SenateRostrum

The Genie in the Bottle:

DISAGGREGATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES DATA

by Randy Beach

also in this issue

Striking The Right Balance:
Local Control Vs. System-Level Decisions

by David Morse, President

When I first began attending Academic Senate plenary sessions, former ASCCC Executive Committee Member Richard Mahon semi-jokingly labeled me the champion of local control. Richard's reason for assigning me this title was that I loudly and emphatically protested whenever anyone raised the possibility of setting system-level standards or regulations that would restrict colleges' ability to set their own standards or make their own decisions. I fully believed in the right of colleges to manage their own resources and practices, and I continued to champion local control over all other considerations for a number of years.

Time has passed, and I have learned a great deal about how the community college system and individual colleges really work. I continue to believe that local control over decision making should be the default position and that only for specific and compelling reasons should the system or the state impose decisions on colleges' management

> I continue to believe that local control over decision making should be the default position and that only for specific and compelling reasons should the system or the state impose decisions on colleges' management of curriculum, finances, or other areas.

of curriculum, finances, or other areas. Each of our institutions is different and serves a different community, and each institution must therefore be allowed to determine for itself how best to serve the needs of its community and its students. Yet I have also come to understand that in some cases legitimate reasons for system-level mandates or decisions do exist and that in some instances all of our colleges may be best served by a unified position, policy, or standard.

The need to balance local control with systemwide or statewide concerns is not new. Each time Title 5 is added to or amended, the Chancellor's Office, the Academic Senate, and other constituencies work to craft language that is specific enough to provide meaningful guidance and structure while still allowing the greatest degree of local flexibility that is reasonable in the specific circumstance. Each time a new program or initiative is launched, the ASCCC consults with system partners to determine the best ways to address statewide needs and concerns without

imposing on or mandating local decisions or use of resources. In numerous cases in the past, the system has managed to strike an appropriate balance between these opposing perspectives, and in the coming months the system will be forced to do so again in a number of cases.

A SUCCESSFUL BALANCE FROM THE PAST: FACULTY MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

One very successful instance of the system's ability to balance state level concerns with local control is the process for establishing faculty minimum qualifications. Education Code §87356 mandates that the Board of Governors will establish minimum qualifications for faculty, administrators, and others, and §87357 states that the Board shall rely primarily on the recommendation of the statewide Academic Senate in establishing these qualifications for faculty. Education Code §87359 also allows for the hiring of faculty who do not meet applicable minimum qualifications through a local equivalency process. Through these sections Education Code mandates that all faculty employed by California community colleges must meet a specified state-level minimum standard in order to ensure quality instruction for all students in the system.

In order to implement these standards, the Academic Senate has established the disciplines list process, which allows colleges to bring forward local suggestions for additions to or revision of the minimum qualifications for faculty disciplines. In addition, the disciplines list is always understood to contain minimum qualifications, meaning that any community college district can set a higher standard if it finds more rigid qualifications to be appropriate. Finally, through the equivalency process allowed in §87359 local districts are able to determine for themselves the processes and requirements through which minimum qualifications will be met. In these ways the system is able to maintain minimum standards for faculty qualifications at the state level while still leaving the final decisions regarding local standards and ways in which applicants can meet them to processes established at the local level.

THE BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PILOT

A recent instance in which issues of local control and statewide standards have arisen regards the community college baccalaureate degree pilot. Fifteen colleges were chosen to participate in this pilot, each having developed its own vision and plan for implementing its degree. The Academic Senate has been tasked by the Chancellor's Office to lead discussions of academic standards and parameters for these new degrees and has formed a representative task force to work with the pilot colleges and other stakeholders to develop requirements for general education and faculty minimum qualifications.

The colleges involved in the pilot are serving different communities and creating degrees for different disciplines, and therefore no single structure or plan are likely to serve all needs. Furthermore, the concept of a pilot is to allow experimentation and exploration, not to restrict options. For these reasons, the pilot colleges rightly expect to be able to develop their degrees in ways that they feel best suit the needs of their students and their programs, not to be forced to conform to one specific template.

On the other hand, the purpose of the pilot is to prepare the way for other colleges to develop and offer bachelor's degrees in the future. Already rumblings exist regarding the expansion

> In order to implement these standards, the Academic Senate has established the disciplines list process, which allows colleges to bring forward local suggestions for additions to or revision of the minimum qualifications for faculty disciplines.

of the program. For this reason, the details of the pilot implementation will impact more than just the pilot colleges, and every college in the system has a stake in how the degrees develop and are perceived. Although the degrees will be granted by individual colleges, they will be representative of the community college system as a whole, and thus all of our institutions have an interest in ensuring the quality, integrity, and viability of the degrees. The parameters and standards for the degrees are therefore more than just a local issue and some level of statewide consistency and oversight is needed.

Balancing these competing but legitimate perspectives is at times a difficult task. The key will be to set parameters that ensure the integrity and quality of the degrees while leaving the pilot colleges as much freedom as possible to experiment within those parameters. This challenge is what the Chancellor's Office and the ASCCC Bachelor's Degree Task Force must address.

TASK FORCE ON WORKFORCE, JOB CREATION, AND A STRONG ECONOMY

The Board of Governors' Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy, also known as the Workforce Task Force, is another recent example of the tension between local control and statewide interests. Throughout the task force meetings between January and July, recommendations were proposed that would have granted greater oversight and control at either the state or regional level. These proposals involved topics from funding to curriculum to faculty qualifications and beyond.

Once again, all parties in these discussions have legitimate positions. California is a very large state, and its various regions do have differing economies and different needs. The concept of a regional approach to many issues is a logical way to address these matters. Furthermore, some issues can best be managed at the state level, such as funding streams that are granted by the state. As with the bachelor's degrees, a sense of state-level consistency and minimum

standards regarding curriculum and programs is also essential, thus requiring clear and efficient processes in the Chancellor's Office.

However, faculty representatives and other task force members frequently found themselves reminding the group that curriculum is and should be approved locally and that for a college to plan and manage the overall resources of the institution and its instructional program, it cannot have select programs directed or developed by regional consortia or other external interests. The same issues arose on topics such as faculty qualifications: state level standards have been established, but local districts need to be able to work within those standards to employ quality faculty that will best benefit students.

On the whole, the members of the Workforce Task Force did an exceptional job of balancing local concerns with state and regional interests. However, the need to reconcile these perspectives will not disappear when the Board of Governors approves the final recommendations. The same issues will likely arise during efforts to implement the recommendations, and thus the same focus on appropriate balance will be necessary.

Local control has been and remains an important value of the ASCCC. The Academic Senate has fought for and will continue to fight for colleges' and districts' right to make their own decisions and manage their own resources as most fully benefits their students and communities. But in some instances state-level standards and requirements are necessary to ensure consistency and quality that will reflect positively on the system as a whole. What happens at one college can and often does impact other, both in perception and in actuality. The challenge is always to maintain reasonable overall standards and policies that benefit the system and the state while still allowing colleges the greatest possible flexibility. ✤

Faculty Primacy in Online Education

by Dolores Davison, ASCCC Online Education Committee Chair

and Fabiola Torres, OEI Steering Committee Chair and member of the ASCCC Online Education Committee

Online education in California is experiencing an exciting period, as the Online Education Initiative (OEI) is beginning to roll out its offerings to California community colleges. In August 2015 the student readiness modules were launched, allowing colleges to use free tools to measure students' preparation for the rigors of online classes. Common assessments and educational plans will also be connected to the OEI, bringing with them the promise of more support and services for students and faculty in online education. Perhaps no portion of the OEI is more anticipated than the arrival of a commonly available course management system, Canvas, which will be offered to campuses for no cost through the 2018-19 academic year. The colleges that are piloting Canvas will do so in the spring of 2016, with the system available to other colleges and more widely to the pilot colleges after that time.

While celebrating the forward thinking of the governor and the Chancellor's Office in supporting online education with the tools that have long been requested by faculty and administrators, faculty must also assert their primacy in the area of online education. AB 1725 (1988) and other legislation ensure the primacy of faculty in certain areas of governance, budget, accreditation, and other aspects of the 10 + 1. The most clearly defined of these areas is curriculum. Faculty primacy is clearly established in the area of curriculum, and while on occasion some administrator may wish to subvert that primacy—

and occasionally some faculty may wish to give it up—most administrators and faculty in the California community colleges acknowledge that curriculum is an area of faculty control. This primacy extends over all aspects of curriculum in terms of development of courses, structuring of majors, grading, textbooks, and establishment of degree requirements.

However, curricular issues can become more muddled in discussions of online education. At many colleges, the distance education coordinator is not a faculty member and may be an administrator with no online experience. Additionally, online education is, for many colleges, a relatively new and relatively small portion of course offerings and in some cases might represent less than 5% of a college's offerings. Administrators might be unfamiliar with or worried about online education and seek to limit the number of courses or sections offered in the online environment. And faculty, particularly part-time faculty, may be unaware of their rights and responsibilities as faculty in terms of curricular development and delivery of classes. As such, faculty leaders on campuses must take actions to ensure that the primacy of faculty is being recognized.

An obvious example of this situation is what is happening as colleges decide whether or not to transition to Canvas as their chosen course management system or CMS. Some administrators may argue that, similar to a classroom, a CMS is a

facility, and, regardless of structure or problems, faculty will be expected to teach within its confines. This claim would be comparable to portable classrooms during times of construction, without air conditioning or multi media, where faculty still manage to teach classes despite lacking items that would be considered the norm on campus. In some ways, the course management system is a facility; however, for faculty who teach online, that facility must possess certain functionalities that would preclude faculty teaching effectively were those functions not present. In much the same way that a chemistry lab must have certain elements in place in order for experiments to be conducted, an online course management system must have elements in place for the course to be conducted effectively. If administrators, especially administrators who have no experience teaching online, are making decisions regarding a course management system in a vacuum, faculty may find themselves saddled with a system that prevents them from effectively teaching their students. For these reasons, online faculty must be involved in any discussions regarding adoption of a course management system, whether that system is Canvas or another CMS.

Another issue with faculty primacy regarding online courses involves scheduling. For many administrators, online courses are a "cash cow"; they require no or very little in person classroom space, and as such they appear to be easy moneymakers because they can be scheduled without taking into account factors such as other classes, the need for a classroom, overhead costs. In addition, some administrators feel that online course faculty do not require special training, so anyone can be assigned an online class, often with very little time before the class is scheduled to begin, and told to teach it. Part-time faculty are particularly vulnerable to this issue, as turning down an assignment can have consequences for adjuncts that do not exist for full-time faculty, including the possible loss of reemployment preference or other preferred status. Without adequate training and support, faculty teaching online may not possess the skills needed to successfully navigate the issues in an online class and therefore may not provide the students in the course with the educational experience they require.

At some universities, courses have been created with no, or limited, faculty input and then assigned to an instructor of record who has had very little if any involvement in the development of the course. The faculty member becomes responsible for grading pre-created exams and perhaps involved in discussions or in answering questions but otherwise has had no particular role in the creation of the course itself. This situation is not far from the use of publisher course packs as classes, where faculty members create no original content and instead rely entirely on the materials provided by the publishers to teach the course. Although course packs often contain materials and tools that are not otherwise available, they should be used along with the instructor of record's own materials, such as discussion topics and exams. Both of these models, pre-created courses and reliance exclusively on publisher course packs, are not models that faculty would encourage for use in a face-to-face classroom, and as such their use in online courses should be discouraged.

Ultimately, as with face-to-face courses, the content of the course should belong to the instructor of record and should be determined primarily by that individual. Faculty members teaching online courses should be regarded no differently; their courses should be their own, and the construction and content of those courses should be left to the primacy of the faculty, not to administrators or others who seek to increase the revenue of the college through the creation of pre-packaged courses or demand that faculty teach online classes when they are not prepared to do so. Administrators and curriculum committees have an obligation to ensure that the courses being taught match the course outline of record and provide sufficient rigor and other requirements for online courses, but the faculty who teach the courses should be responsible for the curriculum of these classes as they are in face-to-face courses. Online education is an important component in the future of the California community colleges, but it must be treated as an educational component rather than simply a revenue source. ◀

LGBT Campus Climate Survey—An Eye-Opening Experience

by Rhonda Findling, EOPS Counselor, Santa Rosa Junior College

With the recent historic Supreme Court decision on gay marriage rights, LGBTQ college students are living in exciting times with hopes of futures endowed with equal rights. In order to ensure that college campuses are providing students with equal educational opportunities through a safe, welcoming, and inclusive college experience, colleges must take the LGBT Campus Climate Survey, a nationally-recognized assessment tool for assisting campuses in improving their environments for LGBTQ students.

In April 2014, a representative team of six LGBT staff at all constituent levels at Santa Rosa Junior College (SRJC) came together to take part in the Campus Climate Survey. We were told that the survey was being encouraged by the State Academic Senate. Most of us at SRJC saw no reason to be concerned that our campus was not a welcoming place for LGBTQ students. We live in an area of California that has a relatively large percentage of LGBTQ individuals and families and a county that is considered mostly liberal. For years, we

> With the recent historic Supreme Court decision on gay marriage rights, LGBTQ college students are living in exciting times with hopes of futures endowed with equal rights.

have had an LGBTQ staff association—GALEAF, Gay and Lesbian Employees and Friends—to advocate for LGBT-related issues.

The LGBT Campus Climate survey questions required input from managers in areas such as Human Resources, District Police, Admissions and Records, and Student Health Services. When Campus Pride, the operators of the survey, sent us our results in a report, we were stunned by how poorly our district scored. The detailed report brought to light many deficiencies and areas in which we clearly could be performing much better for LGBT students and staff. In short, the LGBT Campus Climate report became a wake-up call that we were not, for the most part, a safe, inclusive, and welcoming campus for LGBTQ students.

As an example, the survey asked us whether our campus had gender-neutral bathrooms. We realized that on our main campus site, we had not a single one. Gender-neutral bathrooms are a safety issue not only for transgender individuals in transition but also for those whose gender expression and identity would place them on the gender continuum as neither male nor female but

somewhere in the middle. In fact, gender-neutral restrooms have become such an important issue for college campuses that the president of the UC system, Janet Napolitano, issued a mandate last year asking all UC-campuses to provide gender-neutral bathrooms.

The LGBT Campus-Climate survey is divided into eight different areas: LGBT Policy Inclusion, LGBT Support and Institutional Commitment, LGBT Academic Life, LGBT Student Life, LGBT Housing and Residence Life, LGBT Campus Safety, LGBT Counseling and Health, and LGBT Recruitment and Retention. The rating scale ranges from one to five stars, with five stars being the high or positive rating. SRJC received five stars in only one area—Counseling and Health—primarily because our Director of Student Health Services has done an excellent and deliberate job of making sure her staff is trained on LGBTQ health issues and that the special health care needs of LGBTQ students are incorporated into all health services.

We received only one star in three of the eight areas—Support and Institutional Commitment, Campus Safety, and Recruitment and Retention—as well as only 1.5 stars in LGBT Academic Life. Our campus was doing next to nothing to create a safe, inclusive, and welcoming environment for LGBTQ students, and we were very much in the dark about it.

Conversations with students added additional insight regarding these matters. Gender-queer and transgender students had encountered negative experiences both inside and outside the classroom and did not feel entirely safe on our campus sites. Some gay and lesbian students were victims of name-calling and bullying. Anti-gay stickers had even appeared in our student parking lots. But with no LGBT resource center, no staff person assigned to address LGBT issues,

no safe-space ally signs, no LGBT-sponsored campus events, no LGBT focused classes, no LGBT advisory committee, no LGBT outreach and recruitment, and no training or visibility from our district police on handling anti-LGBT incidences, our LGBTQ students had almost nowhere to take their concerns. One openly gay student confided that he had "repeatedly experienced discrimination" and felt our campus was "not a gay-friendly place." Thus, our overall score on the report was only two of five stars.

A year later, we have taken the results of the survey and moved into action mode. From the Campus Climate report, SRJC put together a list of 22 recommendations. By the end of Fall 2014, we had four gender-neutral bathrooms on our largest campus site, safe-space ally placards with an accompanying PowerPoint training, and a preferred name option for students on class rosters. District Superintendent-President Frank Chong also formed an LGBTQ-Presidential Advisory Committee to prioritize and address other recommendations.

By the end of Spring 2015, the college had approved our first LGBT-focused class—LGBT Arts and Literature (ENGL 36)—which will be offered in Fall 2015. Students from our LGBTQ club also asked for more visibility on our college homepage. Thus, in June 2015, our Public Relations department featured LGBT pride month front-and-center on our homepage, including an in-depth interview of one of our lesbian faculty members, and Dr. Chong wrote a supportive LGBT blog linked to the homepage as well.

Because the Campus Climate Survey can yield such useful information and positive results, all campuses that have not already done so, should contact Campus Pride (*www.campuspride.org*) and request to take the survey. At the time of this

> Gender-queer and transgender students had encountered negative experiences both inside and outside the classroom and did not feel entirely safe on our campus sites.

writing, only 10 California Community Colleges have taken it, and only one college—Pomona College—received five stars. Only two others—Napa College and Sierra College—received four stars. Most of the others scored in close range to SRJC—two stars. Similar to the CCCs, only eight CSUs to date have completed the survey. The only CSU of the eight to earn five stars was San Diego State. CSU Northridge obtained 4.5 stars, and Long Beach and San Jose each received four stars. By contrast, all nine UC campuses have taken the survey and are also far ahead of the CCCs in how they scored. UC Berkeley, UCLA, UC Riverside, UCSB, and UCSC all received five stars. UC Irvine, and UCSD were close behind with 4.5 stars. UC Davis scored four stars.

Clearly, most public institutions of higher education in California have work to do if they want to be LGBTQ safe, welcoming, and inclusive. Another way to contextualize the situation and the problem is to look at the statistics produced by GLSEN—the Gay and Lesbian Straight Education Network—a nationally recognized resource for collecting data on school climate for LGBTQ students in the high school and middle school systems. The last GLSEN report published to date, in 2013, reveals that 55.5% of LGBT students felt unsafe at school because of their sexual orientation and 37.8% because of their gender expression. 71.4% heard "gay" used in a negative way, 74.1% were verbally harassed, 36.2% were physically harassed, and 49% were harassed via electronic devices. 61.6% of the students who reported an incident said that school staff did nothing in response. In their summary, GLSEN writes, "schools nationwide are hostile environments for a distressing number of LGBT students, the overwhelming majority of whom routinely hear anti-gay language and experience victimization and discrimination at school. As a result, many LGBT students avoid school activities or miss

school entirely." Nationally, LGBTQ youth are still at risk of suicide at three times the rate of straight youth.

According to Rebby Kern, the Media, Communications, and Program Manager at Campus Pride, the goal when taking the survey is not to try and earn five stars but to "use it as a benchmark of where you stand, create an action plan, and then to hold yourselves accountable to LGBT students. It's also an opportunity to create coalitions and task forces around these issues."

Kern reports that 430 public institutions of higher education nationwide participated in the first survey Index 1.0. On June 10, Campus Pride released a new version of the Survey, Index 2.0. Since the release of Index 2.0, 160 campuses have already taken the survey. According to Kern, the new version has the same eight categories, but Campus Pride has expanded the questions to be more in-depth, more comprehensive, and more "trans-inclusive." Kern encourages all campuses to take the survey every one to three years, since 80% of campuses achieve many of their goals and then see improved scores when they retake the survey.

As Santa Rosa Junior College President Chong indicated in his LGBTQ blog regarding the results of our Campus Climate survey, "I knew as a College we believed in fairness and social justice for LGBTQ students and employees. But beliefs are not enough: there must be action, visibility, and true institutional support." The LGBT Campus Climate Survey is an invaluable tool and resource for identifying areas of need in order to improve and change the educational experience for LGBTQ students into one that is positive, welcoming, supportive, and safe. Students' futures are not just about equal rights like marriage equality, but also about equal educational opportunity along the way.

> Clearly, most public institutions of higher education in California have work to do if they want to be LGBTQ safe, welcoming, and inclusive.

Big Wheels (of Accreditation) Keep on Turning:

An Update to the Field on ACCJC Activities

by Randy Beach, ASCCC Accreditation and Assessment Committee Chair

Since June, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges has met several times and made significant announcements in regards to accreditation.

ACCJC ARTICLE ON NEW STANDARDS; NEW PRACTICES

ACCJC's most recent newsletter, Spring/Summer 2015 Newsletter contains an article of interest to the field entitled "ACCREDITATION: NEW STANDARDS, NEW PRACTICES" and is available on the ACCJC website. This article highlights the major changes in the standards and the rationale for the changes.

REVISIONS TO ACCJC HANDBOOKS

Over the summer, ACCJC released newly revised versions of the *Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions,* and the *Accreditation Reference Handbook.* These guides are available on the ACCJC website.

CHANGES TO ACCJC POLICY, JUNE 2015

At its June 2015 meeting, the Commission considered and approved policy changes and a policy for first reading. A brief synopsis is provided below. The period for comment on the proposed change is open now until August 31, 2015. The full text of the proposed revisions can be read at the ACCJC website along with instructions for submitting comment.

Policy on Eligibility to Apply for Accredited Status

New policy: Provides information that has been contained in the Eligibility, Candidacy, and Initial Accreditation Manual, for reference by institutions seeking to begin the process for gaining accredited status.

Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions

Revised policy: Definitions related to sanction would align with those of other regional accreditors. New sections include a definitions section and a section on other commission actions.

Policy on Commission Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions

Revised policy: Updates references to current accreditation practice and to eliminate sections that were better covered in other policies. Remaining language was edited and reorganized to facilitate readability and clarity

Policy and Procedures for Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems

Revised policy: Eliminates procedural material and simplifies the policy statement concerning multi-college district or system reviews.

Policy on Closing an Institution

Revised policy: Clarifies that when voluntary or involuntary withdrawal of accreditation occurs at an institution, or is anticipated to occur, the need for a closure report and substantive change review may be triggered as related to the change in the nature of the constituency served.

Policy on Substantive Change

Revised policy: Clarifies that when voluntary or involuntary withdrawal of accreditation occurs at an institution, or is anticipated to occur, the need for a closure report and substantive change review may be triggered as related to the change in the nature of the constituency served.

Area of Emphasis Transfer Model Curricula:

Everything You Ever Wanted to Know About AoE TMCs

by Julie Bruno, Vice-president

and Michelle Pilati, C-ID Faculty Coordinator

Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla, 2010) resulted in faculty spending countless hours developing transfer model curricula (TMCs) at the state level and the corresponding associate degrees for transfer (ADTs) at the local level. Although much work was accomplished in the two years following the passage of SB 1440, the legislature adopted a followup bill, Senate Bill 440 (Padilla, 2013), to ensure progress continued on developing ADTs as well as establishing strong pathways to the California State Universities (CSU) for community college students. While the ASCCC had significant concerns with SB 440 as it was finally passed, as originally introduced the bill was much more problematic. Early versions of the bill not only created mandates requiring the development of ADTs but also specified the areas of emphasis (AoEs) that would be developed. In its final form, SB 440 mandates the development of AoE TMCs but leaves open the determination of what AoEs will be developed. As a result of this new mandate, the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW), the entity that makes curricular determinations regarding the implementation of SB 1440 and now SB 440, established a definition for what an AoE is in the context of ADTs, identified two AoEs to be developed, and convened the faculty to do this work.

SB 440 REQUIREMENTS: STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL

In addition to ADT development mandates, SB 440 required the development of four AoE TMCs. As stated in SB 440 and subsequently incorporated into Education Code 66746(b)(1)(D),

Before the commencement of the 2015-16 academic year, there shall be the development of at least two transfer model curricula in areas of emphasis and, before the commencement of the 2016-17 academic year, there shall be the development of at least two additional transfer model curricula in areas of emphasis.

Further, Education Code §66746(b)(1)(C) includes the requirements for the development of ADTs based on both majors and AoEs at the local level:

A community college shall create an associate degree for transfer in every major and area of emphasis offered by that college for any approved transfer model curriculum approved subsequent to the commencement of the 2013-14 academic year within 18 months of the approval of the transfer model curriculum.

Together, these legislative requirements drive the state level development of the AoE TMCs and, potentially, the local implementation of AoE ADTs. At the state level, the development of at least four AoE TMCs is required. However, the introduction of these TMCs may or may not lead to a local degree development mandate. Presently, the "offered by that college" component of Education Code §66746(b)(1)(C) has been operationalized using Taxonomy of Program Codes (TOP Codes); if a college has a degree in the TOP Code assigned to a TMC, then it has an ADT development obligation. In the event that a new TMC, AoE or major, is introduced and assigned a new TOP Code that previously did not exist and, therefore, is associated with no existing curricula, then no local ADT development is mandated.

AOE TMC DEFINITION AND DEVELOPMENT

While the term "area of emphasis" was added to Title 5 regulations to permit local development of degrees that were broader than a typical major, the ICW determined that a clear definition of the term in the context of ADTs was necessary. As ADTs direct students to take the appropriate coursework to prepare them for a specific pathway at the CSU, an AoE ADT necessarily would have to similarly direct student choices so that their transfer destination was at least somewhat prescribed. While many of the existing TMCs are interdisciplinary in nature and some may even effectively feed into multiple majors, none was intended to do so. To meet the conditions set forth in Education Code, ICW developed the following working definition of an area of emphasis: An area of emphasis is an interdisciplinary TMC that is developed to serve multiple majors at the CSU. Such a TMC may not have a clear department of origin at the CCC and would be designed to prepare the student for an array of majors at the CSU.

(The full policy is located on the C-ID website at *https://c-id.net/docs/policies/ICW_Working_Definition_of_Area_of_Emphasis.pdf*)

With this definition in mind, the ICW began by investigating disciplines that might be served by an AoE TMC. Besides adhering to the AoE working

definition, disciplines selected for AoE TMC development must have enough similarities in major preparation or such minimal preparation that one TMC could effectively prepare a student for various transfer disciplines as well as allow the CSU to deem the TMC similar to one or more CSU majors. If the TMC is deemed similar by a CSU, a student who completes the TMC-aligned ADT at a CCC must be able to complete the Bachelor's degree at the CSU in 60 units. Furthermore, the AoE TMC would encompass a number of disciplines that on their own may transfer small numbers of students per year but when combined may transfer over 100 students per year, thereby creating a viable pathway for students. The introduction of AoE TMCs will serve not only to increase the number of students transferring into the CSU destination majors but also to increase student pursuit of the involved majors at the CCC.

AOE TMCS: SOCIAL JUSTICE STUDIES AND GLOBAL STUDIES

In order to determine what AoE TMCs might be developed, the ICW reviewed the major preparation required at the CSU in numerous majors that were somehow related, potentially shared preparatory courses, and had low numbers of transfer students. At the end of this process, two potential AoE TMCs were identified, Discipline Input Groups (DIGs) were convened, and Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRGs) were appointed to develop a draft TMCs and descriptors. The AoE TMCs that are now named Social Justice Studies and Global Studies are currently in the final stages of development. The Social Justice Studies DIG included faculty from Ethnic, Women's, LGBT, Chicano, and African American Studies, and the Global Studies DIG included faculty from political science, history, and international studies.

The C-ID descriptors and TMCs associated with Social Justice Studies and Global Studies were vetted by faculty statewide from all involved disciplines with feedback and comments incorporated into the documents as appropriate. To reduce confusion in the field, new TOP Codes were established for both Social Justice Studies and Global Studies to clearly indicate that these AoE degrees are different from degrees previously identified locally as "area of emphasis" degrees. Additionally, no degrees are presently assigned to the new TOP Codes, colleges have no mandate to develop an ADT. If local faculty determine that these TMCs would permit them to create ADTs that are beneficial to students, then AoE ADTs will readily be developed even without the mandate to do so.

AOE TMC TO ADT: ONE-TO-MANY

Consistent with the idea of an AoE being broader than a major, local AoE ADT development is anticipated to operate differently from the development of traditional ADTs. At the local level, the AoE ADT may be more specialized than the TMC, with the college making course selections that narrow the scope of the courses students may take. In so doing, one TMC may be used to create multiple degrees at the CCC, and the college can have different options associated with one AoE.

For instance, a Social Justice Studies ADT as locally implemented may have a Women's Studies or a Latin American Studies focus. This idea of a TMC that permits discipline focus at the local level provides a demonstration of the "one-to-many" relationship that can exist between an AoE TMC and ADTs. The process begins with one TMC intended to serve multiple majors at the CSU and ends with one TMC potentially leading to multiple ADTs at the CCC. Examples of these different degrees were presented along with the Social Justice Studies TMC and can be viewed at *https://c-id.net/degreereview. html*.

NEXT STEPS

The SB 440 legislation requires the completion of two additional AoE TMCs by fall 2016. The Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup is continuing to investigate disciplines that potentially may be appropriate for Area of Emphasis degree development. The C-ID website (c-id.net) is the best place to obtain information and updates on the work of ICW and the C-ID System. The ASCCC will provide updates regarding this process as they become available.

Defining the CCC Baccalaureate Degree

by John Stanskas, ASCCC Secretary and Baccalaureate Degree Task Force Chair,

Michelle Grimes Hillman, former ASCCC South Representative, Baccalaureate Degree Task Force Vice-Chair

and Lynell R. Wiggins, Baccalaureate Degree Task Force member, Pasadena City College

On September 28, 2014, California Governor Jerry Brown signed SB 850 (Block, 2015) authorizing the Board of Governors of the California's Community Colleges (BOG), in consultation with representatives of the California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC), to establish a state-wide baccalaureate degree pilot program at no more than 15 California Community Colleges. By May 2015, the Board of Governor had selected 15 pilot college colleges which meeting weekly to help each other prepare the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) substantial change forms and to discuss a variety of issues with the Chancellor's Office.

In Fall 2014, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges passed two resolutions, 9.04 Faculty Inclusion in Development and Implementation of Community College Baccalaureate Degree and 09.05 General Education Patterns for Community College Baccalaureate Degrees. Resolution 9.04 directed that the ASCCC work with the Chancellor's Office and local senates to ensure that community college faculty are appropriately represented on all task forces and other bodies, including any local committees, involved with the development and implementation of the community college baccalaureate degree pilot program and that the ASCCC collaborate with the Chancellor's Office to establish parameters and standards for the California Community College Baccalaureate

Degree before any degree is approved by the Chancellor's Office. Resolution 9.05 recommended that we work with the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) to define the expectations for lower division and upper division general education coursework and communicate the expectations for transfer general education and non-transfer general education. This resolution also established the ASCCC position that any baccalaureate degree created in the California community colleges must include upper division general education requirements comparable with those offered by the California State University.

From the time that Governor Brown signed AB 850, the Chancellor's Office has consistently acknowledged that in areas that impact academic and professional matters, the ASCCC should take the leading role in establishing the parameters of the community college bachelor's degrees. Such areas include general education requirements at upper and lower division levels, definitions of upper division coursework, minimum qualifications for faculty, and required student services. The Academic Senate has embraced this responsibility and has been actively shaping discussions in these areas since the pilot colleges were selected.

PROGRESS TO DATE

Beginning in April 2015 the ASCCC formed a task force to work with the Chancellor's Office and the pilot colleges in setting parameters

for the degrees. This task force includes ASCCC Executive Committee members as well as faculty representatives from general education, basic skills, counseling, articulation, career technical education, and the pilot colleges and a Chancellor's Office representative. The task force presented at the CTE Leadership Institute in May 2015, the Bachelor's Degree Summit hosted by the Chancellor's office for pilot colleges in June 2015, and the ASCCC Curriculum Institute in July 2015 to gather feedback on baccalaureate degree programs and what offering a Baccalaureate degree means.

The ASCCC has also had communication with other public degree granting institutions at the system level. The CSU system is struggling with responses to the community college bachelor's degrees and has not yet been able to offer significant support to the conversations regarding the pilot program. The UC system has been more encouraging and is watching the progress of the pilot quite closely.

The task force has based its discussions on some foundational assumptions:

- Bachelor's degrees offered by the CCCs must be at least equivalent in breadth, rigor, and utility to bachelor's degrees offered by any other public college or university in the State of California;

- Bachelor's degrees offered by CCCs should serve as appropriate preparation for the workforce and for further educational goals; and

- CCC bachelor's degrees are not 'applied' bachelor's degrees. In other words, the degree is not intended to be a terminal degree but a stepping stone for students' educational goals.

Working from these assumptions, the task force discussed upper division coursework definition, upper division GE requirements, minimum qualifications, support services needed, and admission and articulation with universities.

Through these discussions and in consultation with the pilot colleges, the task force has moved closer to establishing parameters for the degrees. At a very broad level, the task force has concluded that a bachelor's degree should include a minimum 120

units, lower division sets a foundation for the field, and upper division should reflect more currency in the field of study than foundational lower division. More specifically, the task force has drafted the following parameters for consideration:

- Upper division units should require lower division knowledge and apply that knowledge as demonstrated measures of critical thinking through writing, oral communication, and computation. Critical thinking may encompass research elements and upper division requirements may include workforce training and an apprenticeship. A minimum 24 upper division semester units could require practicum or capstone projects. This recommendation if adopted would set a minimum threshold written into Title 5.

- Regarding lower-division general education requirements, the task force has recommended IGETC or CSU-GE Breadth required for lower division general education. Faculty throughout the state have expressed broad acceptance of this requirement to date.

- The task force has discussed a minimum of six required semester units from two different disciplines of upper division general education that broadens the worldview of the students and is dependent on lower division general education knowledge and reflects current issues or trends in the field as appropriate. One of these courses must have an emphasis in written communication, oral communication, or computation. The same rules used in the IGETC Standards document to fulfill areas of general education would apply. This recommendation if adopted would set a minimum threshold written into Title 5.

- The task force made recommendations regarding faculty minimum qualifications. The pilot disciplines are fields that generally do not fall on the master's degree list. Given that, the task force recommends the following:

  □ The instructor of record must have any Master's degree AND two years of experience in the field AND appropriate licensure.

OR

◦ Any Bachelor's degree AND 6 years of experience in the field AND appropriate licensure.

Higher standards may be implemented by local colleges or required by external programmatic accrediting bodies. The recommendation explicitly leaves off the usual ending of *or the equivalent.* The recommendations appear to have broad support thus far and would be written into the faculty qualifications guidelines as a minimum threshold.

- The task force discussed a possible recommendation to local colleges regarding eligibility requirements to begin bachelor's program:

  ◦ Year 1. Students in these programs must be college ready: eligible for freshman composition and college level mathematics and fulfilled local reading competency requirement.

  ◦ Year 3 might include the completion of IGETC or CSU GE-Breadth, local reading competency, and lower division discipline requirements with a minimum of 2.0 GPA.

The recommendations regarding this last bullet would be written in Title 5 as permissible limitations on enrollment, not required.

ONGOING CONVERSATIONS

One area that remains to be resolved regards the ASCCC position that the system should "ensure that the bachelor degrees being offered were not seen as applied degrees in the sense that they are considered terminal." With many CTE degrees offered by community colleges in other states, students are prepared for the workforce and are not expected to pursue many educational pursuits beyond this initial training. In addition, the concept of the applied degree at the associate level carries connotations that are similar to the use of the term "vocational," and the ASCCC hopes to avoid any connection to past stigmatization of the inherent occupational educational mission.

In describing the purpose of the baccalaureate degree in the California community colleges, the Chancellor's Office accurately noted the SB850 legislation that described the rationale for the 15 pilots. The bill would require participating community college districts to meet specified requirements, including but not limited to offering baccalaureate degree programs and program curricula not offered by the California State University or the University of California and in subject areas with unmet workforce needs, as specified:

SECTION 1.

The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) California needs to produce one million more baccalaureate degrees than the state currently produces to remain economically competitive in the coming decades.

(b) The 21st century workplace increasingly demands a higher level of education in applied fields.

(c) There is demand for education beyond the associate degree level in specific academic disciplines that is not currently being met by California's four-year public institutions.

Based on this language, the Chancellor's Office challenged the ASCCC's decision to not use the term applied and almost implied that the ASCCC was shying away from the inherent workforce implications. They then used Section 1 (b) above to draw a proportional relationship with the need for advanced education in applied fields and the use of the term Applied Baccalaureate Degrees.

Given the ASCCC position, the task force will urge caution with the language used so that pilot programs are not limited by past perceptions of vocational studies. Any student who earns a bachelor's degree in the California public education system should be considered to have achieved the equivalent of any other student with the same level of degree. No degree structure should be associated with a type of learning or instructional methodology the development of our pilot programs. The description of a program may consist of explanations of the value of applied learning and instruction in our degree programs, but the system should

work toward establishing these degrees within a dynamic new paradigm of what CTE is today and can be tomorrow, where a student earning a baccalaureate degree with a CTE major emphasis could consider graduate preparation in addition to workforce goals. For the benefit of our students, community colleges should create a baccalaureate degree program that considers the possibility of a future need for advanced educational preparation.

The other area of concern among approximately half of the pilot colleges is the use of IGETC or CSU GE Breadth as the lower division general education preparation for these degrees. Roughly half the pilot colleges created their proposal using their local associate degree patterns. However, the other half of the pilot colleges already uses the IGETC or CSU GE Breadth. Given that the system as a whole and the public already understand IGETC and the CSU GE Breadth, the system needs to consider this issue very carefully. With 113 colleges that might all eventually offer bachelor's degrees and the system needs to ensure that degrees created through the pilot program are recognized as equal to our other system partners. Further, our collective educational systems are increasingly pressured to move students through faster, to evaluate and often minimize expectations outside of major's preparation, and to waive requirements or award credit for prior knowledge. External forces often question the value of requirements outside of major preparation, and general education is viewed as an additional hoop impeding student progress.

Yet while employers rank technical knowledge seventh among the most important qualities in a new employee, according to the National Association of Colleges and Employers in their October 2013 survey[1], the following skills are also included in the top ten:

- Ability to work in a team structure
- Ability to make decisions and solve problems

---

1   http://www.naceweb.org/about-us/press/skills-qualities-employers-want.aspx

- Ability to plan, organize, and prioritize work
- Ability to verbally communicate with persons inside and outside the organization
- Ability to obtain and process information
- Ability to analyze quantitative data
- Proficiency with computer software programs
- Ability to create and/or edit written reports
- Ability to sell or influence others

This list demonstrates the value of general education: we teach all these skills in our curriculum. This situation offers an opportunity for a conversation about the value of general education and how that value should translate so that students, the public, and the legislature are able to directly see those linkages.

WHAT'S NEXT?

The ASCCC task force has plans for more conversations through October and will present a plan to the field by the Fall 2015 Plenary Session in November. At that time, all proposals will be voted on for approval by delegates to the plenary in order to establish the ASCCC's final recommendations regarding the parameters of the community college bachelor's degrees. The ASCCC will work with the Chancellor's Office to make any necessary Title 5 changes to accommodate new mission extension. The ASCCC will also continue to consider what support curriculum committees and college senates need in regard to creating these degrees.

While at this time decisions regarding the bachelor's degrees may seem to impact only the 15 pilot colleges, members of the legislature have explicitly stated that the purpose of this pilot is to prove that these degrees can be successful and then to expand the program accordingly. For this reason, faculty at all colleges in the system must remain informed regarding the pilot and help to shape the efforts of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to make sound and long-range decisions about these academic and professional matters.

Accessibility in Online Education

by Dolores Davison, ASCCC Online Education Committee Chair

and Laurie Vasquez, ASCCC Online Education Committee Member

Beginning in 1999, when the Chancellor's Office first created *The California Virtual Campus* to support development and delivery of online learning in California community colleges, community colleges have increasingly dedicated time and resources to online education. Now, in the 25th year of the Americans with Disabilities Act, community colleges have an obligation to grapple with challenges regarding ways to deliver an accessible classroom environment to all students, including students with disabilities.

Over the years Disabled Student Programs and Services professionals have tried to support students with disabilities in an online environment without the necessary tools, supporting policies and procedures, or local supports for training instructors in the online classroom. However, in the last few years the Office of Civil Rights has stepped in and taken a national scan of what providing an accessible environment means, who is responsible, steps to ensure compliance, and a close examination of the tools used to deliver instructional materials. In examining these issues, the Office of Civil Rights has discovered the following deficient areas:

- Inaccessible class assignments and materials on the learning management system

- Inaccessible live chat and discussion board functions in the learning management system

- Inaccessible documents that are scanned images on webpages and websites

- Inaccessible videos that are not captioned

- Lack of alternative text on all images

- Inaccessible course registration through a website

- Inaccessible student enrollment systems

All of these areas can impede or prevent the creation of an accessible environment for students, and colleges must therefore work to address these problems in order to truly offer full access to all.

In recent settlements with universities and community colleges across the country, a clear definition of "accessible" has been developed:

"Accessible" means a person with a disability is afforded the opportunity to acquire the same information, engage in the same interactions, and enjoy the same services as a person without a disability in an equally effective and equally integrated manner, with substantially equivalent ease of use. A person with a disability must be able to obtain the information as fully, equally, and independently as a person without a disability. Although this might not result in identical ease of use compared to that of persons without disabilities, it still must ensure equal opportunity to the educational benefits and opportunities afforded by the technology and equal treatment in the use of such technology.—Resolution Agreement—OCR Docket #15-13-6001

This definition emphasizes the need to allow students with disabilities to engage in all class activities and to access all course materials and resources to the same degree as students without disabilities. If colleges wish to create fully accessible educational environments for all, then such a definition must be the foundation of instructional design.

In the early years of online education, accessibility seemed very simple: the classes were predominantly if not entirely text based, and thus online classes were accessible to virtually all students. Students with vision impairments could access the text with screen readers. As technologies improved, the interface became more graphical and more tools became available for faculty to use. The needs for accessibility therefore changed. Unlike face-to-face classes, where accommodations such as note takers for students with visual impairments or interpreters for hearing impaired students are provided in the classroom, faculty in online classes frequently found themselves in the position of trying to identify accommodations for students without proper support or resources.

The results of this situation were, as one would expect, frustrating, and accommodations were difficult to provide in a timely manner. Faculty scrambled to figure out ways to make text more useful for screen readers or to caption videos that they had used for years in both their face-to-face and online classes. In many cases faculty were simply not able to provide accommodations and therefore could not use the technologies and resources they had discovered; the absence of close captioning, for example, doomed many videos that would have otherwise been a resource for students. The absence of assistance or accessibility solutions became a genuine reason for not teaching a course in as robust a manner as it could otherwise have been.

The Online Teaching Conference held in San Diego in June 2015 demonstrated that these issues are being addressed. A series of questions were asked of the audience as a way to determine what steps were being taken at their colleges to ensure the college's legal requirements were being met. The event revealed that progress has been made in many areas.

However, some of the concerns are yet to be addressed. Many online faculty are part-time, which can inhibit their ability to make use of the resources that exist at their colleges or in some cases to even be aware of what resources exist. And ultimately, many faculty are unaware of what needs to be done to make their courses accessible and ADA compliant.

Increased scrutiny from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges has made online accessibility an issue that must be addressed. Colleges must have policies on student authentication, regular and effective contact, and ADA compliance. In order to ensure true accessibility, colleges have to look at their local processes with additional support from the system. Some campus cultures may need to be tweaked in order to address accessibility. The discussion should begin at the top leadership tier. College Board policies and procedures should reflect the institution's commitment to accessibility. Those policies and procedures should have been reviewed by the local academic senate. Accessibility issues might also be addressed in the college's current educational master plan, distance education plan, district technology, student equity plan, and student success and support program plan. These planning documents should work in concert to support student success and outline areas of responsibility on the campus.

Colleges have a legal obligation and responsibility to ensure that courses being provided are accessible to all students, regardless of disability or issue. As such, colleges should have in place disability resource specialists or other professionals who can assist faculty in ensuring that their courses are ADA compliant. These individuals might be part of the Disability Resource Services Center, the Faculty Resource Centers, or under the direction of the distance education coordinator, dean, or other administrator who oversees online instruction. The support may even be under technology departments.

If a college does not have these individuals in place that can ensure compliance, then this issue becomes both pedagogical and legal. Faculty should have all available resources necessary to teach their classes, regardless of modality, and as such should have access to all necessary support through which to offer their courses. If that means closed captioning videos, providing screen reading software, or transcribing lectures

on podcasts, those services need to be available. For captioning the state funded DECT grant can be found at

https://www.canyons.edu/Offices/DistanceLearning/ Captioning/Pages/default.aspx

Faculty should also have regular access to professional development opportunities to learn about not only the services available but the types of materials that they can use in their online courses to make these services work even better for their students. For example, a faculty member might be more likely to construct his or her syllabus using Microsoft Word in order to better facilitate a student's ability to read the syllabus if the faculty member is aware that many of the extant screen reading software programs can read Microsoft Word documents but cannot easily read PDF files unless tagged for accessibility. Likewise, learning how to implement some basic accessibility skills, such as creating alt tags for images, might enable a faculty member to construct a text lecture with pictures in a manner that is more accessible to students who use screen readers. Ultimately, being familiar with what is required for an accessible course will help faculty ensure that their courses are compliant.

All colleges should review the 2011 Chancellor's Office Distance Education Accessibility Guidelines, found at *http://extranet.cccco.edu/ Portals/1/AA/DE/2011DistanceEducationAccessibil ityGuidelines%20FINAL.pdf.* College professional development committees should consider offering workshops on accessibility to allow faculty to become familiar with the requirements of accessibility and the types of resources that exist at the college.

The Online Education Initiative is working with pilot colleges in all phases to ensure that accessibility requirements are met and, when possible, exceeded. Ultimately, however, accessibility is the responsibility of the college's faculty, staff, and administration, and it is a responsibility that needs to be consciously addressed and supported at every college in the system. 🌶

UPCOMING SENATE PAPER ON EFFECTIVE ACCREDITATION PRACTICES

The Accreditation and Assessment Committee will present for approval at the Fall 2015 Plenary Session a paper on effective practices for maintaining accreditation and preparing for a visit by an accrediting team. The paper will be available for review beginning in September.

CITY COLLEGE SAN FRANCISCO

On July 8, 2015, The ACCJC held a special meeting to take a vote of the commissioners whether to uphold its decision in April 2013 to terminate City College of San Francisco's accreditation. This step was taken to comply with the San Francisco Superior Court's injunction which called for the Commission to reconsider the decision to terminate the college's accreditation. This step was put in place when CCSF opted to enforce the court ordered injunction while it remained in restoration status. The Commission vote to affirm the termination of CCSF's accreditation, which has no impact on CCSF's restoration status or the outcome of CCSF's next evaluation in spring 2016, when the college must be in compliance with the 2014 Standards.

CHANGE IN FACULTY COMMISSIONERS

At the June meeting, the Commission congratulated Professor Virginia May of Sacramento City College as she completed her term. The Commission announced the seating of Kevin Bontenbal of Cuesta College as a faculty Commissioner. Bontenbal will serve a three-year term beginning on July 1, 2015. 🌶

The Genie in the Bottle:
Disaggregation of Student Learning Outcomes Data

by Randy Beach, ASCCC Accreditation and Assessment Committee Chair

With the release of the revised ACCJC Standards in 2014, Standard I.B.6 has received a great deal of attention and prompted many discussions across the California Community College System, as well as an ASCCC resolution at the Spring 2015 Plenary (2.01 S15). This standard requires colleges to not only collect but also to disaggregate student learning outcomes (SLO) data, which is the practice of collecting an individual student's SLO data and linking his or her scores to student's demographic data, especially gender, ethnicity, and other metrics related to student equity and disproportionate impact. Colleges are required to then analyze SLO data for disproportionate impact among subpopulations and make program changes according to the results.

With this change, the idea of a genie in a bottle fits fairly well when discussing disaggregated data and student learning outcomes. The most famous version of the Persian folktale of Aladdin and the genie in the lamp is told in the *One Thousand and One Nights* in this way: After Aladdin discovers the lamp and releases the genie, the genie helps Aladdin to become wealthy and powerful, and even helps him to to marry the emperor's daughter Princess Badroulbadour, who was betrothed to another, and to build a grand palace. Other stories tell of genies, or the Jinn, whose intentions when released from the bottle are not benevolent but are very nefarious in the same vein as the "trickster" character in western literature. Even in the *One Thousand and One Nights* tale, a sorcerer tricks Aladdin's wife and steals the lamp only to command the genie to take away all the riches Aladdin has gained. Like in the tales, SLOs and disaggregation are fickle genies,

and this duplicity raises the question of whether SLO data disaggregation will be a good genie, a bad one, or something in between.

THE GOOD GENIE

A 2012 brief by the National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, an organization that provides technical assistance and training to 106 federally funded Safe Schools/Healthy Students in K-12, argues in favor of disaggregation. The brief points out that aggregate data masks inequities in success rates among subpopulations, leaving those struggling subpopulations unrecognized and on their own in terms of improving success rates. The brief also argues that disaggregation informs and provides data support for changes in how programs are implemented in order to support all students. These changes can take the form of specific policy changes, funding augmentations, and more surgically precise program improvements that take into account the diversity in the classroom.

Student Equity Planning through the Student Success and Support Act at its core relies on disaggregated data for planning improvements in student achievement for subpopulations. Taking that philosophy to the course-level and program-level learning outcome assessment is an extension of that effort, at the federal and state levels, to increase access, course completion, ESL and basic skills completion, degrees, certificates, and transfer for all colleges. Title 5 regulations require colleges to review and address disproportionate impact for Indians or Alaskan natives, Asians or Pacific Islanders, Blacks, Hispanics, Whites, men, women, and persons with disabilities (§54220(d)) and to develop specific goals or outcomes and

National Center Brief: The Importance of Disaggregating Student Data. National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, Safe Schools; Healthy Students. April 2012. Web. 10 Aug 2015.

actions to address inequities. Action plans for improvement then evolve through the program review process. Disaggregation advocates say meaningful conversation about disproportionate impact cannot happen without disaggregation of course-level learning outcomes.

THE BAD GENIE

Later in the story of Aladdin, an evil sorcerer tricks Aladdin's wife and takes the lamp. He uses the genie to take away from Aladdin the riches he attained with the genie's help. Similarly, we might ask whether SLO disaggregation, like the Jinn from Persian lore, also has a bad side or whether this particular genie can be used for mischief and mayhem in the wrong hands.

The concerns over the disaggregation genie are wide-ranging. Student privacy concerns are real and require very precise data reporting practices that must be collegially agreed upon by faculty, administrations, and researchers at each college and in keeping with FERPA regulations. When data are disaggregated for courses that only offer one section or are rarely offered at all, publicizing results with demographic information may allow students to be identifiable, especially for underrepresented minority students. Also, low sample sizes call into question the validity of the data collected in the first place. If only 20 Asian-American students are included in learning outcomes assessments out of 250 students total across two or three sections of a capstone course, that data may not really tell you anything significant about Asian students. Even if the data are longitudinal over several years, small sample sizes may not provide useful information.

We have to also remember that SLO assessment frequently raises controversy in any context. Some faculty bargaining units, which may already be resistant to SLO assessment, will certainly ask relevant questions about additional workload associated with this type of data entry that may reinforce the opinion of local unions that ACCJC is imposing standards without deference to bargaining agreements. Local senates should approach the way they respond to this standard with their bargaining unit partners as part of the conversation, in the same way they would be involved in any discussion related to district policy or practice intended to address accreditation standards.

THE GENIE IS OUT AND HE'S NOT GOING BACK IN

SLO assessment is here to stay, and the ASCCC has made statements regarding compliance with SLOs in the last decade. For better or worse, this genie is not going away.

In order to use the genie for good while acknowledging the arguments for and against, colleges should begin disaggregation data conversations slowly and in measured steps:

- Pick one course in a program, maybe the course with the most sections, and ask faculty in those sections to collect and input disaggregated data into their database systems.

- Review less controversial data attributes in reporting. For example, look at sections taught in the evening versus sections taught during the day, sections taught online versus sections taught on ground, or sections taught at a central campus versus at an education center or remote site. Such a beginning may be a way to get start the process while keeping in mind the requirement in the ACCJC Standards that data on subpopulations must be disaggregated by the time of your college's next self-evaluation report to be in compliance, beginning Spring 2016.

- Look to Student Equity funding. If issues of workload are impeding the conversation over disaggregation, look to Student Equity funding as potential seed money to build an infrastructure where disaggregation is not a hardship or burden for faculty.

SO, HOW DOES THE STORY END?

One cannot predict at this time how this story will end because it is just beginning. As more colleges begin adopting and revising processes in order to comply with the new standards in Spring 2016, questions over SLOs in general and disaggregation specifically will begin making their way to meeting rooms across the state. Community colleges throughout California must begin discussions of how they will address the SLO disaggregation requirement and consider the various implications of this practice regarding workload, student privacy, data relevance, and other issues in order to ensure that the ACCJC's requirement turns into a good genie that can grant positive results for colleges and students. ✐

Faculty Recognition:

Acknowledging Your Own Faculty Is Part of Professional Development

by Julie Adams, Executive Director

and John Stanskas, Secretary, Standards and Practices Committee Chair

Everyone likes to be acknowledged for his or her work, and recognizing what we do well is an important part of motivating all faculty. However, in today's climate of competing priorities, faculty leaders can easily neglect to recognize our colleagues who are doing amazing work. The ASCCC is committed to helping local senates uphold this pillar of professional development and recognize their faculty statewide.

Each year the ASCCC offers three awards:

- one to recognize exemplary college programs;

- one to acknowledge outstanding community college faculty who have a track record of excellence both in teaching and in professional activities and have demonstrated commitment to their students, profession, and college; and

- one to honor faculty who have made outstanding contributions that positively impact diverse populations of students.

Recognizing faculty and programs is not the only reason the local senate should consider nominating a program or faculty from their college. The ASCCC awards offer an opportunity to share the good work of faculty with the Board of Governors and colleagues statewide through presentations and press releases. Two of the three awards are presented before the Board of Governors: the Exemplary and the Hayward Awards recipients are provided with an opportunity to share their programs and faculty accomplishments with the Board. College faculty rarely receive opportunities

to provide the Board of Governors with information about local programs and faculty accomplishments. These awards allow colleges to promote their programs or faculty and to show the faculty how much they are appreciated.

BUT WE DO NOT HAVE TIME TO COMPLETE THE APPLICATION PROCESS.

In the past, senate leaders and faculty have mentioned that the applications timeline does not allow for the development of the application for each award. For this reason, the applications for the three awards are now available on the ASCCC website. If the local senate starts its process early, the deadlines are not a barrier. However, an easier way to complete the application process might involve delegating the identification of programs or faculty and the development of the application to an individual or group.

At the Spring 2015 Plenary Session, the delegates passed Resolution 12.01, Faculty Recognition. Authored by members of the ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee, this resolution recognizes the importance of acknowledging faculty exemplary work while also understanding the workload for local senates. The resolution recommends that local senates form an awards committee or appoint individuals to ensure that faculty from their college have the opportunity to be recognized for their work. For example, Santa Barbara City College established a Faculty Recognition Committee for the purpose of "identifying potential opportunities to acknowledge faculty excellence in performing their job responsibilities

and participating in campus leadership."[2] Resolution 12.01 S15 further recommended that local senates establish processes for nominating and submitting applications in a manner that aligns with the ASCCC timelines for each award.

We have submitted applications in the past but they were unsuccessful.

At the 2015 Faculty Leadership Institute, a breakout was held that shared with attendees key points to consider when developing an ASCCC award applications. Some of the tips that were shared in the breakout were as follows:

- Exemplary Awards:
  - Distinguish your program from other programs (i.e., many colleges have a high school bridge program: how is your program different from all the rest?);
  - Rubrics: Pay attention to the rubric. The readers use the rubrics to rank the applications.
  - Provide data: the rubrics included with the awards provide detailed information about the type of data needed. Provide tables, graphics, real numbers that supports the application. For example, do not just say, "Early data demonstrate an increase in enrollment" without providing how that was determined. Was it a 20% increase? What are the numbers to support the 20%?

- Hayward Award:
  - Provide as much information as possible to describe the faculty contributions, commitment, accomplishments, and community engagement. Ensure that the information is detailed and concise while remaining within 200 words per prompt.
  - Be mindful of the rubric. Again, this is your guide and the only criteria the readers will use.
- Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award:
  - Demonstrate the faculty members' commitment to diversity. Follow the rubric.

---

2   Hanna, K. (March 2009) Fishing in the Academic Senate's McElligot Pool. ASCCC *Rostrum. http://www.asccc.org/content/fishing-academic-senates-mcelligot-pool*

- Provide direct and demonstrated evidence—both observable and measureable—in the form of qualitative and quantitative data.

- Provide detailed examples.

The rubrics are the guide for applicants and the measuring tool for the application readers. Successful applications provide as much detail and data as possible without relying on the readers' interpretation. Rather than expecting readers to grasp indirect implications, give them the information as directly and specifically as possible.

APPLICATION INFORMATION

- Calls for the Exemplary Award go out the first week in October, are returned by second week in December, and are recognized by the Board of Governors at their January meeting. Up to two programs will be awarded a cash prize of $4,000 each. The theme for this year's Exemplary Award is "Contextualized Teaching and Learning."

- Calls for the Hayward Award go out the first week in November, are returned by the last week in December, and are recognized by the Board of Governors at their March meeting. One part-time faculty member from Areas A and D and one full-time faculty member from B and C will be recognized and be awarded a cash prize of $1,250 each.

- Calls for the Regina Stanback-Stroud Diversity award go out the first week of December, are returned the second week in February, and are recognized at the ASCCC Spring Plenary Session. One faculty member will be awarded a cash prize of $5,000.

Sadly, last year the ASCCC did not receive enough applications to present the Hayward Award to full-time faculty or the Stanback-Stroud Award on diversity. We hope that this article provides information about how local senates can create a process for nominating faculty and exemplary programs for statewide recognition. Please visit the ASCCC website for the call for awards, applications, rubrics, and other information about the ASCCC awards as well as a few examples of successful applications (*http://www.asccc.org/awards*).

If you have any questions, please contact us at *info@asccc.org.*