



SEPTEMBER 2014

1 | WHERE WE HAVE BEEN, WHERE WE ARE NOW, AND WHERE WE ARE GOING

4 | DATA AT YOUR FINGERTIPS

7 | IT'S TIME TO SUBMIT DISCIPLINES LIST REVISIONS

8 | IN APPRECIATION OF JOHN VASCONCELLOS

10 | REMEMBERING AN EDUCATIONAL ADVOCATE

11 | INFUSING CULTURAL COMPETENCY, DIVERSITY, AND EQUITY

12 | ACADEMIC SENATE EVENTS

13 | BUILDING FACULTY PROCESSES FOR STUDENT SUCCESS AND EQUITY

15 | A CHALLENGINGLY GOOD YEAR

17 | THE CONCEPT OF CREDIT COURSES: ANOTHER LOOK AT COURSE REPETITION AND REPEATABILITY

20 | THE ONLINE EDUCATION INITIATIVE

25 | THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

27 | A TRIBUTE TO A FRIEND OF THE SENATE

SENATE ROSTRUM

ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES NEWSLETTER

THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

President: David Morse | Executive Director: Julie Adams | Design and Layout: Rita Sabler, Creative Director

The Rostrum is a quarterly publication of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 525, Sacramento, CA 95814.

The Rostrum is distributed to all faculty through college academic senate presidents and by individual mailing. For deadline information call (916) 445-4753 or email us at julie@asccc.org

Note: The articles published in the Rostrum do not necessarily represent the adopted positions of the Academic Senate. For adopted positions and recommendations, please visit our website at www.asccc.org

You can find this and the previous issues of this publication online at: www.asccc.org

Where We Have Been, Where We Are Now, and Where We Are Going

DAVID MORSE, PRESIDENT

This summer has been busy for the members of the ASCCC Executive Committee. Although the 2014-15 committee did not officially take office until July 1, we really began working immediately after our orientation meeting on June 1, or in some cases even sooner. Much has been happening in the past few months, and much more is to come this year. In order to keep those we represent informed, a review of what we have been working on and an outline of what we hope to do this year is in order.

WHERE WE HAVE BEEN: SUMMER 2014

The final meeting of the 2013-2014 Executive Committee was held at Asilomar, near Monterey, on May 30, with orientation for the 2014-15 Executive Committee taking place over the following two days. The orientation began with a morning of training in cultural competence, as directed by ASCCC Resolution 3.01 S14, and through that training the new Executive Committee developed the beginning of a plan for ASCCC actions that could promote diversity, equity, and cultural competence. The remainder of the two days was spent in team building and in reviewing Academic Senate procedures, policies, and other information important to serving as a member of the Executive Committee.

Our second activity together was the Leadership Institute, held in San Diego from June 12 to 14. The Executive Committee met the day before the institute with attorney Mark Alcorn to receive training and information on our roles as members of a nonprofit board, a subject that raised numerous concerns over the past year. This useful and instructive presentation was followed by a very successful institute with over 100 attendees. In order to prepare new and

future senate leaders for greater participation at plenary sessions, one series of Leadership Institute activities had the attendees write potential resolutions on Thursday, submit amendments on Friday, and engage in a mock plenary voting session on Saturday. This institute also kicked off the pilot module for our Professional Development College, with thirteen local senate leaders participating in this new opportunity for training in faculty leadership.

The final group activity for the Executive Committee during the summer was the Curriculum Institute, held in San Jose from July 10 to 12. Although not all Executive Committee members are required to participate in the Curriculum Institute, this year twelve of the elected members—the other two had previous and unbreakable commitments—demonstrated their dedication and their enthusiasm for the upcoming year by attending at least a part of the event and participating in a variety of breakout presentations. Over 300 faculty, staff, and administrators attended the institute, which was praised for its effectiveness and inclusivity by Chancellor's Office representatives in venues such as Consultation Council.

In addition, several members of the Executive Committee, as well as many other dedicated faculty members from around the state, participated in meetings throughout the summer regarding the three technology initiatives: Online Education, Common Assessment, and Educational Planning. This work is intense and often challenging, with many diverse interests and perspectives involved, but our representatives, led by the Executive Committee members, have done a terrific job of holding to Senate positions and moving the initiatives in positive directions.

Numerous other discussions and meetings, both large and small, have also taken place throughout the summer. Various members of the Executive Committee have attended meetings on the structure of C-ID, the equity funding formula, budget updates and requests for 2014-15, system budget planning for 2015-16, professional development, the Open Educational Resources Project, and others, as well as continuing to represent the Academic Senate at meetings of the Board of Governors, Consultation Council, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), the Council of Faculty Organizations (COFO), the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum (SACC), and other ongoing assignments. Again, it was a very busy summer for the Executive Committee as a whole.

WHERE WE ARE NOW: THE BEGINNING OF FALL 2014

As faculty and students return to their campuses for Fall 2104, the Executive Committee has already begun its work for the upcoming year.

One of the first projects for all members of the Executive Committee is to call together the Senate committees they will be leading or sitting on and to set the agenda for the year. Last year most ASCCC committees were placed on hiatus as we experimented with a task force dominated model. This year, the committees are back. Executive Committee members worked throughout the summer to determine the most effective and representative membership for each committee, and now each group is beginning to perform its charge of addressing previous resolutions passed at plenary sessions, discussing issues of statewide concern, and planning for the Fall 2014 plenary session.

Executive Committee members are also coming back together to work as a group through the regular Executive Committee meeting schedule. This year, in order to encourage attendance at the Executive Committee meetings and to promote greater transparency, the meetings will move around the state, with the first day of

each meeting to be held on a community college campus. The first Executive Committee meeting of the fall took place on August 22-23 in Long Beach, with the first day's meeting on the Long Beach City College Campus. The September meeting will begin at San Diego City College on September 12 and the October meeting at Lake Tahoe College on October 10, with each meeting continuing off campus on the following day. Both days of each meeting are open to all who are interested in attending. Future meeting locations will be announced through the ASCCC President's update and the Senate Presidents' Listserv and are posted on the Senate's website. The Executive Committee hopes that by bringing our meetings to our colleges, we will increase communication with the faculty we represent and will be able to keep local senates more connected to and informed about statewide issues.

Of course, the work begun in summer also carries on into the fall. The technology initiatives continue to move forward, as does work such as C-ID and the Open Educational Resources Project. Executive Committee members continue to attend meetings with Chancellor's Office staff and other system partners to represent the voice and the interests of faculty.

In addition to statewide meetings, Executive Committee members are also coming to individual campuses to assist local faculty. The ASCCC has received a number of requests for Executive Committee members to make presentations to local academic senates or curriculum committees, and various members have agreed to visit colleges or districts to work directly with faculty.

WHERE WE ARE GOING: PLANS FOR 2014-2015

In the upcoming year, the Executive Committee plans to move forward with a number of projects or initiatives to serve the interests and needs of local academic senates statewide. While some of these activities will be charged to the Executive

Committee as a whole, much of the work will be done by our newly re-established committees or by a few special task forces.

In 2014-15, the Executive Committee will engage in strategic planning for the ASCCC in order to better determine what the organization should become and how it should conduct its work as it moves forward. The first strategic planning meeting is scheduled for September 6 in Sacramento, and thus the planning will be underway by the time this *Rostrum* is published. Future special meetings regarding strategic planning are already scheduled for October and December. Any plan developed by the Executive Committee will of course be brought to the ASCCC body for approval at plenary sessions.

As an indication of our ongoing commitment to improvement and consistency, a major review of ASCCC policies and practices will be undertaken by the Standards and Practices Committee (S&P). This review will not be primarily focused on changing the way we operate, but rather on ensuring coherence between ASCCC practices, legal requirements, and our published documents. The first step in this review is an examination of ASCCC bylaws in order to ensure that the bylaws are up to date, clear, and complete. A review of other policies and documents will follow, as throughout the year the S&P committee will work to ensure the consistency and sufficiency of the ASCCC's official documents. As with the strategic plan, the work produced by this committee will be presented to the body for approval at the plenary sessions.

Another body with a new focus is the Legislative Committee, which is returning after a significant hiatus. This committee will track and analyze legislation and other activities in Sacramento that involve educational issues in order to better inform local senates and to represent the positions of faculty to the legislature, the governor, and other interest groups in a more timely and effective manner. The committee expects to work closely with both the Governmental Relations Division in the Chancellor's Office and with other system

partners, including the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), to address the increasing pressure of legislative activity on our system in a more proactive way. Our goal is to increase the ASCCC presence in policy discussions at state level and provide tools or information for advocacy at local level.

Professional development is an important charge of the ASCCC and an increasingly strong focus within the community college system. This year the ASCCC will look to provide leadership in this area in a variety of ways. The Executive Committee will continue to advocate for ongoing, substantial funding for professional development projects at the local level. We will also work to provide valuable professional development activities at the state level, including the continued development of our Professional Development College and activities such as institutes and regional meetings focused on CTE leadership, student services, curriculum, and other topics that are important to faculty.

One *Rostrum* article cannot present an exhaustive list of the Executive Committee's activities, plans, and goals. We hope and expect to undertake numerous activities that will increase the transparency of our organization, provide more conscious and clear planning and direction for the future, promote the state-level profile and influence of the ASCCC, and establish greater two-way communication with local senates and faculty statewide.

We will pursue that final goal, better communication with faculty, in a variety of ways. Moving our Executive Committee meetings to local campuses is only the first step. But in order to achieve this goal, we need to hear from you. Please feel welcome to contact members of the Executive Committee, whether by attending our meetings, through email, or by whatever other method you choose. Tell us about your local issues, your concerns, and your successes. Our primary charge is to represent you, and we have a great many projects and activities planned to fulfill that charge, but we are always more effective in representing your voice when that voice comes to us clearly and directly from you. ■

Data at Your Fingertips: How the CTE LaunchBoard Can Enhance Faculty Conversations About Student Success

KATHY BOOTH, LAUNCHBOARD PROJECT MANAGER

RENAH WOLZINGER, LAUNCHBOARD FIELD DIRECTOR & DIGITAL MEDIA FACULTY AT GOLDEN WEST COLLEGE

In the classroom, faculty develop a deep understanding of students' mastery of competencies taught in a specific course, but they may be less aware of what happens to those students in subsequent terms. Career technical education (CTE) faculty can now find information regarding their students' further progress by using the CTE LaunchBoard. By providing easily-accessible information on program enrollment, student completion, employment outcomes, and alignment with labor market demand, the LaunchBoard can support departmental, college-wide, and regional conversations about how to improve student transitions between K-12, college, and the workforce.

- **Unemployment insurance wage records** that capture employment retention and earnings
- **Labor market information** regarding historical and projected job openings, as well as average salaries for specific occupations within a region
- **CTE Employment Outcomes Survey results** on students' employment in their fields of study and third-party certifications

The LaunchBoard aggregates a number of data sources to provide a more holistic view of students and their progress in CTE...

WHAT IS THE LAUNCHBOARD?

The LaunchBoard aggregates a number of data sources to provide a more holistic view of students and their progress in CTE, including the following:

- **Chancellor's Office MIS data** on student characteristics, progress, and completion
- **Intersegmental information** about student participation in workforce training prior to enrolling in community college and whether students major in similar fields once they enter a four-year college

The LaunchBoard is supported by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and hosted by Cal-PASS Plus. The concept for this tool came from a series of statewide data meetings that included faculty, deans, college administrators, technical assistance providers, and policy makers. The major organizations that have contributed to its design and implementation are the Chancellor's Office, Cal-PASS Plus, Centers of Excellence, the RP Group, and WestEd.

The LaunchBoard is currently in its “1.0” iteration, meaning that various data have been aggregated and displayed in a dashboard format. Faculty are encouraged to test out the tool and send feedback using an embedded survey on the Cal-PASS Plus website.

Your input will be used to refine the tool and to design items that will be built in version 2.0, such as enhanced labor market information, a program review report, and expanded K-12 to community college pathway mapping.

HOW CAN FACULTY ACCESS THE LAUNCHBOARD?

The LaunchBoard is available on the Cal-PASS Plus website at <https://www.calpassplus.org/LaunchBoard/Home.aspx>. Access requires a Cal-PASS Plus user name and password, which are only issued to college employees. You can request access from the LaunchBoard website by submitting your name, job title, and institution (<https://www.calpassplus.org/User/Login.aspx>). Once your information is verified, you will be sent log-in information that will allow you to see information from your college only. Before you receive a user name and password, you can test a demo version of the LaunchBoard by visiting <https://www.calpassplus.org/Launchboard/LaunchboardDemo.aspx>.

HOW DOES IT WORK?

The LaunchBoard is divided into three sections.

Program Snapshot

The Program Snapshot tab enables practitioners to access information on general program areas—such as Nursing or Accounting—at their college, with the ability to select the academic year for which metrics are displayed. Information is organized in eight categories:

The LaunchBoard is also helpful for shining the light on program successes, particularly in building pathways between K-12 and college, as well as training experienced workers who are not seeking to complete a degree or certificate.

- Enrollments
- Capacity to serve students
- Alignment with other educational segments (coming in Fall 2014)
- Student participation in support services
- Attainment of key milestones
- Community college and third-party credentials
- Employment and wage gain
- Employment demand and trends

So, for example, in the Milestones section, you could select Automotive Technology in 2011-12 and see the rate at which students completed courses, succeeded in courses, enrolled in the following term, and attained more than 8 units, as well as their average grade point average. Or, by looking in the Credentials section, you would find out the rate at which students completed locally-issued credentials, certificates, degrees, and third-party credentials.

Each metric shows the selected year’s figures as well as a five-year trend, with an arrow indicating whether the trend is increasing or decreasing. Each metric can also be disaggregated to understand how these figures vary by specific student characteristics, including:

- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Age

- Disabled student status
- Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) status

Common Metrics

This tab—which will be populated in Fall 2014—enables users to view information on how students performed on 34 Common Metrics that are associated with funding from the Chancellor’s Office Workforce and Economic Development Division. Similar to the Program Snapshot tab, comparison to previous years’ data and disaggregated results by student characteristics will be included (if data are available).

Additional Tracking Tool

The Additional Tracking tool can be used to record participation in CTE activities that are outside the application enrollment process, such as contract education or career fairs. Outcomes for these students are automatically mapped and included in the Common Metrics tab. The tool can either be used for participants to self-register or for learner information to be bulk-uploaded.

HOW IS THE LAUNCHBOARD USEFUL FOR FACULTY?

The information in the LaunchBoard, particularly in the Program Snapshot tab, is helpful for processes like program review and new program approval. Faculty can log in and examine how students are faring in their program or compare wages and projected employer demand for specific occupations. The LaunchBoard is also helpful for shining the light on program successes, particularly in building pathways between K-12 and college, as well as training experienced workers who are not seeking to complete a degree or certificate. With ready access to student progress, outcomes, and labor market information, faculty can hold rich conversations about ways to support students in attaining their goals and transitioning into the workforce.

WHERE CAN I FIND MORE INFORMATION ON THE LAUNCHBOARD?

Visit the dedicated LaunchBoard page on the Chancellor’s Office “Doing What Matters” website (<http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/LaunchBoard.aspx>) for a range of resources including the following:

- Recorded webinars on LaunchBoard features
- Short videos on topics like how to use the Additional Tracking Tool and why it is important to capture more comprehensive metrics for CTE
- Short guides and PowerPoints on ways to use LaunchBoard data to support common college decision-making processes
- Dates for face-to-face trainings on the LaunchBoard

CAN I GET HELP WITH USING THE DATA?

The Centers of Excellence, the RP Group, and WestEd are available to support LaunchBoard use. The Centers of Excellence can provide insight regarding wage outcomes and labor market information. The RP Group provides assistance to researchers on interpreting student milestone and success data that are available through the LaunchBoard. WestEd is providing trainings that help regions leverage LaunchBoard data and will develop a cadre of “super-users” who can work with practitioners on understanding and using the LaunchBoard.

WHERE DO I DIRECT QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS ABOUT THE LAUNCHBOARD?

Your feedback will be very helpful in the next phase of the LaunchBoard design, as well as for developing additional training and support resources.

Please send any questions or comments to launchboard@cccoco.edu. ■

It's Time to Submit Disciplines List Revisions

CRAIG RUTAN, STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMITTEE CHAIR

Every two years, like clockwork, an important process begins again: faculty can propose new disciplines or make revisions to those that exist. In March, an email was sent to senate presidents letting them know that proposed revisions to the Disciplines List could be submitted to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) office for consideration.

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

At the spring 2014 Plenary Session, the delegates approved modifications to the disciplines revision process. These changes include the following:

Each proposal must have a seconder from a different district than the initiator;

While the support of a local senate is sufficient for submission, having the support of one or more professional organizations may strengthen a proposal.

The initiator or an informed designee is required to be present for both hearings where the proposed revision is presented; and

If the body has previously rejected the proposal, it may be resubmitted for consideration if it has changed significantly, such as the inclusion of a new rationale and new evidence.

Completed proposals with all of the required paperwork must be submitted to the ASCCC office. All submissions must be received by September 30, 2014. For assistance in completing a proposal, please contact the ASCCC office at disciplineslist@asccc.org or the Standards and Practices Committee Chair at rutan_craig@sccollege.edu. ■

In Appreciation of John Vasconcellos

DOLORES DAVISON, AREA B REPRESENTATIVE

LESLEY KAWAGUCHI, CHAIR, HISTORY OF THE ASCCC TASK FORCE

When former California state legislator John Vasconcellos passed away in late May, 2014, extensive obituaries appeared in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Sacramento Bee*, and *San Jose Mercury News*. All mentioned his tireless work as a California legislator, his patience and ability to get legislation passed, and his national fame for the 1986 California Task Force to Promote Self-Esteem and Personal and Social Responsibility. While some alluded to his work in higher education, not one of those obituaries referred to the single piece of legislation authored by John Vasconcellos that has had such extensive impact on California community colleges and community college faculty, Assembly Bill (AB) 1725 (1988), which radically altered the framework within which faculty, local academic senates, and ASCCC operated.

AB 1725, along with its subsequent incorporation by the Board of Governors (BOG) into Title 5 regulations in 1991, revolutionized several aspects of California community colleges. The legislation framed its narrative within the future of California and its educational needs in anticipation of the 21st century. It defined the California Community College System and established the stated functions of local boards and the BOG, placing California's community colleges into higher education and separating them from their original function within the K-14 system. This change included the addition



of a second tenured faculty member as a voting member of the Board of Governors. Vasconcellos' legislation also impacted local and state-level governance structures by requiring the BOG to develop policies and guidelines regarding the academic senate and standards regarding the role of students in governance. In addition, AB 1725 created a program-based funding model based on Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES), and it promoted student access and success.

For faculty, Vasconcellos' landmark bill replaced credentials with minimum qualifications, including the Master's Degree. It created the concept of the Disciplines List, used to define minimum qualifications in existing and new academic fields. Responsibility for the Disciplines List created a partnership of the ASCCC and Board of Governors which continues to this day. AB 1725 altered the evaluation and tenure process of full-time and part-time faculty and

established faculty service areas, giving faculty a major role in developing hiring criteria, policies, and procedures in collaboration with local board representatives. It suggested the still unrealized goal of 75:25 as the ideal ratio of full-time to part-time instruction. It promoted program improvement and professional development funds for faculty and staff, priorities that are now moving forward again in the wake of the Student Success Initiative. Moreover, AB 1725 promoted vocational education as one of the primary missions of California community colleges.

Finally, for local senates, AB 1725 institutionalized the concept of shared governance and defined the 10 plus 1 areas of academic senate purview. Indeed so much of AB 1725 touched on academic senate purview that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges prepared a background paper for the Fall 1988 plenary session. (See http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/SectionsAB1725_0.pdf).

In short, the work of the ASCCC and of local academic senates revolves around the very essence of AB 1725. Today, faculty leaders in the California community colleges cannot imagine a world in which “rely primarily” or “mutually agree” did not exist.

In some instances, areas that were mandated in AB 1725 have moved beyond what was initially envisioned with further legislative requirements. As an example, AB 1725 required the development of a transfer core curriculum that would facilitate California community college students’ transfer to California State University and University of California. Over the years, several attempts to streamline this process, including common course numbering and C-ID, have finally led to the Associate Degrees for Transfer to the CSUs. These efforts were the result of faculty from all three systems working together to formulate core curriculum in discipline/majors, and they help to achieve a goal envisioned many years earlier through the legislation championed by John Vasconcellos.

While some alluded to his work in higher education, not one of those obituaries referred to the single piece of legislation authored by John Vasconcellos that has had such extensive impact on California community colleges and community college faculty, Assembly Bill (AB) 1725...

The language and issues that faculty and local senates continue to deal with daily and that the ASCCC discusses at its institutes and plenary sessions would be very different had Vasconcellos never authored AB 1725. This bill was the result of a far-reaching vision that was so critical to community college faculty and governance that one of ASCCC’s partner organizations, the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), names one of its awards the John Vasconcellos Advocate of the Year Award for an outstanding full-time faculty advocate whose work affects faculty statewide. Two past presidents of the ASCCC, Ian Walton and Jane Patton, were honored with this award in 2007 and 2012 in recognition of their efforts to support the voice of faculty in ways consistent with Vasconcellos’ vision.

In short, Vasconcellos’ AB 1725 strengthened and highlighted the important role of faculty in both governance and instruction for the California community colleges. It also gave strength to both local senates and the ASCCC in establishing faculty purview in those specified areas in which faculty have expertise. For this, in gratitude, we appreciate, honor, and give thanks to John Vasconcellos.

Remembering an Educational Advocate

PHIL CRAWFORD, NORTH REPRESENTATIVE

In 1969, I was in my third year of police work for the San Jose Police Department. John Vasconcellos, a newly elected Assemblyman from my district, sent his chief of staff to do a ride along in a police car, and she was assigned to my beat, which was the toughest in the city at the time. When I later met John at a fundraiser, he asked what I did to make such an impression on his chief of staff. I told him I had offered her simple, truthful speak about internal and community issues and problems. We became friends and worked together on educational initiatives and budgets, and I sometimes walked precincts with him.

John was the “go to guy” in the Legislature, in no small part because he learned the inner and outer detailed workings of the budget. John seemed to have the magic of winning over big business interests while moving a progressive agenda that astonished politicians nationwide. It surely helped that he was an intellectual at heart, having graduated Magna Cum Laude from Santa Clara University (SCU) and first in his class from SCU’s School of Law. As a first year student, he managed to convince the president of the university to fire the Dean of the Law School, whom he proclaimed incompetent. He was a trusted friend of Speaker Willie Brown and served as chair of the Education and the Ways and Means Committees.

His contributions to education are second to none. He established the state’s first Legislative Review of California’s Educational Master Plan

His arguments were so convincing and persistent that he was able to convince conservative Republican Governor Deukmejian to sign AB 1725 into law.

in 1980s. He was the first to move to fruition legislation providing \$20 million for low performing schools burdened with violence and truancy. He moved the California community colleges from secondary education clones to a model more like the universities by empowering the academic senates and reversing the trend to rely upon part-time instructors. His arguments were so convincing and persistent that he was able to convince conservative Republican Governor Deukmejian to sign AB 1725 into law.

John was a pioneer of humanistic politics. While his work on self-esteem was the joke of national cartoonists and pundits, that work—including the establishment of a commission on self-esteem and the creation of self-esteem legislation—eventually revealed a clear scientific relationship between substance abuse, educational failure, and violence linked to personal self-esteem or lack thereof. Courage, humility, and a commitment to personal growth were the hallmarks of his pathway, and it was an honor to have had the opportunity to work with him through the years. He will be sorely missed. ■

Infusing Cultural Competency, Diversity, and Equity

JOHN STANSKAS, CHAIR, ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE

JAMES TODD, CHAIR, EQUITY AND DIVERSITY ACTION COMMITTEE

The Spring 2014 ASCCC Plenary Session produced a timely resolution (3.01), especially as our system-wide engagement with student equity was renewed with the promise of designated state funding for community colleges. The ASCCC Executive Committee was asked to “engage in cultural competency and equity training at its annual ... orientation, and use the information from that training to develop its cultural competency plan as a model for local senates.” The Executive Committee did engage in this training at its June orientation meeting, and the results of that discussion should help not only to develop an ASCCC plan but also to provide a spark to begin local discussions as senates begin the academic year.

The resolution was a fantastic mandate and impetus for a larger conversation and action. On June 1, 2014, the Executive Committee welcomed Past President Jane Patton for a day-long cultural competency training; at the same time, it was announced that the Equity and Diversity Action Committee, which had been on hiatus as a task force, would be reestablished as a standing committee of the ASCCC.

The training traversed several themes, from exploring a philosophy of diversity to the value of understanding the powerful historical constructions and lived experiences of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality. An Executive Committee comprised of various disciplines

and backgrounds acknowledged that the ASCCC does many things well in terms of diversity—including recognizing diversity in writing and policy, providing opportunities and awards, promoting caucuses, and making diverse appointments—but that reflecting diversity in our local senates and the ASCCC must remain an ongoing area of focus.

To guide the ASCCC’s work regarding cultural competency, the Executive Committee envisioned new objectives for this year, a part of which will involve reframing the conversation about diversity to one about equity across the system, including both students and faculty. Rather than approach equity as a supplement to “add in” to our current agendas, the challenge is to continually integrate and encourage equity in our themes, strategic planning, policies, and events. For this reason, the ASCCC must engage in difficult conversations and presentations exploring hiring practices, understanding demographic data, thinking about success and achievement, and discussing what it means to “reflect” diversity and “enable” equity.

Local senates have an excellent opportunity to engage and evaluate college planning this academic year in terms of student success and equity.

Faculty can expect equity and diversity to be a major focus of the ASCCC this year—at plenary sessions, during local senate visits, in our discourse, and across our strategies. The Equity and Diversity Action Committee is charged with building a cultural competency plan that will encourage greater diversity in local senates, and the continued focus on issues of diverse achievement and student equity across the state should help to inform our discourse as a Senate body.

In addition, the theme of the Academic Academy this year will center in large part on equity and diversity. The Academic Academy will take place March 12 – 14, 2015 at the Costa Mesa Westin Hotel. More information will be available on the ASCCC website in the coming months. Local senates are encouraged to identify upcoming faculty leaders to attend and bring information back to their colleges.

Local senates have an excellent opportunity to engage and evaluate college planning this academic year in terms of student success and equity. Local Student Equity Plans, Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), Basic Skills Plans, and Enrollment Management Plans should be integrated to best serve local communities; evaluating these plans on local campuses can also lead to philosophical discussions about the value of diversity.¹ Additionally, faculty involvement in Assembly Bill 86 consortia planning and noncredit/credit discussions should incorporate elements of equity, especially as we try to reflect on and serve our communities and their needs. With much to do and many opportunities for change, the ASCCC looks forward to hearing how you are doing with these complex conversations throughout the year, especially at the Academic Academy. ■

1 See the article “Building Faculty Processes for Student Success and Equity” elsewhere in this Rostrum for further discussion of this topic.

Academic Senate Events

Student Equity and Success Regional Meeting (North)

September 26, 2014

American River College

Student Equity and Success Regional Meeting (South)

September 27, 2014

Mt. San Antonio College

Area Meetings

October 24 - 25, 2014

Various Locations

2014 Fall Plenary Session

November 13 - 15, 2014

Irvine Marriott

2015 Accreditation Institute

February 20 - 21, 2015

The San Mateo Marriott San Francisco Airport

2015 Academic Academy

March 13 - 14, 2015

The Westin South Coast Plaza

Building Faculty Processes for Student Success and Equity

JAMES TODD, CHAIR, EQUITY AND DIVERSITY ACTION COMMITTEE

CYNTHIA RICO, CHAIR, TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION COMMITTEE



While many challenges are currently facing California community colleges, the mandated Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) and Student Equity Plans are two of the most pressing requirements for colleges in Fall 2014. With the SSSP plans due October 17 and Student Equity Plans due November 21, faculty must help craft meaningful methods to locally address student completion of educational goals. The toughest questions concern access and success—specifically, how colleges will examine and respond to achievement gaps across student populations. Needless to say, both plans require significant thought, careful consideration, and nuanced preparation in a short amount of time.

Student Success and Support Program plans must document how colleges aim to increase student access and success by providing orientation, assessment, advising, and other educational planning services. These annual reports require a description of all SSSP services, policies, activities and procedures offered at a college or district, regardless of funding courses. Plans must also address how institutional evaluation and research will assist or improve services, including prerequisite procedures, professional development, technology, and policies on issues such as exemptions and appeals.

Not designed to be supplemental in nature, SSSP plans must be intimately coordinated with other college and district efforts, including those engaging student

equity. As faculty consider the connections between student success and equity, the terrain becomes more complicated and challenging. Importantly, equity is not necessarily equality, and the spirit of the Student Success Act of 2012 centers on this point. While *equality* refers to ensuring similar treatment and resources for all, *equity* examines the difficulties of reaching the same outcome across all populations. Planning for equity therefore requires a complex understanding of the differences among individuals that may either pose barriers or contribute to success.

Student Equity Plans are not easy to implement. Fundamentally, these plans must explain how colleges will mitigate disproportionate impact: the evidential, structural conditions that affect student access and success. Colleges must address five student success indicators, or metrics, in examining and alleviating disproportionate impact: access, course completion, English as a Second Language and basic skills completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer rates.

Planning for equity therefore requires a complex understanding of the differences among individuals that may either pose barriers or contribute to success.

Because equity requires investment and intervention, the California Legislature recognized the need for funding equity in addition to the general SSSP formulas, with an approved figure of \$70 million for 2014-2015. That funding should help colleges as they establish the work of their Student Equity Committees, which must plan to integrate and employ strategies that address and monitor equity and, when needed, organize interventions and services for students who are at risk of academic progress or probation. This work also became more complicated with the addition of the budget trailer bill SB 860 in June 2014, as the disaggregated subgroups to be considered expanded. Plans must now include ethnic and gender subpopulations, veterans, low-income-students, foster youth, and students with disabilities.

As institutions throughout the state consider the scope of the SSSP and Student Equity Plans, all local academic senates and their colleges face the arduous task of establishing processes that truly address student success and student equity in meaningful, concrete ways. Community colleges should share their processes as they develop and integrate these plans into their educational master planning, program reviews, accreditation work, and basic skills initiatives. Through such sharing, colleges can begin to address such issues as how to engender a holistic approach to planning, budgeting, and delivery of services to support equity in student access and success and how to best take into account the life cycle of the college student, from pre-enrollment through placement, enrollment, advising and counseling, persistence and sustainability, and graduation or transfer.

As you consider your local campus and its sociocultural context, a good place to start might be with the following questions:

- Where is disproportionate impact an issue?
- What strategies and approaches has your college successfully implemented to mitigate disproportionate impact?

- Has your college researched the literature of “best practices” that have proven to be successful in the retention, persistence and completion across various populations or best practices in admissions, assessment, orientation, counseling and advising, basic skills, or interventions?
- Have you considered what data makes sense to draw on to explore your success and equity issues—even beyond the Scorecard or DataMart?
- What analyses do you need in order to address and monitor changes in disproportionate impact?
- What information would be helpful for action planning and improvement?
- What kind of training or professional development is needed?

Colleges are currently at various stages in the planning, discussion, and writing of their Student Equity Plans. In the spirit of collegiality and helping colleges meet the deadline of November 21, 2014, all of our institutions should find ways of sharing our SSSP and Student Equity Plans across our colleges and districts. The ASCCC Executive Committee will work to provide assistance in helping colleges collaborate with each other and is exploring avenues to facilitate such discussions. The Academic Senate will strive not only to enable faculty-driven processes for student success and equity but also to collaborate with colleges on methods to implement, sustain, and evaluate local efforts that will inevitably benefit all students.

For more information, and to access your copy of the Student Equity Template, go to: <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/StudentServices/StudentEquity.aspx> ■

A Challengingly Good Year: An update from the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum

JULIE BRUNO, VICE PRESIDENT, PAST CO-CHAIR OF SACC
MICHELLE GRIMES-HILLMAN, CO-CHAIR OF SACC

As most of us can attest, decisions made in the Chancellor's Office directly affect the day-to-day workings of our colleges. Never is this fact more obvious to faculty than when they are creating or revising curriculum. As colleges work to address the educational goals of their students and meet the curricular requirements of the Chancellor's Office, issues may surface that could adversely affect curriculum and curriculum procedures at local colleges. When warranted, these curricular issues come to the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum (SACC) for consideration. SACC, a collaborative committee with membership including representatives from faculty, administration, and the Chancellor's Office, is charged with investigating, deliberating, and providing recommendations to the Chancellor's Office to address or resolve curricular issues and improve Chancellor's Office policies and procedures.

SACC considered a number of issues during the past year. Unfortunately, our ability to address certain issues, such as concerns with information in the Program and Course Approval Handbook, was impeded by the vacancies of key positions in Academic Affairs.

In spite of these difficult conditions, we did make progress in resolving several issues, as evidenced by the committee's recommendations captured in our meeting summaries and information disseminated at the Curriculum Institute as well as the Chancellor's Office memorandums published in May.

However, we were unable to resolve all issues, and a few matters that SACC worked on this last year will continue into the next:

As colleges work to address the educational goals of their students and meet the curricular requirements of the Chancellor's Office, issues may surface that could adversely affect curriculum and curriculum procedures at local colleges.

- Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH): SACC will collaborate with the Chancellor's Office to revise the PCAH in an effort to address the concerns that came to light during the past year as local curriculum chairs, articulation officers, and curriculum specialists attempted to implement directives from the PCAH. As this work continues, the SACC faculty representatives will rely on their

colleagues in the field to identify concerns and provide specific examples and rationale for any proposed changes.

- Program Goals: SACC is considering a recommendation to the Chancellor's Office to revise the program goals in the Curriculum Inventory for traditional (non-Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT)) associate degrees. Currently, four possible program goals exist for associate degrees: transfer, career technical education (CTE), CTE and transfer, and other. Moreover, the PCAH limits the use of a local general education pattern for traditional (non-ADT) transfer degrees and only permits the use of CSU or IGETC pattern. These two conditions have created significant restrictions on the development and revision of traditional associate degrees that include a local general education pattern, thereby constraining colleges in serving students transferring to private or out-of-state colleges and universities.

These two issues will consume a substantial amount of time and effort; however, there are a few other matters that remain on the SACC agenda for the coming year:

- Implementing progress indicators for noncredit courses, including elevating the priority of Title 5 changes to add Satisfactory Progress (SP) (Resolution 14.02 S14)
- Coding of English as a Second Language (ESL) courses for the Data Mart basic skills progress tracker tool (Resolution 9.04 S14)
- Developing guidelines for the enrollment of community service and credit students in classes
- Changes to Education Code regarding auditing language (Resolution 6.02 F11)
- Developing guidelines for collaborative programs (formerly conjoint programs) to

create partnerships between and among colleges for programs and degree offerings including ADTs.

Although the work of SACC continues, the faculty membership will be changing. This past year, our representatives created an effective, collegial, and collaborative environment at SACC and should be commended for their efforts. Many thanks to Marie Boyd (Chaffey College), Cori Burns (Cosumnes River College), Erik Shearer (Napa Valley College), and John Stanskas (San Bernardino Valley College) for their service. SACC welcomes the new faculty representatives who began their tenure in August: Dolores Davison (Foothill College), Dave Degroot (Allan Hancock College), Craig Rutan (Santiago Canyon College), and Jolena Grande (Cypress College). Marie Boyd will also remain as a faculty representative for the coming year, serving for a second year on the committee. Finally, ASCCC Curriculum Committee Chair Michelle Grimes-Hillman (Mt. San Antonio College) will take over as the faculty co-chair of SACC.

As always, updates on SACC's work will be provided at ASCCC curriculum regional meetings, plenary sessions, and listserv postings as well as through the SACC meeting summaries located at

[http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/AcademicAffairs/CurriculumandInstructionUnit/SystemAdvisoryCommitteeonCurriculum.](http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/AcademicAffairs/CurriculumandInstructionUnit/SystemAdvisoryCommitteeonCurriculum.aspx)

aspx ■

The Concept of Credit Courses: Another Look at Course Repetition and Repeatability

DAVID MORSE, ASCCC PRESIDENT, CO-CHAIR SYSTEM ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CURRICULUM 2011-13

JULIE BRUNO, ASCCC VICE-PRESIDENT, CO-CHAIR SYSTEM ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CURRICULUM 2013-14

MICHELLE GRIMES-HILLMAN, ASCCC CURRICULUM CHAIR, CO-CHAIR SYSTEM ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CURRICULUM 2014-15

The changes to regulations regarding credit course repetition that were approved in 2011 have now been official for three years. The Academic Senate has offered numerous presentations at plenaries, institutes, and regional trainings to help local senates and faculty prepare and implement the 2011 regulation changes, and in November 2013 the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office published the Credit Course Repetition Guidelines. Still, these regulations remain a cause for concern for some faculty, and various groups and individuals have continued to lobby for additional changes that would increase opportunities for course repetition. At the 2014 ASCCC Spring Plenary Session, Resolution 9.02 called for the Academic Senate to "work with the Consultation Council and the Board of Governors to increase repeatability options." This resolved clause was ultimately removed from the final resolution by majority vote of the delegates present.

The Academic Senate understands the concerns regarding course repetition and is working to implement options that would allow colleges to serve lifelong learners and other community members and to help students to gain the experiences they need

to reach their educational goals. However, as the delegates at the plenary session realized, once again revising the regulations to allow for more course repetition is not a viable approach to the situation. The principles regarding the awarding of course credit, as well as fiscal and curricular responsibility, require that the California Community College System seek other solutions.

First, one must understand the difference between repeatability and course repetition. Course repetition implies that an individual student can take a course over again due to certain circumstances or the student's characteristics. Course repeatability means that any student can repeat the course regardless of the circumstances. Since the 2011 regulation changes, courses may be listed as repeatable for only three reasons: intercollegiate athletics, courses that are required by the CSU or UC

The Academic Senate understands the concerns regarding course repetition and is working to implement options that would allow colleges to serve lifelong learners and other community members and to help students to gain the experiences they need to reach their educational goals.

to be repeated for a major, and vocational and academic competition courses. In all other cases, courses may not be listed as repeatable, and individual students can be granted the opportunity to retake the course only under specific circumstances.

When discussing course repetition and repeatability, one should also understand the educational principles behind the regulations. The educational principle behind credit courses is based on achieving objectives and outcomes². Discipline faculty, curriculum committees, and local senates need to have focused conversations to determine the appropriate objectives and outcomes for each course, after which most colleges list the course objectives and student learning outcomes on their course outlines of record. If the student achieves those objectives and outcomes, the student passes; if the student does not, the student should not pass. Given that principle, it is very difficult to explain to policy-makers in Sacramento why a student who passed a class, and therefore was judged to have done a satisfactory job of learning what the class was intended to teach, should take the class again—and, moreover, why the public should pay for a student to take a class that covers material which the student has already learned.

One can argue that students may pass a course and still benefit from more practice or experience, but that argument could apply to any course. A student in a public speaking course—which has never been repeatable—could benefit from taking the course over again and improving, but some limits on such experiences need to exist for the sake of the taxpayer. Title 5 regulations set that limit at the point at which the student has demonstrated a satisfactory level of achieving the objectives and outcomes by passing the course. This limitation may make grading decisions more difficult. Some faculty and some institutions

may need to reconsider their definition of a C grade. In some cases, a “C” seems to have meant “you did okay, and you worked hard and are improving, but you still need more work.” But such a definition has never been the intended standard for a “C” grade. A “C” should mean that a student learned the material and achieved what he or she needed to in order to move forward to higher levels or to apply the knowledge. While such a standard is more difficult for faculty to apply because of the sympathy we may have for our students, it nevertheless is what a “C” is intended to signify and is the definition through which policy-makers view the curriculum. Next, one must consider the accumulation of units that students attain during their time on community college campuses. Colleges should ensure that our students are able to have the experiences they need to be successful whether they transfer to a university, go straight into employment, or enrich their lives through learning, but students may not actually need all of the units they accrue to achieve their personal and educational goals. While the system should not limit reasonable and necessary student options, it also cannot promote the accumulation of truly excessive units.

The revision of the regulations in 2011 came about in large part due to abuses by local curriculum committees. Although they may have had good intentions, some colleges stretched the old regulations to such an unreasonable point that they drew attention that ended up forcing changes on all of our institutions. Those colleges bent and interpreted the old regulations in ways that they were never intended to be used, and as a result we all paid for it. That is why the Academic Senate has urged colleges to work within these new regulations, not to try to stretch them—because if the same thing happens again, this conversation will take place again in a few years with even more restrictive regulations. However, not all aspects of the changes regarding course repetition are or have to be negative. Some faculty have suggested that that the Title 5 changes now create challenges for students who need to maintain licensure or meet

2 For a discussion on the difference between objectives and outcomes, please see the document *Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment* (Fall, 2010) at http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/SLO-paper-Fall2010_0.pdf

legal mandates. Individual students were always able to repeat courses to meet such requirements, and this option still exists through Title 5 §55040(8). In addition, under the previous regulations a student could only repeat a course if the repeat was mandated by law or policy. The new Title 5 language allows students to repeat a class due to “significant change in industry or licensure standard” in order to get or keep a job (Title 5 § 55040(b)(9)), and the documentation and verification of that need is determined by the local district. This change is actually a loosening of the regulations. The challenge is that local senates will need to look at the documentation and verification processes that they are using to ensure that students get into the courses they need to gain or maintain employment.

In addition, the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum (SACC) discovered a misalignment between the sections of Title 5 on work experience and course repeatability. Under Title 5 §55040, only occupational work experience courses are allowed to be repeatable, but general work experience courses are not. Therefore, SACC recently discussed and recommended proposed changes to §55040 (b) (6) that delete the word “occupational” and substitute the word “co-operative” throughout, thereby encompassing both occupational and general work experience. Title 5 §55253 (b) was also amended to align with §55040. No changes to apportionment regulations are required by this change. These recommended changes have been seen by the Board of Governors for first reading and should be approved by the end of the year.

The Academic Senate and SACC also continue to advocate for changes to the language on auditing in Education Code, as directed by ASCCC Resolution 6.02 F11. Such changes may allow more opportunities for those students who have completed a class to come back for a refresher in the content or more practice at a skill without

The Academic Senate and SACC also continue to advocate for changes to the language on auditing in Education Code, as directed by ASCCC Resolution 6.02 F11.

receiving additional credit. The Chancellor’s Office, at the urging of the Academic Senate and SACC, is also working on developing guidelines through which credit and community education students can be enrolled in the same class. These changes may help to address the issue of community members and other students who want to participate in performance classes but do not need to receive credit.

The Academic Senate remains committed to exploring options that will help colleges address student needs for additional experience in courses they have successfully completed but in which they may, for legitimate reasons, need more practice or instruction. In addition to the current work regarding auditing and community service courses, other possibilities may exist and could be proposed. Opportunities in noncredit instruction may also help to address some of the issues. The key is to uphold the system’s educational principles and look for ways to serve students while minimizing instances in which they receive credit for the same thing more than once. ■

The Online Education Initiative: A Progress Report

DAN CRUMP, ONLINE EDUCATION STEERING COMMITTEE, ASCCC REPRESENTATIVE AT-LARGE
JOHN FREITAS, ONLINE EDUCATION STEERING COMMITTEE, ASCCC AREA C REPRESENTATIVE

Since the Online Education Initiative (OEI) was announced in Fall 2013, many questions have arisen: When will the first classes be offered? What are the requirements for participation? When will the Common Course Management System (CCMS) be operational, and will it live up to the promise of being a system that meets the needs of all online faculty and students across the state? Will a separate online community college be the end result of this project? Throughout the course of numerous meetings during the past months, answers to many of these questions have been clarified.

First, a brief history of the OEI is in order. In January 2014, the governor proposed funding in his 2014-2015 budget for expanding access to the CCCs, CSUs and UCs through the offering of massively open online courses (MOOCs) for credit. Many educators felt that this proposal was a massively bad idea. Opening online credit courses to hundreds or thousands of students through a MOOC is contrary to good practice in online education and accreditation standards, and doing so would violate state and federal requirements for regular and effective contact. Fortunately, the governor was convinced instead to fund the expansion the existing online education that the California community colleges already do quite well and have been doing since the 1990s.

With the passage of the 2013-2014 budget, the Online Education Initiative (OEI) was born, along with the Common Assessment Initiative and the Education Planning Initiative, both of which were recommendations from the Student

Success Task Force. All three projects were funded by competitive grants. The Request for Applications (RFAs) for each initiative was released to the field by the Chancellor's Office on September 1, 2013.³ The OEI grant was awarded to the Foothill-De Anza CCD/Butte-Glenn CCD consortium in November 2013, with Foothill-De Anza CCD acting as the fiscal agent. The project funding is \$16.9 million for the first year, with

³ The original RFAs, with detailed project requirements, can be found at <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/TechResearchInfoSys/Telecom.aspx>



Faculty contended that the pace of the project was too fast to be workable, with little opportunity for local senates to weigh in on whether or not their colleges should participate in the project.

ongoing funding of \$10 million per year for the remainder of the grant project; the total grant period is five years.

The overarching purpose of the OEI is to create an Online Course Exchange in order to provide seamless access to the online courses and services students need, with the following key elements:

- Focus on ADT (associate degree for transfer) courses
- Development of a common course management system (CCMS) for use at little or no cost to participant colleges and built to specification
- Providing faculty professional development in online pedagogy
- Providing student support tools such as online tutoring
- While concerns have been expressed that the end result of the OEI will be the creation of a separate, independent online community college, the project directors and the Chancellor's Office have given assurances that no such separate college is planned or expected.

The OEI Steering Committee⁴ was established as a representative, constituent-based body of 26 voting members, including nine faculty appointed by the Academic Senate, and six ex-officio members representing the fiscal agent

4 For more information about the OEI, go to <http://ccconlineed.org>

and the Chancellor's Office. The committee has met twice monthly since April, in person and online. The committee acts as the governance body for the project and has purview over all

policy recommendations for the OEI project. The committee is subdivided into workgroups on academic affairs, student services, professional development, the common course management system, and the pilot colleges' consortium.

The selection of Pat James (previously Dean of Instruction, Library and Technology & Distance Education, Mt. San Jacinto) as the permanent Executive Director of the OEI in June marks an important milestone for the project. A former member of Academic Senate Executive Committee, James is highly regarded as a preeminent expert in online education. Most importantly, she holds as her guiding principle doing what is best for students. Prior to her selection, the Steering Committee was encouraged to select pilot colleges in the summer and start offering courses in the fall. Faculty contended that the pace of the project was too fast to be workable, with little opportunity for local senates to weigh in on whether or not their colleges should participate in the project. In the interest of doing what is best for students and developing a pilot that offers the highest quality online education experience possible, the new executive director made the much-needed decision to push the start of the pilot to the Spring of 2015, with the selection of pilot colleges being announced in August.

The selection of the pilot colleges was completed in late July. Fifty-eight colleges responded to the initial interest questionnaire; of those, forty-four provided requested additional information. The original plan was to select eight pilot colleges. Instead, the selection team made a recommendation to select 24 colleges for the pilot to participate on three tracks,

with eight colleges in each track: piloting the student readiness modules, the online tutoring system, and the full experience on the new CCMS. The OEI Steering Committee approved this recommendation, and thus the number of pilot colleges was expanded. The criteria used for selecting the pilot colleges were as follows:

- Currently use Open CCC Apply
- Have established online education programs
- Require or have substantial professional development for online faculty
- Geographical and college size diversity (north, south, urban, suburban, rural, size)
- Diversity of CMS used
- Accreditation status – the participant colleges cannot be on Show Cause
- Capacity to add online courses to their schedules
- Participation in the piloting of other projects – Common Assessment, Education Planning

The colleges selected to test the student readiness modules and the online tutoring system will offer at a minimum two courses each and will use their existing course management systems. This level of involvement will allow these colleges to focus on testing the effectiveness of these specific components. Piloting of the student readiness modules and online tutoring system is on schedule to start in Spring 2015. The colleges selected for the “full launch” will offer courses and test the

mentioned services components within the new CCMS. These offerings are currently on schedule to start in Summer 2015.⁵

The “full launch” will mark a major milestone for the OEI project because at that time the CCMS will go live. The successful development and launch of the CCMS as a system that meets the needs of faculty and students alike will likely be the key to success for the overall OEI project. While the efficacy of the components of the course exchange, the provision of faculty professional development, and the link to the Education Planning and Common Assessment Initiatives are all important, the success of the OEI and the establishment of a fully operational Online Course Exchange will certainly hinge on the quality and utility of the CCMS. If the CCMS does not support the needs of online faculty and the students they serve, then faculty will likely offer little support for participation in the future Online Course Exchange.

Because of the importance of the CCMS to this project, a workgroup under the purview of the OEI Steering Committee has been established for the purpose of identifying the needs of online faculty and developing the technical specifications for the CCMS, developing the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the selection of vendors to build the CCMS, and reviewing

5 The reason for launching in summer instead of fall is that a period is needed to test the system with fewer classes and fewer students active. Summer is also a lighter period for the CCC Technology Center, and thus the summer launch will allow technical issues identified in summer 2015 to be addressed before Fall 2015 begins.

Because the end goal of this project is to create an Online Course Exchange that will allow students a seamless experience, the project is very complex and includes many issues to be resolved.

and rating the proposals. This workgroup will include faculty from the OEI Steering Committee, faculty with expertise in the area of teaching and developing course management systems, and faculty from the pilot colleges. All faculty appointments will be made by the Academic Senate.

Because the end goal of this project is to create an Online Course Exchange that will allow students a seamless experience, the project is very complex and includes many issues to be resolved. For example, while courses offered are required to be C-ID-approved, the initial group of courses still needs to be identified. Important considerations include the need to strike a balance between high-demand courses needed for general education and graduation requirements and courses needed to complete ADTs. Differences between participant colleges in registration dates and local enrollment priorities need to be addressed, as do the differences between colleges in enrollment

limits, placement assessment, business services policies, and other policy and operational differences.

The quality of course design must be assured. Courses that are to be offered will first be reviewed by a workgroup of the OEI Steering Committee to assure that they meet minimum quality standards for course design established by the OEI Steering Committee. The four main categories for evaluation are as follows:

- Course design – structure of the course, learning objectives, organization of content, and instructional strategies
- Interaction and collaboration – communication between students and instructors that requires interdependent group work

OEI PILOT COLLEGES

Student Readiness (Spring 2015)	Online Tutoring (Spring 2015)	Full Launch (Summer 2015)
Antelope Valley	Barstow	Butte
Cabrillo	College of the Canyons	Coastline
Hartnell	Columbia	Foothill
Mira Costa	Imperial Valley	Shasta
Monterey Peninsula	Mt SAC	Fresno City
Ohlone	Pierce	Lake Tahoe
Rio Hondo	Saddleback	Mt San Jacinto
West Los Angeles	Victor Valley	Ventura

Local senates should be consulted on continued participation in the Exchange, regardless of whether or not they were consulted on participation in the pilot.

- Assessment – instructional activities designed to measure progress towards learning outcomes, provide feedback to students and instructor, or enable grade assignment
- Learner (student) support – support resources made available to students taking the course

Within each main category are sub-categories, such as learner engagement, communication strategies, assessment design, and orientation to course and course management system. Ultimately, the rating rubric assesses whether or not students are receiving regular and effective contact when taking the course. The rubric categories then reflect how quality design of the various components of an online course results in regular and effective contact for students and how that regular and effective contact improves the learning experience for the students.

The faculty assigned to teach the courses must also be prepared for teaching in the online learning environment. One of the components of the OEI is to provide professional development opportunities that will allow faculty to improve their skills in course design and teaching in the online environment. As the project matures from the pilot phase to the established Exchange and more colleges become involved, this aspect of the initiative will provide a real opportunity to allow more faculty to participate in professional development activities that will

improve their skills in the online environment and thus improve the quality of online education across the system.

As this project progresses, faculty throughout the state must stay informed regarding developments and issues. Because the project involves areas of faculty purview under the 10+1 such as curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, student preparation and success, and faculty professional development, local senates should have been consulted before their colleges committed to participation in the OEI. Given that the solicitation of potential pilot colleges began in early May, some of the senates at the pilot colleges may not have been consulted before participants were selected. Thus, local senates at the pilot colleges should strongly urge that their administrations explain what impacts participation in the pilot may have on the college and provide regular status reports during the pilot. Furthermore, participation in the pilot should not mean automatic continued participation in the Exchange after the pilot phase ends. Local senates should be consulted on continued participation in the Exchange, regardless of whether or not they were consulted on participation in the pilot. Finally, local senates should remember that faculty primacy on academic and professional matters extends to the OEI at both the local and state level. While the Academic Senate represents the faculty statewide on the OEI Steering Committee⁶, local senates at participant colleges do not lose their right to collegial consultation because of participation in the OEI. Should participation in the OEI pilot or the future Exchange prompt governing boards or administrators to propose changes to local policies and procedures covered under the 10+1, local senates must be collegially consulted. ■

6 Resolution 7.01 F13: <http://asccc.org/resolutions/academic-senate-participation-online-course-exchange>

The Community College Bachelor's Degree: Many Questions Still Unanswered

WHEELER NORTH, TREASURER



On August 21, 2014, Senate Bill 850 (Block) formally passed out of the legislature and was sent to the governor for his signature. This bill would create a pilot program in which fifteen community colleges in fifteen different districts could each offer one bachelor's degree in one discipline. The options for these degrees are limited to disciplines in which the California State University and the University of California do not offer degrees unless the CSU or UC agrees to waive this provision.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has opposed this legislation in specific and the concept of community college bachelor's degrees in general through several resolutions. In Spring of 2010 resolutions 6.01 S10 and 6.09 S10 were written to both oppose the idea and to research the feasibility of offering Baccalaureate degrees. Specifically, resolution 6.01 addressed proposed legislation at the time that would have established community college bachelor's degrees and resolved that

the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose any expansion of the California community college mission as proposed in AB 2400 (Anderson, March 2010).

More recently, the Academic Senate passed resolution 13.01 S14, again asking for research prior to implementing the development of such programs.

However, with the passage of SB 850, the creation of community college bachelor's degrees is now seemingly inevitable. The governor is expected to sign the bill, and some districts are already planning for the creation of these degrees. Local academic senates may choose to continue opposing the CCC bachelor's degree at their own colleges, but faculty in many areas have already endorsed the concept. At the state level, the Academic Senate may continue to urge caution and ask for more research before any expansion of the pilot can take place. At this time, however, a limited implementation of the CCC bachelor's degree seems a certainty at least for the immediate future, and thus faculty must engage in a conversation to address the many outstanding questions that remain regarding these programs.

One important topic for discussion will be the economic model on which the degrees will be constructed. The legislation's funding formula would have the students paying the same base rates for lower and upper division courses, with an additional \$84 per unit for their upper division courses. Lower division coursework for the degrees would be delivered under the same

rules and funding that currently exists for all CCC students. This funding system may give rise to many questions, including the definitions of upper and lower division courses and the extent to which these tuition rates will truly offset the full cost of offering a bachelor's degree program.

The Academic Senate has maintained throughout discussions of SB 850 that any proposal for bachelor's degree programs should not divert resources away from our existing lower division mission. Supporters of the bachelor's degree have readily conceded this point, noting that the primary mission of the California community colleges will remain unchanged and that any new bachelor's degree programs will be supplemental to that mission. Yet SB 850 offers no language that would protect existing programs or ensure that the bachelor's degrees will not supplant the primary mission. Faculty must continue to work at both the state and the local level to guarantee that resources for established programs will not be diminished by the pilot programs.

Minimum qualifications are another issue that must be addressed before the bachelor's degrees can be offered. Some have suggested that upper division coursework will require a different set of minimum qualifications. Such a discussion falls directly within the purview of the Academic Senate, and the results of this debate may raise additional questions, such as union issues regarding different pay rates for different qualifications, common or separate union representation for upper and lower division faculty, and faculty service areas.

Various other questions also remain to be answered in areas such as admission requirements, registration priorities, financial aid, and others. Clearly, engaging in the enterprise of offering bachelor's degrees will force us to examine nearly every aspect of the

ways we currently serve our students. Many of these topics are local issues, and colleges that offer these degrees will need to establish answers before the programs can be offered. Other issues will be a matter of statewide debate and potential regulation changes, and the Academic Senate will therefore need to engage in these conversations in order to ensure outcomes that are acceptable to faculty.

While the number, scope, and scale of issues regarding the community colleges bachelor's degree may be daunting, faculty must insist on appropriate consultation and decision-making processes at both the state and local level, and we must be willing to invest our time and energy in these difficult discussions. With the passage of

Local academic senates may choose to continue opposing the CCC bachelor's degree at their own colleges, but faculty in many areas have already endorsed the concept.

SB 850, the CCC bachelor's degree is no longer a concept that academic senates can simply oppose. Indeed, through appropriate implementation we may make these new programs beneficial to many students, but such a positive outcome can only happen if faculty assume our proper role in helping to guide the process and answer the many questions that remain. ■

A Tribute To A Friend of the Senate



On August 19, 2014, Randy Lawson, Executive Vice-President of Santa Monica College, passed away. Randy's passing is a tremendous loss not only to his college, which he loved dearly, but also to the entire California Community College System.

Randy helped to create the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum (SACC) and served as administrative co-chair of that body for many years. The writers of this brief tribute each had the honor of serving as Randy's co-chair on SACC, and we therefore had the opportunity to know him both personally and professionally. He was unfailingly courteous, considerate, and collegial, and he was always respectful of faculty positions and arguments. He had an incredible level of knowledge regarding both the history of our system and curricular issues, but even more important and impressive was his kind and gentle nature. All of us who served with him respected him deeply and appreciated his many contributions to our system and our colleges.

Our deepest sympathies go out to Randy Lawson's family and to his colleagues at Santa Monica College. Their loss is our loss, and we will miss Randy terribly but will always cherish our memories of him as a colleague and a friend.

Jane Patton
Michelle Pilati
Mark Wade Lieu
Beth Smith
David Morse
Julie Bruno
Michelle Grimes-Hillman ■