funded by the matching grants.

Responsibilities of the council were established initially by legislation, and ICAS further defined the council's responsibilities. Responsibilities defined by legislation are as follows (§66409):

- Select up to 50 lower division courses in the public postsecondary segments to target for the development and acquisition of digital, open source textbooks and materials.

- Create and administer a standardized, rigorous review and approval process for open source textbooks and related materials.

- Promote strategies for production, access, and use of open source materials.

- Regularly solicit and consider input from each segment's respective statewide student associations.

- Establish a competitive request for a proposal process in which faculty members, publishers, and other interested parties may apply for funds to produce the high quality, affordable, digital open source textbooks and related materials in 2014.

- Explore methods for reviving classic or well regarded, out-of-print textbooks in digital, open source formats.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates further defined the responsibilities of the council:

- Meet goals of SB 1052 legislation.

- Work collegially under the direction of the California OER Council Project Coordinator to produce the deliverables specified in the Hewlett grant proposal timeline.

- Submit policies and processes to ICAS for review and approval; document and archive policies and processes approved by ICAS.

- Develop policies for building the collection of open textbooks in the California Digital Open Source Digital Library (CDOSL).

- Develop a process for review teams which will include composition, timelines, rubrics for evaluating texts, minimum standards for text to be included in CDOSL, an appeal process for authors, training necessary for review and normalizing, and a process for communicating names of texts approved for inclusion in CDOSL by discipline or alternate ways to categorize the texts.

- Send regular reports to ICAS about disciplines, texts, challenges, etc.

- Prepare content for the CDOSL website and ICAS webpage.

- Prepare and administer or delegate professional development opportunities by or across segments.

The legislation mandated that appointments to the council by the Academic Senates representing each of the three branches of California public higher education be made within 90 days after the act became operative. The council first met via conference call on January 27, 2014, after matching funds were awarded

and then at Coastline Community College February 3, 2014, where it identified the first 50 courses for which to find and review OER textbooks.

The Institute for the Study of Knowledge Management in Education (ISKME), in its effort to create a teaching and learning network for free-to-use educational resources from around the world titled *oercommons.org*, created a definition of open education resources that served as a starting point for the CA OER Council's efforts to define OER. According to ISKME, open education resources are "Teaching and learning materials that are freely available online for everyone to use, whether an instructor, student, or self-learner. Examples of OER include: full courses, course modules, syllabi, lectures, homework assignments, quizzes, lab and classroom activities, pedagogical materials, games, simulations, and many more resources contained in digital media collections from around the world."

The California Open Education Resources Council decided that while the ISKME definition of OER provided a starting point, it was too broad given the legislation's emphasis on textbooks. Ancillary materials should be open and available to students, faculty, and the public but are potentially too voluminous and would be difficult to count using the legislation's emphasis on OER textbooks for 50 courses. The council focused efforts on finding and reviewing digital, open source textbooks, referred to most commonly as eTextbooks on the COOLforEd.org website.

Using the Hewlett Grant and C-ID (Course Identification Numbering System) course descriptors, the council identified criteria by which the 50 courses would be determined and, in February 2014, identified more than 50 courses for which to evaluate OER textbooks. As noted in the Progress Report delivered to ICAS on February 6, 2014, the criteria were multifaceted:

- The course is highly en le OER textbooks for each course

In terms of copyright and access, open education resources should be licensed CC-BY, a Creative Commons Attribution license. According to the OER Glossary on the CA OER Council website, "OER licensed CC-BY can be modified, used commercially,

and may or may not be shared in the same manner, provided credit is given to the author." Variations of CC-BY include attribution licenses that forbid commercial use, forbid modification, allow for use without credit to the author, and more. By having courses licensed for modification and open use, faculty are encouraged to adopt OER materials and further modify them to best meet their own needs.

While SB 1052 called for the creation of the CA OER Council, SB 1053 called for the creation of the California Digital Open Source Library (CDOSL) by the CSU in collaboration with the council. CSU already had an online open education resource library, MERLOT (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching). Both UC and the California Community Colleges system have partnered with CSU on MERLOT and related open resource projects, so the type of partnership and sharing of educational resources called for by the legislation already had precedent.

According to the *COOLforEd.org* website, "the California Digital Open Source Library is being designed so faculty can easily find, adopt, utilize, and/or modify OER course materials for little or no cost." The textbooks being reviewed for the fifty high impact courses identified by the CA-OER Council will be housed on the COOL for Ed website and made available to faculty and students. *COOLforEd.org* is considered the first library service of the digital open source library, and more will be developed as warranted to meet the needs of specific stakeholders.

Within the Course Showcase of the *COOLforEd. org* website, faculty can see courses listed by C-ID number and see recommended free eTextbooks and faculty reviews of free eTextbooks and can even follow a link to recommend additional free eTextbooks appropriate for each course. Disciplines represented on COOLforEd.org include art, accounting, business, biology, chemistry, child development, communication, computer science, economics, English, history, mathematics, music, physics, psychology, sociology, and Spanish. While many of the disciplines only have one course identified with a free eTextbook available, more courses are being considered and textbooks are being reviewed throughout Fall 2015; the list will be more complete by the end of November 2015.

Each textbook is reviewed by at least one faculty member from each of the three system partners before being added to the list. Highly rated eTextbooks are those averaging at least a 4 out of 5 from all reviewers. Most reviews available include comments in addition to the rating system required. Efforts are underway to encourage faculty discipline review groups to consider including the highly rated eTextbooks with the list of recommended texts in each C-ID course descriptor to better publicize the availability of free or low cost eTextbooks.

The language in SB 1053 states what faculty and students in all three systems, but especially the community college system, are already aware of: textbooks are too expensive. While some faculty may already use OER materials or may have even published OER materials, many continue to use commercial textbooks. If a student does not buy a textbook because of the extreme cost of the textbook, then that student is less likely to succeed in a class. Having free or low cost textbooks that cover the material needed for a class as well or better than commercial texts is expected to increase student access to the required material; the exorbitant cost of a textbook will no longer be a barrier to students needing the information. The more faculty members start to use OER texts, and the more people utilize the freedom of the creative commons license, the more resources will be available and the stronger the resources will get.

The initial provisions of SB 1052 and SB 1053 conclude at the end of 2015. A new bill, AB 798 College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015 authored by Assemblymember Bonilla, was signed by the governor on October 8, 2015. Resolution 06.05 S15 Support Textbook Affordability Act called for the ASCCC to "endorse the intent of AB 798 (Bonilla, as of April 6, 2015) to promote the consideration of appropriate open educational resources through funding that is dependent on the agreement of local academic senates." Information about CA-OERC and the work being done in open educational resources will be presented at the ASCCC's Instructional Design and Innovation Institute as well as other events throughout the year, and the ASCCC urges faculty to educate themselves and their colleagues about open educational resources and their potential benefits to our system.

The sources for this article are available in the online version at asccc.org/publications/rostrum

# Program Review: From Mandate to Benefit

by Wheeler North, ASCCC Treasurer
and Kathy Booth, LaunchBoard Project Manager

## PROJECT ORIGINS

Program review is a required and potentially beneficial element of college planning, yet it is largely undefined both in terms of the activities involved and in the objectives and outcomes it should produce. Consequently, these processes are extremely varied at different colleges, which ultimately may also be a factor in the results of accreditation self-study and review processes.

In Spring 2014, adopted Resolution 07.05 called for the ASCCC to "work with the California Community College Chancellor's Office and other appropriate agencies to further develop research tools that offer quantitative, qualitative and meaningful data for local program review processes." This partnership subsequently led to a joint one-year research effort with the CCCCO LaunchBoard project to examine the feasibility of using state-level data to inform local review for CTE programs.

## THE DESIGN PROCESS

To get a sense of the additional information that CTE practitioners wanted so that they could supplement the data available through local program review processes, the ASCCC and LaunchBoard team held a series of meetings at conferences and via two statewide CCC Confer calls that were attended by approximately 100 faculty, researchers, and CTE deans. This process led to the development of a concept paper that outlined key criteria as well as desired data points, which were circulated to the field for comment via a survey. This process yielded the following specifications:

- *Use a graphical, question-driven data display*: Visually represent information to address key questions about supply and demand, as well as program completion and employment outcomes. Whenever possible, information should include comparison data that colleges can use to benchmark their performance. Visuals should be backed-up by data charts.

- *Tailor the data displayed:* Create a "wizard" feature that allows users to only see the data most relevant for their programs' goals. For example, a program that provides training for incumbent workers might want to see job retention and wage increases, whereas a program that is aligned with a CSU degree might want to see transfer outcomes. Also, practitioners wanted the option to see outcomes for both completers and skills-builders—workers who are engaged in short-term course-taking to maintain and add to skill-sets required for ongoing employment and career advancement.

- *Provide professional development:* Offer guides that provide suggestions on how to use the tool in program review processes and in discussions within departments or across colleges. Examine programs that show the strongest outcomes to document effective practices.

During 2014-15, the LaunchBoard team developed a pilot program review tool and worked with 10 colleges that volunteered to review data on a total of 25 programs. Teams of faculty and researchers discussed the information in the program review tool as part of departmental meetings and then filled out a survey on the usefulness of the data and the structure of the tool.

## WHAT WE LEARNED

Local program review processes are strengthened by having additional data that may not be widely available at the college level. Pilot colleges reported

that having labor market and employment outcomes gave them a stronger understanding of whether students met their goals. They also valued access to historical trends and regional context.

Program review processes may be best enhanced by combining traditional local program review data, additional locally-calculated data points, and regional/statewide information. Some practitioners were eager for return-on-investment metrics that were not possible to calculate in the LaunchBoard because financial data are not sufficiently granular in statewide data sets. This type of additional information, combined with regional totals, labor market information, and benchmarking data, would augment and strengthen local program review conversations.

Practitioners would benefit from a common set of data and opportunities to look at the information together. Because program review data may be cut differently by individual colleges, comparing apples to apples may be difficult when examining results. Statewide tools allow decision-makers to use consistently-defined metrics so they can immediately get to the meatier conversations—such as how a program has been designed or implemented that might influence outcomes.

Additional statewide data is needed about post-college outcomes. Many practitioners focused on data points that are not available in statewide data sets, such as whether students become employed in their field of study, earn a third-party credential, start their own business, or are satisfied with their program. Some of these questions are addressed in the CTE Outcomes Survey, a survey of former CTE students that colleges can elect to either administer on their own or pay Santa Rosa Junior College to implement on their behalf to leverage economies of scale with other colleges. However, colleges must pay out of pocket each year to participate, which may disadvantage colleges with smaller CTE programs and lower budgets.

## NEXT STEPS

**LaunchBoard 2.0:** The LaunchBoard team, rather than build out a program review tool, elected to redesign the main interface of the LaunchBoard. The Program Snapshot tab is currently being rebuilt so that information is accessed via questions such as "Are we training the right number of students for available jobs?" and "How much money are students making?" Answers are displayed visually, with opportunities to explore deeper into related data, such as more detailed labor market information or disaggregated results. The LaunchBoard team will be sharing a demo version across the state this fall and rolling out a full release in February 2016. This past spring, the LaunchBoard team released another tool that allows colleges to examine program-level data from the CTE Outcomes Survey, which makes information on post-college outcomes more readily available for program review conversations.

**Inquiry/data templates:** While information on key topics for program improvement such as budgets and scheduling cannot be generated from statewide data, research or inquiry templates could be designed that would facilitate a more systematic review of these issues. For example, colleges could use suggested formulas to calculate students' return on investment or gather information in a consistent fashion to support the review of scheduling across multiple programs or colleges. It would be beneficial to bring together faculty, researchers, and college leadership to identify high-priority lines of inquiry and research specifically tailored to program review and improvement that could be built into templates and shared across the state. These efforts could be integrated into other statewide efforts such as the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative, regional and sector research activities, and resource planning, to name a few.

**Professional development:** Having access to better data will give colleges a big step forward in making program review more meaningful. However, data alone is not sufficient. Professional development will be needed to help practitioners understand how to combine local data, regional and statewide metric, and labor market information when considering ways to strengthen CTE portfolios.

The Academic Senate and the LaunchBoard team look forward to pursuing these next steps in the near future. Faculty throughout the state should take note as these opportunities unfold, as faculty input will be critical to making these efforts beneficial to programs and students. 🖋

# New to the ASCCC Plenary?
## Breaking Through the Culture and Tradition to Represent Your College Effectively

By the 2015-2016 Relations with Local Senates Committee

Attending your first Academic Senate for California Community Colleges plenary session with hundreds of colleagues from the 113 colleges in the system may seem overwhelming. To a new attendee, plenary can feel like a foreign land where one must decode the language, purpose, and procedures without a guidebook. However, a little understanding of history and some preparation for the event can enrich the plenary experience.

### WHAT IS PLENARY?

In 1969, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges held its first meeting, bringing together local academic senate leaders from throughout the state to discuss policy and issues of common concern. Plenary sessions have continued to be held on at least a bi-annual basis since that initial event. In 1988, the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education reinforced the role of academic senates in governance as delineated in AB 1725 (Vasconcellos, 1988). This legislation gave substantial new responsibilities to local senates, and these responsibilities are now codified in Education and Title 5. No other educational system in the nation grants this type of influence on institutional governance to faculty. However, with that influence come responsibilities and a need for guidance for both new and experienced local leaders. ASCCC plenary sessions provide such guidance by bringing together the leaders of California's diverse system of locally controlled colleges to consult on common interests, to receive leadership training, and to make recommendations on important issues like minimum qualifications or curriculum standards. Plenary sessions are designed with a vision to create a truly representative and democratic governance venue for faculty colleagues to meet and collaborate through a resolution-driven decision process. The resolutions determine policy and action which help guide and support individual colleges and their faculty members. (See ASCCC history at www.asccc.org/papers/brief-history-academic-senate-california-community-colleges.)

### THE RESOLUTIONS PROCESS—SETTING PRIORITIES, POLICY, AND DIRECTION

The plenary session is designed to provide professional development on key statewide issues by engaging leaders in the discussion of important topics relevant to the mission of participation in college governance.

The ASCCC uses a formal resolution process to define the majority opinion of the faculty who work at the 113 colleges. As soon as the initial set of resolutions from the ASCCC Executive Committee are published, local senate presidents should send the resolutions to their senates. Presidents may wish to summarize key points in order to guide their senates through discussion of the issues and

resolutions. In turn, this discussion will prepare the president to adequately represent his or her senate.

The plenary session is preceded by area meetings that allow attendees to bring local concerns for discussion, to amend the initial resolutions, and to submit additional resolutions. At the area meetings, senate representatives examine the resolutions by looking at the background and context which led to each resolution. Additional resolutions may also be submitted by any plenary attendee on the first day of the plenary session, and amendments to resolutions can be submitted on the first two days. On the final day of the plenary session, after all resolutions and amendments have been submitted, delegates from local senates vote on each resolution in order to establish ASCCC positions and give direction to the Executive Committee.

The resolutions process may seem foreign, and new attendees may not know how to engage in the discussion. However, most plenary attendees quickly become familiar and comfortable with the process and begin to participate more fully. A complete lesson on the resolution process can be found at www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/resolution-handbook_1.pdf.

### PLANNING AHEAD TO GET THE MOST FROM THE PLENARY EVENT—BRINGING COLLEAGUES AND ASKING QUESTIONS

Each local senate should determine which representatives from the college or district should attend plenary. Because of the amount of information and training available, having a team to share the work will enable a senate to return to its campus with more complete information. Whether faculty come as a team or individually, all should realize that other people plenary attendees may also be new or unfamiliar with the processes, meaning, or outcomes of event. Attendees therefore should not hesitate to ask questions. In order to effectively represent a local senate, attendees must understand the issues being debated. Area representatives and all members of

the ASCCC Executive Committee are available to answer questions, give advice, and help to orient any plenary attendee in need of assistance.

### LEADERS LEADING—WHO ARE THESE PEOPLE?

Many of the faculty who come to plenary sessions attend multiple academic senate events and have interacted with each other numerous times, and thus a new attendee can easily feel that all of the other participants in a plenary session already know each other. However, the majority of plenary attendees enjoy making new friends and hearing new perspectives. Not only are most veteran plenary participants willing to answer questions and explain both procedures and issues, but many are happy to invite new attendees to join them for dinner or to include them in other activities. ASCCC Executive Committee members are especially committed to welcoming new attendees and helping them find their way, whether in formal plenary activities or in social interactions. In addition, individuals who wear badges that say "ambassador" are available to answer any questions regarding plenary processes and practices. Attendees should not hesitate to introduce themselves to others, to begin conversations, or to join a table at lunch or in the evening in order to get to know their colleagues.

Plenary sessions are also a great source of networking and an opportunity to get advice ways to address local college issues. Many experienced local senate leaders are always in attendance and are willing to discuss ideas and give advice as well exchange contact information for further discussions after the plenary. These discussions can help faculty leaders to develop their own perspectives and become better informed on both statewide issues and approaches to challenges on their own campuses.

YOU ARE NOT ALONE!

While new attendees may feel overwhelmed at their first plenary session, most leaders who attend ASCCC events will recall feeling the same way when they began their experience in faculty leadership.

Many people who have long histories participating in local and statewide senate activities have expressed similar sentiments.

"My first plenary, I was sure I was on another planet. I felt like everyone else was clued in and I was lost. I admired people involved in the very structured and weird style of debate, but I admit I was often pre-occupied with all the rules, objections, and what seemed like secret understanding about the pro and con microphones. Don't even get me started on the serpentine voting—I counted off wrong! Eventually, I learned the procedures and I began, like an anthropologist, to decode the culture of the plenary. I learned rich insights to take back to my senate." Janet Fulks

"My first plenary, I felt so intimidated. Everyone knew everyone and I hadn't a clue. Big groups talking and laughing and I didn't know anyone. I was lucky: I came with a colleague to one of the sessions and she introduced me to the people she knew. It can be scary but if you reach out they will be there for you. Now plenary is one of my favorite meetings. I can get the real inside scoop on what is happening in the state. See old friends, compare notes. Not the least as to who is working where around the state. Catching up after the meetings is so important. This group understands what I do. They understand the problems and frustrations of local senates. Sometimes being senate president can be a hard lonely position. These guys understand this. It's their world too." Mary Rees

"My first ASCCC event was the 2007 Curriculum Institute. I attended with a group from my college and district, so I felt quite welcome. I continued to attend Curriculum Institutes through 2011. In 2009, I attended the Faculty Leadership Institute at Granlibakken. My senate president brought me, so again, I was not on my own. We had a great time, and I learned a lot. When I became the local academic senate president, I began attending more ASCCC events, including the plenary sessions. Understanding the "debate rules" was a little challenging the first time, but by the end of my second plenary, I was starting to get the hang of it. Now, going to the mic and debating was another hurdle I had to overcome, but with most things, the more you do it, the better it gets. I still find

it nerve-racking. One thing ASCCC could improve on is defining our acronyms. I still get lost with some of them. Overall, I found that when I put my foot forward to participate in ASCCC events and committees, I got to know people state-wide from other California community colleges. I suppose this can be hard for folks that come in from smaller colleges and/or districts, but it is what we must do as faculty leaders." Ginni May

"I attended my first Plenary in Fall 2012, as I was beginning my term as vice-president of my local senate. I was fascinated by the passionate discussions and the way opposing viewpoints where presented to the delegates (pro and con mikes). Sometimes I felt frustrated, when someone called the question for a vote because I wanted to continue listening to what people had to say, so I could arrive at my own position. Finally, after attending three consecutive plenaries, I had the "schema" and the background knowledge to fully understand the issues being debated. When we are attending our first plenary, we are students of the Academic Senate, learning a new discipline that has a different language. It takes time, so be patient." Alicia Muñoz

"As a new senator, I was hungry for knowledge. Without any training or guidance from my local senate, I was determined to know policies, procedures, and resources needed to build an effective senate. My first experience at the plenary was exciting, overwhelming, and extremely energizing. I had an opportunity to work with a great group of folks working behind the scene in collecting ballots, counting ballots etc. Although I was not a delegate, I enjoyed participating in the Area breakout session. On the last day of plenary, I found it fascinating observing the resolution debate of pro/con, listening to parliamentary protocol/procedures and what seem like hours—amendment after amendment after amendment on several resolutions. While I am not a pro, I can appreciate the resolution process and as a new delegate, take ownership of being a responsible voter." Rochelle Olive

# Results of the Baccalaureate Degree Taskforce Survey to the Field

by John Stanskas, ASCCC Secretary, Chair of the Taskforce

## INTRODUCTION

The passage of SB850, signed into law in September 2014, and action based on that bill by the Board of Governors in March and May 2015 authorized the California Community College system to create 15 bachelor's degrees offered by pilot community colleges, commencing in Fall 2016. The accelerated timeline required by SB 850 has required the Chancellor's Office and the Academic Senate to rapidly act to define the parameters the degrees. To assist in providing guidance, the ASCCC formed the Bachelor's Degree Taskforce, comprised of CTE faculty from the pilot colleges as well as faculty experts in general education and articulation. The Bachelor's Degree Taskforce developed recommendations to address specific issues inherent in creating baccalaureate degrees such as unit requirements, general education requirements, and minimum qualifications for faculty teaching in these new programs. These recommendations will be brought forward to faculty by resolution at the Fall 2015 ASCCC Plenary Session for deliberation. In an effort to involve the faculty as much as possible in discussions of these issues, the ASCCC has held numerous breakout sessions and meetings since April to discuss the work of the Taskforce and receive input. To ensure an exhaustive vetting of the Taskforce recommendations, the Academic Senate also invited feedback on the recommendations through a survey.

The ASCCC received 432 responses to the survey between September 15 and 26. Of the respondents, 86% self-identified as faculty and 9% as administrators. The "other" category appeared to be mostly faculty, self identified as counselor, part-time faculty, or emeritus faculty. Additional categories of respondents included student government and curriculum specialist. Responses also demonstrated a breadth of various districts from around the state.

## RECOMMENDATION #1:

*Modify Title 5 to define baccalaureate degrees at California community colleges as a minimum of 120 semester units including a minimum of 24 upper division units; and*

*Ensure that upper division units are defined as requiring lower division knowledge and applying that knowledge as demonstrated measures of critical thinking through writing, oral communication, and/or computation, and allow that upper division may encompass research elements, workforce training, apprenticeship, required practicum, or capstone projects.*

Of the respondents, 83% agreed with the recommendation, while 6% disagreed; the remaining 11% were unsure. Most of the comments expressed concern that 24 units is an insufficient number of upper division units and the number should be higher, with 30, 32, and 40 given as examples. A few respondents suggested that community college bachelor's degrees should have the same requirements as the CSU system.

## RECOMMENDATION #2:

Modify Title 5 §53410 to ensure that faculty teaching upper division coursework adhere to these minimum qualifications as follows:

*(e) For faculty assigned to teach **upper division** courses in disciplines where the master's degree is not generally expected or available, but where a related bachelor's or associate degree is generally expected or available, possession of either:*

*(1) a master's degree in the discipline directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment or equivalent foreign degree plus two years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment and any appropriate licensure; or*

*(2) a bachelor degree in the discipline directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment or equivalent foreign degree plus six years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment and any appropriate licensure.*

*(f) For faculty assigned to teach upper division courses in disciplines where the master's degree is not generally expected or available, and where a related bachelor's or associate degree is not generally expected or available, possession of either:*

*(1) any master's degree or equivalent foreign degree plus two years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment and any appropriate licensure; or*

*(2) any bachelor degree or equivalent foreign degree plus six years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment and any appropriate licensure.*

All of the disciplines proposed for the pilot fall into disciplines where no specific degree is required, so this recommendation is important to define the minimum qualifications necessary to teach the courses offered in the upper division. As evident in the language of the recommendation, the task force believes that equivalency is not an option for minimum qualifications that do not fall on the master's degree list of disciplines. Disciplines that already require a master's degree as the minimum qualification are not affected by this recommendation, nor are the minimum qualifications to teach any lower division courses changed.

Of the respondents, 78% agreed with the recommendation, 9% disagreed, and 13% were unsure. The preponderance of the unsure responses and comments were confused by the language that currently exists in Title 5 regarding "equivalent foreign degree" language. In addition some respondents thought a Ph.D. should be required for upper division instruction, and some expressed concern that experience in the field should be recent. A few were concerned about finding qualified instructors.

## RECOMMENDATION #3:

Ensure all baccalaureate degrees granted by the California community colleges require either IGETC or CSU-GE Breadth as lower division general education preparation; and,

Require six semester units of upper division general education offered by at least two disciplines external to the major—one of which must have an emphasis in written communication, oral communication or computation.

The task force recommended that in order to earn a baccalaureate degree from the CCCs, students must complete a general education pattern consisting of either IGETC or CSU-GE Breadth to satisfy lower division requirements. In addition, six additional semester units of upper division general education must be completed in disciplines external to the major, one of which must have an emphasis in written communication, oral communication, or computation. This total of 43-45 semester units of general education is consistent with the requirements of other states' community college baccalaureate programs and slightly less than the Title 5 requirement of 48 semester units of general education for the CSU system.

Of the respondents, 74% agreed with this recommendation, 16% disagreed, and 11% were unsure[6]. The comments on this question were sharply divided and generated the most comments, 59, and the most unsure comments, 38. Many of the respondents thought the total units of general education were too stringent for CTE degrees and advocated for a different pattern for the community college baccalaureate. Another large group of respondents seemed to indicate that community colleges should require exactly what CSU requires in terms of general education, which would be an argument for more units. The number of written comment responses advocating for fewer units in general education was 24; the number of written comment responses advocating for more units of general education was 29.

---

6 The total is greater than 100% due to rounding to the nearest whole percent.