Senate Rostrum

Asserting the Academic Senate's Voice:

The Importance of Relationships and Education

BY JULIE BRUNO, ASCCC PRESIDENT

Effective Practices for Student Engagement p3

Who Gets to Teach That Course? p8

Asserting the Academic Senate's Voice:
The Importance of Relationships and Education

by Julie Bruno, ASCCC President

In the May issue of the Rostrum, President David Morse and I wrote an article providing a progress report on the work of the Academic Senate, specifically focusing on a number of the goals outlined in the 2015-2018 ASCCC Strategic Plan. In reflecting on the past two years, we discussed the benefits of the organization's commitment to establishing collegial and collaborative relationships with system and external partners as well as the value of these relationships as the Academic Senate advances the interests of the faculty in statewide initiatives, projects, and discourse. This fall, the ASCCC Executive Committee will be evaluating the progress made on the goals and actions of the Strategic Plan. As we prepare for that discussion, the first goal of the Strategic Plan, to "assert the faculty voice and leadership in local, state, and national policy," continues to be critical, especially in light of summer events.

THE ACADEMIC SENATE, EDUCATIONAL POLICY, AND DEALING WITH MISPERCEPTIONS

In the past two years, the ASCCC Executive Committee has established key relationships with legislators and their aides as well as staff members in a number of government branches such as the Governor's Office, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and the Department of Finance. Overwhelmingly, our experience in working with our colleagues at the Capitol has been positive and encouraging. During our inaugural ASCCC Legislative and Advocacy Day in May 2016, we visited numerous legislators and aides, some of whom we had never contacted in the past, and were warmly welcomed. Most of the people we spoke with were interested in learning more about our organization and the work we do on behalf of students and faculty. However, we did experience a few less than heartening experiences with individuals who had preconceived notions and, in come cases, biases against faculty. These events served as a reminder that we must increase our efforts in developing productive relationships with members of the legislature.

The importance of connecting with and educating the legislature was demonstrated at a Senate Education Committee hearing in Early June. Approximately 30 bills were on the agenda, and the Academic Senate had a keen interest in one in particular, AB 1985 (Williams, 2016) on Advanced Placement Credit, since the legislation would, in part, interfere with faculty purview in setting academic standards by eliminating the ability for faculty to set the academic credit score for advanced placement tests in general education courses at their colleges. During the hearing, amendments were offered that removed most of the problematic language, which was extremely helpful, but an equally significant aspect of the discussion was how the testimony of the individuals speaking in support of the bill reflected a lack of understanding of the role of faculty in setting academic standards for students as well as the Academic Senate's responsibility to provide recommendations, advice, and consultation to local senates, the Board of Governors, and the Chancellor's Office in academic and professional matters.

In comments to the committee, individuals providing support for the bill criticized the community college system for not having a systemwide policy on AP credit, called out colleges that had AP policies requiring scores of 4 or 5 in awarding AP credit for general education courses when a score of 3 is generally accepted by CSU and UC, and censured the Academic Senate for being aware of the need for an AP credit policy for at least eight years but not acting to implement both a systemwide policy and policies at individual colleges.

Certainly the supporters of the legislation have good intentions and believe they are acting to guarantee students receive credit for completed coursework. Of course, the Academic Senate shares their interest, as evidenced by the number of resolutions and policies we have developed to support student success. Further, their comments may act as reminders for faculty to review their colleges' AP credit policies to

ensure that their policies do not create impediments that deter students from receiving credit for coursework they have completed. The proposed legislation should remind colleges that policies need to be reviewed and revised as the needs of our students change and the educational environment evolves. All of these things are positive aspects that arose from the AB 1985 discussions.

However, the criticism directed at the Academic Senate, and by association faculty in general, is more troubling. Evidence offered in support of the legislation included references to two resolutions: Resolution 04.04 Spring 2008 CCC GE Advance Placement (AP) Equivalency and Resolution 04.01 Spring 2009 Adopt and Publicize California Community College General Education Advance Placement (CCC GE) List and Template. Both resolutions articulate the Academic Senate's support of awarding AP credit for students and urge local senates to develop and widely publish AP credit policies. The individuals testifying at the hearing were aware of the resolutions, but their comments indicated that they misunderstood the role of faculty, local senates, and the ASCCC in policy development and implementation at the state and local level.

The most striking aspect of the comments at the hearing was how little the legislators understood the role and function of the Academic Senate. This situation is not unusual. To anyone unacquainted to our governance system, why we do what we do and how we do it can seem complicated and perplexing. The Academic Senate is a deliberative organization that is directed by the resolutions adopted by its members. This deliberativeness is often seen as a barrier to change when in fact, if the Academic Senate is brought into a policy discussion early, we can act as a partner in collaboration for change and innovation. In carrying out resolutions, the Academic Senate works collaboratively with faculty, local senate presidents, administrative colleagues, and system partners. This process frequently means developing and assisting with the implementation of policies and effective practices that improve teaching and learning, assist students in reaching their educational goals, and change the community college system for the better. For the resolutions that urge local academic senates to act, implementation is incumbent upon local senates to carry out the directions of the resolutions, often by developing and implementing polices and effective practices, in collegial consultation with administrators, staff, and students.

When we are interacting with individuals who have experience with our system of higher education or have taken the time to learn about the role of faculty, local senates, and the ASCCC, engaging and explaining issues is less difficult. The challenge lies in developing relationships with those who are not familiar with our work and perhaps even misunderstand our role. Until we are able to come from a place of mutual understanding, misconceptions can act as a barrier to developing relationships, especially with those who may not be predisposed to respect the role of faculty in the higher education. The Academic Senate and faculty must continue to reach out, educate, and change perception.

ADDRESSING THE STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL ON FACULTY VOICE

The first goal set by the ASCCC's strategic plan states that we will "assert the faculty voice and leadership in local, state, and national policy." This statement is more than an aspiration; it is a foundational principal of the Academic Senate. The Strategic Plan contains strategies that will help us to achieve this goal. The ASCCC Executive Committee will continue to work on these strategies, including developing new relationships with legislators and their aides as well as maintain our existing relationships with individuals and organizations. Additionally, we will turn our attention this year to increasing efforts in educating others about how our organization functions and the good work we do, both at the local and state levels. We should not be known for just our governance role but also for our work in providing professional development, leadership training, teaching and learning forums, and equity and diversity activities as well as all our events and institutes.

To communicate our work to stakeholders and the public, the Executive Committee is implementing strategy 1.1C in our strategic plan: Develop a public relations plan to promote the visibility of the ASCCC. This plan will involve strengthening our communications, producing materials that publicize the work of faculty and the Academic Senate, and increasing our presence on social media.

The Academic Senate is in the third year of implementing our Strategic Plan, and the strategies we employ are moving us closer to achieving our goals. We must continue our efforts to benefit of our students, our colleges, and our communities.

Effective Practices for Student Engagement in the Online Environment

by Conan McKay, ASCCC Online Education Committee Chair

and Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, ASCCC At Large Representative, Online Education Committee Member

Faculty have primacy in designing and implementing content for their courses regardless of modality of instruction, whether traditional face-to-face classroom setting or online through a Learning Management System (LMS). In recent years, distance education in California Community Colleges has received more resources and attention than ever before. With the inception of the California Community Colleges Online Education Initiative (OEI), standards for online course design and professional development tools have been created, including a course design rubric. According to the OEI website, the "Rubric is intended to establish standards relating to course design, interaction and collaboration, assessment, learner support, and accessibility in order to ensure the provision of a high quality learning environment that promotes student success and conforms to existing regulations." The rubric has been well-received by colleges, and in November of 2015 the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) adopted a resolution urging local senates to establish course design standards for their colleges (Resolution 9.01 F15).

With the influx of tools to support course development, one might think that once a faculty member masters the design of the online course and checks for accessibility and compliance with Americans Disability Act, he or she only needs to upload content to ensure student success. Instead, the reality is that faculty need to engage online students in their learning and keep them engaged throughout the semester or quarter and thus usher them toward success. An abundance of research exists on student engagement as a significant factor regarding retention and success metrics. Fish, Wade & Wickersham (2009) and Hohnen & Murphy (2016) conclude that in order for learning to occur, whether online or on campus, students must be engaged.

According to the Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCCSE), student engagement can be measured through faculty-student interactions, active and collaborative learning experiences, and involvement in extra-curricular activities. Students who are engaged in these ways have greater indicators of student retention and success (CCCSE, 2015). These factors may be easier to address in a traditional face-to-face setting where the faculty and students are in the same room together; an online environment requires a greater effort to intentionally engage students in these ways. Weimer (2016) encourages faculty to create classroom questions that are engagement-focused rather than knowledge-focused. The premise is that an environment which promotes dialog and collaborative thinking encourages engagement. This principle can be applied to the online learning environment in the creation of online discussion boards that are engagement-focused rather than always content-driven.

Research in neuroscience posits that when students believe that a faculty member cares about them and when the faculty member offers positive feedback on their assignments and builds a sense of community within the virtual classroom, students will stay in the virtual class, engage in the material, and in turn press on to succeed (Hohnen & Murphy, 2016). The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Distance Education Report (2013) also reports that "the foundation of any quality instruction is the relationship between the instructor and the student." In order for

students to be engaged and receptive to learning, they need to feel respected, trusted, and valued. Student-teacher interaction as a best practice in a virtual environment boils down to effective communication. Not only is communication a fundamental tenet of effective practices, but a statutory requirement for "regular effective contact" between instructor and students is codified in §55204 of the California Education Code. The Distance Education Report further reported that 81.4% of faculty use email as their primary form of communication, while 78.8% of faculty cited discussion boards as their preferred method of communication. Although these forms of communication can be very effective, faculty must also be aware that as the student body changes, so do the methods that we use to communicate with students. An increasing number of students are using mobile smart phones as their primary interaction with technology. Faculty need to look beyond traditional tools of using email and discussion boards to interact with students and consider engaging students through the use of text messages, social media accounts, and other digital tools. Research further suggests the use of video teleconferencing for virtual office hours can strengthen connections between students and faculty and lead to greater persistence (Hohnen & Murphy, 2016).

Other effective practices include problem based learning (PBL) and contextualized learning. Contextualized learning occurs when faculty teach skills with direct reference to real world events and practices, developing relevant context which helps students recognize the value of material to their education and career completion (Perin, 2011). While college courses commonly employ some type of group work and PBL in traditional face-to-face classes, those activities are more difficult to translate to virtual classrooms. Both PBL and contextualized learning highlight the active rather than the passive, with students drawing on prior knowledge and lived experiences to build new connections. These practices facilitate not only engagement but ultimately students' mastery of material.

Although this list is by no means exhaustive, it does include some basic principles of what is considered best practices for faculty who have chosen to teach online. Student engagement, problem based learning, and contextualized learning are cornerstones of quality instruction. Faculty have a responsibility to ensure all courses being taught in an online environment have the same academic rigor as traditional, face-to-face courses. We must always consider how we are teaching and engaging students across modalities. Both we and our students will benefit if we work through local processes to insist on relevant professional development opportunities to remain current in effective instructional practices for online instruction.

REFERENCES:

Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2015). Engagement rising: A decade of CCSSE data shows improvements across the board. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Program in Higher Education Leadership. Retrieved from https://www.ccsse.org/docs/Engagement_Rising.pdf.

Fish, W., Wade, W. & Wickersham, L.E. (2009). Best practices for online instructors: Reminders. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 10(3), 2009, pp. 279–284.* Retrieved from https://learn.vccs.edu/bbcswebdav/institution/NVCC/ELI/TOTAL%20Project/Supplemental%20Files/fish%20-%20best%20practices%20for%20online%20instructors%20-%202009.pdf.

California Community Colleges. (2013). *Distance education report.* Sacramento, CA: General Services Printing Office. Retrieved from http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/reportsTB/REPORT_DistanceEducation2013_090313.pdf

Hohnen, B. & Murphy, T. (2016). The optimum context for learning: Drawing on neuroscience to inform best practice in the classroom. *Educational & Child Psychology*, 33 (1).

Online Education Initiative (2016). *Online Course Design Standards.* Retrieved from http://ccconlineed.org/faculty-resources/professional-development/online-course-design-standards/

Perin, D. (2011). Facilitating student learning through contextualization: A review of evidence. *Community College Review.*

Weimer, M. (2016). Six things faculty can do to promote student engagement. *Faculty Focus.* Retrieved from http://www.facultyfocus.com/

An Update On The Baccalaureate Pilot Program and ACCJC

by John Stanskas, ASCCC Vice President

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has been working for the last two years to support the pilot colleges implementing the CCC baccalaureate degrees authorized on September 28, 2014 when Governor Brown signed SB850 (Block, 2014) into law. Progress was documented two *Rostrum* articles from 2015, "Defining the CCC Bachelor's Degree[1]" and "Results of the Baccalaureate Degree Taskforce Survey to the Field[2]".

A series of resolutions passed by the delegates to the Fall 2015 ASCCC Plenary Session (F15 9.01, 9.02, 9.04, 9.05, 9.06, 10.01) set the minimum standards for baccalaureate degrees that we, as faculty, expect in the areas of defining upper division coursework, defining the number of upper division units required, expectations for general education, and minimum qualifications for faculty to teach upper division courses. The ASCCC then worked with the CCC Chancellor's Office to create *The Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program Handbook[3]*, which was approved by the Board of Governor's in March 2016. The handbook reflects the advice and judgment of the faculty in areas of program development, minimum qualifications, and student success.

REGIONAL ACCREDITATION CONCERNS

In January 2016, soon after a first reading by the Board of Governors made the *Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program Handbook* a public document, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) posted a draft policy on Accreditation of Baccalaureate Degrees[4]. The Chancellor's Office reached out to ACCJC in an attempt to reconcile the differences between the system's recommendations and those outlined in the draft policy. In March, after the second reading and adoption of the handbook by the Board of Governors, ACCJC issued a statement indicating they wished to work with representatives from the colleges[5] to receive input regarding accreditation processes. In that spirit, the pilot college chief executive officers, the Chancellor's Office, and the ASCCC all reached out together to improve ACCJC's draft policy. From March through June 2016, these combined system voices repeatedly requested a meeting, a dialog, or any rational

1   http://www.asccc.org/content/defining-ccc-baccalaureate-degree

2   http://www.asccc.org/search/node/bachelor%27s%20degree%20type%3Arostrum

3   http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2016_agendas/March/Attachment-2.7-Final-BA-Degree-Handbook.pdf

4   http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Policy_on_Accreditation_of_Baccalaureate_Degrees-1.pdf

5   http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Statement_of_the_ACCJC_re_BOG_Resolution_03_22_2016.pdf

exchange of ideas. Instead, ACCJC responded with a webinar that, while publicly posted, contains factual misinformation and does not include the comments submitted by participants during the webinar. CCC System representatives also took part in one phone meeting in late May, during which representatives from the ACCJC explained their policy and were unable to provide any documented rationale for their decisions. An ACCJC representative asserted that the policy is the direct result of conversations with the federal Department of Education, but no written documentation detailing this conversation or conclusions drawn from them was ever released. The system's representatives repeatedly pointed out that ACCJC's policy is the most proscriptive in the country and represents a level of rigidity and inflexibility not found by any other regional accreditor. In fact, some degree programs accredited under WASC-Senior (Western Association of Schools and Colleges) are not in compliance with the policy adopted by ACCJC. Unfortunately, the community college system's accrediting body continues to turn a deaf ear to the system and its leaders. ACCJC accredits 132 colleges; the California Community Colleges represent 113 of those, yet ACCJC remains unresponsive to the system's concerns.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CCC AND ACCJC POLICIES

ACCJC's policy and that adopted by the California Community College System contain several differences. The relevant aspects of the ACCJC policy are as follows:

1. ACCJC requires 40 semester units of upper division;

2. ACCJC requires 36 units of general education, of which at least 9 units must be of upper division general education;

3. ACCJC requires a master's degree to teach upper division. Specifically, the language states.

Specified Baccalaureate Degree Program Evaluation Criteria:

The qualifications for faculty teaching upper division courses in the baccalaureate degree include the requirement for a master's degree (or academic credentials at least one level higher than the baccalaureate degree) or doctoral degree, in an appropriate discipline.

In cases where no Master's degree is available for the field of study, the qualifications for faculty teaching upper division courses in the baccalaureate degree include a bachelor's degree in the discipline or closely related discipline, and a Master's degree in any discipline, and demonstrated industry work experience in the field for a minimum of six years, and commonly required industry-recognized certification or professional licensure.

The Commission may require some faculty in non-career technical education baccalaureate programs to have the recognized terminal degree in the field of study.

California community college faculty recommended and the system adopted a minimum of 24 units of upper division coursework and a general education pattern following IGETC or CSU-GE Breadth for lower division in addition to six units of upper division. In addition, the system recommendation was that the minimum qualification to teach upper division is a bachelor's degree and six years of experience working in the field for CTE programs that do not generally require a master's degree. The recommendations from the system were developed after nearly a year of research across the country and evaluating other regional accreditors' expectations and requirements. The flexibility built into the recommendations accounts for degrees that may be very heavy in lower division course work such as chemistry or dental hygiene, general education patterns that permit student movement throughout the system and to other systems, and standard expectations for faculty preparation in fields where no

master's degree program exists and industry expertise and experience are integral to a functional program.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

For the moment, the Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Office will strive to help pilot colleges offering the baccalaureate degree determine how to comply with both the ACCJC recommendations and those adopted by the Board of Governors. To that end, a meeting of faculty leaders and program implementers will take place in September at the Chancellor's Office.

In the longer view, the system is pursuing two tracks regarding accreditation. With the endorsement of the Board of Governors, the system's chief executive officers have created two separate task forces. The first task force, with Academic Senate participation, is working to improve the processes of our current accreditor, ACCJC, to better serve the colleges. The second task force is evaluating the system's options regarding regional accreditation that aligns the three systems of public higher education in California[6]. The difficulties with ACCJC regarding the baccalaureate degree policies are one more example of why faculty must support both task forces in their efforts to ensure that our institutions are able to meet the needs of their students and their communities.

---

6   http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ ExecutiveOffice/Board/2016_agendas/ March/Item-2.2-New-Model-of- Accreditation-FINAL.pdf

It's Time to Submit Disciplines List Revisions

Every two years an important process begins again: faculty can propose new disciplines or make revisions to those that exist. In March 2016, senate presidents were notified that proposed revisions to the Disciplines List could be submitted to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges 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 at http://www.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. As a reminder, these changes include the following:

*   Each proposal must be seconded by an academic senate from a different district than the initiating academic senate;

*   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 required paperwork must be submitted to the ASCCC Office and received by September 30, 2016. For assistance in completing a proposal, please contact the ASCCC Office at disciplineslist@asccc.org or the Standards and Practices Committee Chair at freitaje@lacitycollege.edu.

Who Gets to Teach That Course? The Importance of Assigning Courses to Disciplines

by John Freitas, ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee Chair

Assigning courses to disciplines is designated as an academic and professional matter under the purview of academic senates in Title 5 §53200(c): "(1) Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines." While the vast majority of courses at California community colleges were assigned to disciplines following the passage of AB 1725, changes to college curriculum and to the Disciplines List often necessitate the need for local senates to review the decisions they have made locally in this area. However, misconceptions often arise regarding what it means to assign courses to disciplines. Sometimes this process is confused with equivalency, and sometimes it is incorrectly perceived as being the same as granting single-course equivalency. Other times faculty and colleges are confused about what to do if no corresponding discipline for a course appears in the Disciplines List[7] and how to appropriately use the interdisciplinary studies option. It is important that local senates and curriculum committees understand these issues in order to make effective and appropriate decisions regarding the assignment of courses to disciplines.

In order to teach credit and noncredit courses at a California community college, faculty must meet the required minimum qualifications for the discipline or disciplines to which a course is assigned. Minimum qualifications for faculty are established and revised by the Board of Governors upon recommendation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Title 5 §53407 and §53410 require that faculty who teach credit courses must meet the minimum qualifications as stated in the Disciplines List, while for noncredit courses faculty must meet either the minimum qualifications in the Disciplines List or the noncredit minimum qualifications stated in Title 5 §53412.[8]

While minimum qualifications for disciplines are established at the state level, the assignment of courses to disciplines is locally determined and is primarily the responsibility of local academic

---

7 The Disciplines List is incorporated in the publication *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in the California Community Colleges* published by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. The Disciplines List is available at http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/2014MinuimumQualifications.pdf.

8 The noncredit minimum qualifications are also listed in the Disciplines List for convenience. However, changes to these minimum qualifications still require changes to Title 5 §53412 by the Board of Governors.

senates, with the specific work of assigning courses to disciplines typically delegated to curriculum committees. While the criteria for assigning courses to disciplines are locally determined, the ASCCC established the following principles in its paper *Qualifications for Faculty Service in the California Community Colleges*, which was adopted Spring 2004)[9]:

A college curriculum committee must be very careful to place courses in disciplines according to the preparation needed by the person who will be determined qualified to teach them. Curriculum committee members should remember that placing courses within disciplines is done to assure that the instructor qualified to teach those courses are [sic] likely to possess the appropriate preparation to teach them effectively. Curriculum committee members should resist the impulse to place courses in disciplines primarily to broaden the pool of those who may be considered qualified to teach those courses or to restrict the pool of potential instructors as a means of protecting the assignments of any faculty member or group of faculty who have traditionally taught such courses.

Thus, local senates have a responsibility to establish criteria that ensure that faculty assigned to teach a course will have the proper academic preparation needed to teach that course with the scope and rigor expected of all college instruction. The assignment of courses to disciplines for reasons other than proper academic preparation may result in students completing courses that inadequately prepare them for transfer or employment, loss of articulation, and accreditation sanctions.

Standard practice is to assign each course to a single discipline from the Disciplines List. This practice is preferred because it clearly demonstrates to the students, the public, accreditors, transfer institutions, and employers

that the courses are taught by faculty with appropriate academic preparation. An example of the differing applications of this process might involve a case in which a college decides to expand its curriculum to offer courses in geography, geology, and oceanography. As part of the curriculum approval process, the curriculum committee should recommend the disciplines to which those courses would be assigned. In the case of the geography courses, the assignment to a discipline is straightforward: geography is a discipline listed in the Disciplines List, and therefore the curriculum committee should assign the geography courses to the geography discipline. The decisions regarding the geology and oceanography classes are less obvious because the Disciplines List does not included specific listings for geology and oceanography. However, if one reads the Disciplines List carefully, one notices that the earth sciences discipline encompasses geology and oceanography:

Master's in geology, geophysics, earth sciences, meteorology, oceanography, or paleontology

OR

bachelor's in geology

AND

master's in geography, physics, or geochemistry

OR

the equivalent.

Based on the detail and listed degrees in the earth sciences description, the curriculum committee can logically conclude that courses in subjects such as geology and oceanography should logically be assigned to this discipline.

While standard practice involves assigning a course to a single discipline, colleges do have the option to assign a specific course to more than

---

9   *Qualifications for Faculty Service in the California Community Colleges* is available at http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/FacultyQuals_0.pdf

one discipline, and doing so may be appropriate provided that valid curricular reasons exist. For example, faculty in the African-American studies[10] and English departments at a college might propose to the curriculum committee that a course in African-American literature be assigned to both the African-American studies and English disciplines, given that a person with expertise in either discipline might legitimately be considered properly trained to teach the subject matter of the course. The curriculum committee must then critically review the proposal and consider possible unintended consequences and potential harm to students if the assignment to both disciplines is approved. If the African-American literature course is assigned to both the English and African-American studies disciplines, then any faculty member who meets the minimum qualifications for either discipline may teach the course, including an English faculty member with no background in African-American literature.

This situation can become especially problematic in climates that involve class cancellations or reductions in the work force and faculty seniority or bumping rights. The supervising administrator has the right of assignment of faculty to teach courses and is responsible for ensuring that the requirements of the local collective bargaining agreement regarding faculty teaching load, seniority, and part-time faculty rehiring rights are met. Thus, an unintended consequence of assigning the African-American literature course to both disciplines may be that an English faculty with no expertise in African-American literature is assigned to teach the course in lieu of a faculty member who has a master's degree in African-American studies and who is expert in African-

American literature. Such a decision might be perceived as a disservice to the students. Therefore, the assignment of courses to multiple disciplines should be done judiciously, and care must be taken to ensure that assignment of a course to multiple disciplines does not adversely affect the rigor of courses, is done for valid curricular reasons, and does not harm students.

A common misconception about assigning a specific course to multiple disciplines is that it is somehow the same as granting single course equivalency, but such is not the case. Assigning courses to disciplines is the means by which a district determines the specific minimum qualifications faculty must meet to teach each of its courses, and whereas equivalency involves the decision as to whether an individual person meets those qualifications. If the African-American literature course is assigned only to the African-American studies discipline, then only faculty who meet the African-American studies minimum qualifications can teach that course. If that same African-American literature course is instead assigned to both the African-American studies and English disciplines, then the faculty who teach that course must meet either the African-American studies or the English minimum qualifications. If a person who meets the English minimum qualifications is hired by the college to teach the African-American literature course, that person is not only qualified to teach that particular course but is also qualified to teach any course assigned to the English discipline. This situation does not constitute single course equivalency because the faculty member not only meets the minimum qualifications required to teach the African-American literature course but also meets the minimum qualifications to teach all of the other courses assigned to the English discipline.

Courses that are commonly assigned to multiple disciplines are those that do not have a corresponding discipline in the Disciplines List. For example, many colleges offer courses

---

10   The African-American Studies discipline was approved by the Board of Governors in 2015 for incorporation into the 2016 edition of *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in the California Community Colleges.* However, the 2016 edition has not yet been published.

in environmental science, and four-year institutions offer degrees in environmental science, yet the Disciplines List does not include a listing for an environmental science discipline. Therefore, the curriculum committee must assign environmental science courses to appropriate disciplines listed in the Disciplines List. For example, based on the content and objectives of the courses, a curriculum committee might decide to assign an environmental science – physical processes course to the chemistry and geology disciplines and to assign an environmental science – environmental biology course to the biological sciences and ecology disciplines. The drawback to this practice is that a person with a master's degree in environmental science would be prevented from teaching an environmental science course at that college unless he or she is granted equivalency to one of the disciplines to which that environmental science course is assigned. An alternative approach is for the curriculum committee to assign all of the environmental science courses to the Interdisciplinary Studies discipline. The minimum qualifications for interdisciplinary studies are as follows:

Master's in the Interdisciplinary area

OR

master's in one of the disciplines included in the interdisciplinary area and upper division or graduate course work in at least one other constituent discipline(s).

If environmental science is the interdisciplinary area in question, a person with a master's degree in environmental science is qualified to teach all of the environmental science courses offered by the college. The benefit to students is clear because the environmental science courses they take are taught by faculty with academic preparation in environmental science and who are thus subject matter experts in that discipline. The curriculum committee also needs to assign the environmental science courses to constituent disciplines from the Disciplines List. However, a person with a master's degree in one of those constituent disciplines still needs to have completed the requisite upper division or graduate coursework, as determined locally, in another one of the constituent disciplines in order to be qualified to teach the environmental sciences courses.

In summary, all courses must be assigned to a discipline in the Disciplines List. Education Code and Title 5 provide a fair amount of flexibility to local senates in recommending how courses are assigned to disciplines. In most cases courses are assigned to a single discipline, while in other cases it might be appropriate to assign courses to more than one discipline or to assign courses to interdisciplinary studies. Furthermore, as the Disciplines List is revised local senates should review the assignment of courses to disciplines as appropriate to ensure that students take courses that are taught by faculty with the appropriate academic preparation. In each case faculty leadership and professional expertise through local senates is critical for ensuring that assignment of courses to disciplines is done for sound curricular reasons so that students are enrolled in courses taught by qualified faculty with the academic preparation and knowledge necessary to allow the students to succeed not only in the courses offered at the college but also after transfer or joining the workforce.

Disenfranchised Students –
Where are We Now?

By Ginni May and Dolores Davison
Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Committee

Disenfranchised students make up a significant and increasing portion of the student populations on college campuses. These individuals are disadvantaged by a wide range of difficulties: some have learning disabilities but have not been tested because they are still waiting for an appointment, perhaps because they do not want to be labeled, they have no idea that they have a learning disability, or they do not know that services exist to help them. Others are in need of mental health services, are attempting to leave a gang affiliation, or are facing some other dilemma or impediment that interferes with their academic progress. In short, any student who is facing struggles for which assistance exists through established programs and services but does not qualify for or does not know how to access that assistance is disenfranchised. Faculty are in an excellent situation to help guide these students toward the assistance they need, but many faculty members are at a loss as to how to provide such support.

At its Fall 2014 Plenary Session, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges passed resolution 20.01 regarding the provision of services for disenfranchised students. The resolution called on the ASCCC to work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors to develop a plan to increase services for these students. During the spring of 2015, the ASCCC Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Committee (TASSC) began work to address this resolution.

A survey was drafted to determine how and if California community colleges are addressing the needs of disenfranchised students. While the survey was being developed, an article titled "Disenfranchised Students—Who are They?" was published in the February 2016 *Rostrum*. This article, written by members of TASSC, provided information to prepare the field and survey respondents with an overview defining the students in question and the issues they might face. The survey was then disseminated in Spring 2016 to a wide range of college constituents to provide information to TASSC about the types of services available for disenfranchised students at the colleges as well as how the colleges facilitate connecting such students with these services.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

In a breakout at the Spring 2016 Plenary Session, TASSC presented some preliminary results of the survey. Of the 113 community colleges in California, 53 submitted survey responses. While a single respondent answered the survey for some colleges, in other cases numerous individuals from an institution submitted replies. The responses came from a variety of college constituencies: counselors, senate presidents, chief instructional officers, chief student services officers, student services deans, counseling deans, and others such as EOPS faculty, directors or deans of student equity, and general faculty.

In an attempt to ensure that the definition of disenfranchised students was as inclusive as possible, the survey included the question, "Are there additional ways that you would define students who are disenfranchised other than the second whereas of the resolution?" The following are a few representative responses:

Mental health issues are expanding with students. Also, any student with "odd" behavior or who looks "odd" is being referred to campus police or student discipline. All faculty, staff and students are assuming all students with possible mental health issues are going to be active shooters. Students and staff are on edge.

DSP/LD students and corresponding support; Students who are economically challenged but who escape attention due to ineligibility for standard services such as BOG fee waivers; students who are unable to complete or persist due to lack of support to pass key courses in basic skills, especially mathematics where success rates across the state are so darn low—we need to intervene more effectively to provide these students with the education and the success they pay for.

"constant state of insecurity" seems to cover all disenfranchisement not listed earlier in the whereas. Former foster youth is a group that comes to mind, but they might be covered under the "constant state of insecurity" phrase.

In regard to homeless students, nearly 70% of the colleges that responded do not offer or assist with on or off campus housing. Of the colleges that indicated that they do offer some services for their homeless students, responses included the following:

Just stop gap kinds of things, like lunches and toiletries if they need them . . . through donations.

We try to help them engage with services in the community but no structured relationships.

Not outside the scope of what we offer all of our students: Student Health Clinic, Food Pantry, etc.

Other responses included brief narratives regarding the following situations:

Diminishing funds for the college's child-care program, which provided childcare for students in need as well as served as an educational program for their childhood development program;

Veteran specific mental health services;

LGBT centers;

Foster youth programs;

Services offered in silos – central access would allow more students to know what services exist and access them more easily.

What next?

The survey results demonstrate that many colleges are attempting to address the plethora of needs that exist among the California community college students, yet still more needs to be done both statewide and at the colleges in regard to disenfranchised students. These efforts must include a combined focus by the Chancellor's Office, the ASCCC, and other stakeholders to find funds to provide the services to disenfranchised students and informing the students about the services. With the February 2016 *Rostrum* article and the Survey on Disenfranchised Students completed, this year's TASSC will continue to move forward in addressing Resolution 20.01. A full analysis of the survey results and discussions with the Chancellor's Office are among the next steps to establish a plan for meeting the needs of disenfranchised students in the California community colleges.

REFERENCES

Resolution 20.01 F14—Developing a System Plan for Serving Disenfranchised Students; http://asccc.org/resolutions/developing-system-plan-serving-disenfranchised-students

February 2016 Rostrum Article: *Disenfranchised Students—Who Are They?* http://asccc.org/content/disenfranchised-students—who-are-they 🦟

Strong Workforce Funding: A $200M Infusion for CTE and the Academic Senate's Role

by Julie Bruno, ASCCC President

and John Stanskas, ASCCC Vice President

I n June 2016, Governor Brown signed SB 830, the budget trailer bill, establishing the Strong Workforce Program for the California Community Colleges that grants $200 million in ongoing funding to support and expand career technical education. This allocation will provide a welcome and much needed infusion of support for CTE and workforce programs at institutions around the state. The funding will be divided between direct distribution to colleges and regional support, and academic senates should play an important role in ensuring that the funding is used effectively and appropriately.

THE STRONG WORKFORCE PROGRAM FUNDING MODEL

Five percent of the $200 million will go to a college that will provide leadership for the program and coordination of the funds. Of the remaining funds, 40% will be distributed to the seven regions and 60% to districts. The disbursement to districts is based on the following formula:

YEAR 1:   1/3 Unemployment Rate

1/3 CTE FTES

1/3 Job Openings.

Thus, funding is based on the needs of the region, demonstrated by the unemployment rate and job openings, and the current full-time equivalent students (FTES) in programs coded as career technical education.

Starting in year two, Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) performance metrics[11] are included in the funding formula. A summary of those metrics can be found at. The formula for Year 2 and every year thereafter will be as follows:

YEAR 2+:   1/3 Unemployment Rate

1/3 CTE FTES

1/6 Job Openings

1/6 WIOA Metrics.

Sixty percent of the money distributed directly to districts is intended to address areas needing support as identified by the community college system to the legislature, including equipment, facilities, professional development, class size restrictions, the need for full-time faculty,

11 http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/portals/6/docs/SW/Strong%20Workforce%20Metrics.pdf

dynamic curriculum, and changes in response to labor market demand. To maintain the ability to collect apportionment, the standard Chancellor's Office recommendation is to fund up to 80% of the cost of, for example, a full-time faculty member with Strong Workforce money and the other 20% from general funds.

The 40% of the funding distributed to regions should take the form of visible support to the colleges in the region or be distributed to the colleges. An example of appropriate regional expenditures could include coordinated advisory committee meetings to ensure the colleges in the region are meeting the labor market needs or responding to an emerging labor market need. Funding could then be distributed to a college or a number of colleges that would develop programs to meet the emerging need. Each region has some freedom to decide how to utilize the 40% as long as the region adheres to the parameters established in the legislation and by the Chancellor's Office.

The Strong Workforce Program accountability measures are built into the funding model starting in the second year. In addition, the Scorecard and IEPI metrics will be used to evaluate the system's performance. Additional metrics are spelled out in legislation, including metrics that align with WIOA, such as employment rates and employment in the field of study.

THE LOCAL ACADEMIC SENATE'S ROLE IN IMPLEMENTING THE STRONG WORKFORCE PROGRAM

The academic senate's purview over educational program development, policies for faculty professional development, processes for program review, and processes for institutional planning and budget development is codified in Title 5.

Colleges and districts should have established policies and processes for institutional planning and budget development in addition to evaluating all programs, discontinuing or creating programs, and providing professional development. These processes should be flexible enough to accommodate the influx of additional dollars targeted to improving and expanding CTE programs. However, some colleges may need to incorporate the more focused elements of the Strong Workforce Program metrics into college processes to meet the requirements for funding.

The regional aspect may be new for some members of local academic senates. Interested faculty can find their own college's region and access the regional consortium's website through http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/ResourceMap.aspx. As the regional consortia meet and determine educational priorities and processes for allocating funding, local academic senates should have representatives in attendance and participating that can communicate the recommendations of the college to the consortium and provide reports to the senate regarding the outcomes of these meetings. This job may be assumed by the senate president or delegated to an individual such as the local senate's CTE liaison. In any case, faculty must involve themselves in the academic and professional matters discussed locally and regionally.

As the Strong Workforce Program is implemented regionally and locally, academic senates and CTE faculty will have even greater responsibility in ensuring that their colleges' governance processes support CTE programs. These efforts are critical to securing successful outcomes for students, colleges, industry, and communities.

CCC Assessment and CCCAssess:

Understanding the Assessment Approval Process

by Cheryl Aschenbach, Chancellor's Office Assessment Advisory Member

T he Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) is intended to increase student access to and success in California Community Colleges. Goals include ensuring that all students complete courses, persist to the next academic term, and ultimately achieve their desired educational outcomes with the assistance of admissions, orientation, assessment and testing, and student follow-up.

Assessment is an important part of the SSSP process, as improper placement can increase the number of remedial courses students are required to take prior to college level, increase student frustration, and increase overall costs of attending college. Conversely, proper placement can decrease the length of remediation or number of remedial courses required, decrease student frustration by ensuring students are placed at a level appropriate to their knowledge and skills, and increase the likelihood that students achieve their desired education outcomes.

As explained in the Chancellor's Office Assessment Q&A document published in March 2005, assessment is much more than testing: "According to Section 55502(c) of the Title 5 Regulations, assessment instruments, methods, and procedures 'include, but are not limited to, interviews, standardized tests, holistic scoring processes, attitude surveys, vocational or career aptitude and interest inventories, high school or college transcripts, specialized certificates or licenses, educational histories and other measures of performance.'" But while many

different methods and pieces of information can be used to place students into courses, assessment tests are common. Although placement can be done without a test, Title 5 §55521(a)(3) establishes that placement cannot be done with a test alone. Colleges typically use an approved assessment test in combination with other information to place students into courses. And, in order to receive Student Success and Support Program funding, colleges must use the common assessment instrument once it is available if an assessment test is used as part of a college's placement methods (Title 5, §55518).

By now faculty should be aware that a common assessment test (CCCAssess) is being developed. The Common Assessment Initiative (CAI) has been working for nearly three years to create a custom assessment system for the California Community Colleges. A May 2016 RP Group evaluation of CAI processes, led by Senior Researcher for the RP Group and lead evaluator for CAI Tim Nguyen, included a survey of individuals participating in the Common Assessment Initiative. According to Nguyen, the survey found that 94 percent of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the decision to custom-develop CCCAssess rather than adopt or modify an established testing instrument, and 91 percent were satisfied or very satisfied with the progress made in the past year to develop CCCAssess.

Title 5 §55522(a) states that "the Chancellor's Office shall establish and update, at least annually, a list of approved assessment tests for use in placing students in English, mathematics, or English as a

Second Language (ESL) courses." Any assessment test that a college uses for placing students into courses in these disciplines and others must be on the Chancellor's Office approved list. All assessments tests must be evaluated to ensure they minimize or eliminate cultural or linguistic bias, are valid, and are reliable.

While CCCAssess is a CCC-developed assessment test, it still must meet the standards that all second party publishers and local campus developers must meet to earn a place on the Chancellor's Office approved list of assessment tests. This process includes submission of a proposal to the Chancellor's Office with all required information as explained in the Chancellor's Office document *Standards, Policies, and Procedures for the Evaluation of Assessment Instruments Used in the California Community Colleges,* 4th edition (March 2001). The ultimate goal is to ensure that an assessment test is valid, meaning that it measures what it is intended to measure, does so consistently, and is free from bias.

Assessment test proposals are received by the Chancellor's Office and evaluated by the Assessment Workgroup, a sub-committee of the SSSP Advisory Committee. The workgroup consists of community college staff representing all groups responsible for assessment at colleges: administrators including representatives of CEOs, CIOs, and CSSOs, faculty including English, reading, ESL, mathematics, and counseling, assessment coordinator, SSSP coordinators, and researchers. The Assessment Workgroup meets biannually, usually mid-spring and mid-fall, to review and evaluate proposals and make a recommendation for one of three levels of approval or for disapproval. The workgroup is aided by psychometric consultants who do an initial review of proposals, submit a preliminary recommendation and request for clarifying information to Chancellor's Office and submitting colleges or publishers, produce a modified report based on clarifying information and any other supplemental material provided by submitters,

and then work alongside the workgroup to generate a final recommendation to the Chancellor's Office, which then notifies colleges and publishers.

Test submissions are evaluated on established standards for content validity, test bias, establishing and validating cut scores, disproportionate impact, and reliability. Submissions must include content-related descriptions of the test (e.g. test blueprint, information about item selection algorithm) and enough test items so local colleges can conduct a content alignment study between items and placement course prerequisites. Submissions must also include criterion or consequential validity evidence from at least three community colleges for probationary approval, at least four community colleges for provisional approval, and at least six community colleges for full approval, with a majority of the colleges supplying data being from California for any level of approval (2001 CCC Assessment Standards). A bias review panel and empirical study on disproportionate impact must be included to indicate fairness across all groups. Finally, reliability evidence must be provided using test-retest reliability methodology and reporting standard errors of measurement. Cut score validation and disproportionate impact are the responsibility of the college using the assessment, even in the case of publisher exams.

Depending on the information provided, the workgroup can make one of four recommendations:

- Full approval—submission meets standards in all areas.

- Provisional approval—submission meets most standards, including minimum required standards for validity and absence of bias.

- Probationary approval—submission meets the minimum required standards for validity and absence of bias.

- Disapproval—submission fails to meet the minimum required standards for validity and absence of bias.

Reviewing assessment test submissions is not an easy task, and the psychometric consultants as well as experienced assessment experts play a critical role in making certain that all workgroup members understand and apply the minimum standards as submissions are evaluated. Workgroup members often speak of the people at the center of it all – students – while reviewing and discussing submissions. Ultimately, the workgroup is responsible for ensuring that an approved assessment test does no harm to students by making sure tests are fair, reliable, and valid.

According to the CCCAssess Implementation Timeline, colleges are expecting to implement CCCAssess at pre-determined points between Fall 2016 and Fall 2018. Twelve of the colleges planning for Fall 2016 CCCAssess implementation were pilot colleges; the total number of colleges included in the Fall 2016 implementation was increased with the announcement that ACT's Compass would sunset effective November 30, 2016, at which point the total number of colleges implementing CCCAssess increased to 37, including pilot, sister, and Compass colleges. With 37 total colleges expecting to implement CCCAssess in Fall 2016, the stakes were high and the pressure was on CAI to launch an assessment test that would consistently and effectively produce placement recommendations that, when used in combination with other methods, appropriately place students into courses.

However, recent developments have led to the conclusion that CCCAssess will not be an approved assessment test for Fall 2016. Expansions and improvements were already planned beyond the initial rollout and approval, and some of those planned expansions are pieces critical for implementation. While the launch delay causes challenges for the 37 colleges planning on the test's availability in Fall 2016, those involved in the decisions are confident that the postponement will make CCCAssess a more robust product at approval and initial launch. The Common Assessment Initiative Steering Committee, management team, and workgroups are developing an assessment test that, once complete and approved by the Chancellor's Office and considered along with other CAI efforts, accomplishes multiple goals of the Board of Governors and California Legislature, including developing a common assessment test, reducing the cost of assessment, and reducing the need for re-assessment by increasing the portability. System stakeholders remain positive that CAI efforts will continue to increase the effectiveness and accuracy of placement for students assessing at or below college level, lower unnecessary remediation rates for California Community College students, increase the initial placement level for qualified students, increase awareness of the importance of placement tests and improved student preparation, assist colleges with efforts to improve local assessment and placement practices, and leverage multiple measures data and research to improve placement.

Progress has already been made on many of these CAI goals, and as system stakeholders faculty should recognize the multi-faceted efforts of CAI rather than focusing solely on the delay of CCCAssess as a Chancellor's Office approved assessment test. System stakeholders should also remember that the initial timeline for CCCAssess implementation only included twelve pilot colleges in Fall 2016. The development timeline was challenging, putting significant pressure on developers, and was then exacerbated further by an urgent need for an alternate assessment test due to the sunset of Compass. CAI is preparing to serve far more colleges with CCCAssess far earlier than planned, and while challenges still exist at the system and college levels, patience now will result in a stronger product for our students later.

In Memorium: Walter Mccallum

The ASCCC lost one of its former leaders when Walter Mccallum passed away on July 20, 2016

Mccallum was born in South Dakota on December 1, 1927 to parents whose highest level of education was eighth grade. At the urging of a high school teacher, he attended and graduated from UC Berkeley and later received his graduate degree in chemistry at Cornell University. After completing his studies, Mccallum took a position on a project in West Africa through US AID. However, his desire was to teach at a community college to help first generation students like himself, and he would be hired by Sierra College to teach chemistry while living in West Africa. Maccallum claimed that he was the first and only faculty member at Sierra who was ever hired without a live interview.

At Sierra College, Mccallum developed a project to create an energy efficiency comprehensive approach to not only save money but to help save the planet, one of the first of its kind at an institution of higher education in California. He was also recruited into faculty leadership positions and served as local academic senate president. He would later elected to the ASCCC Executive Committee and served as president of the ASCCC from 1975 to 1976.

Among Mccallum's accomplishments as ASCCC president were initiatives regarding accreditation and part-time faculty. Mccallum wanted to ensure that accreditation had a more comprehensive approach around quality and student success and insisted that an accreditation visiting team without faculty was not acceptable. He also helped to focus the Academic Senate on part-time faculty issues regarding quality and equity, for which he was later recognized by the California Assembly.

After his senate presidency, Mccallum returned to Sierra College and served for a time as an administrator, but eventually his love of teaching led him back to the classroom. He later retired and lived in Provence, France. He is survived by two children, Joy Mccallum Thym of Reno and Patrick Mccallum of Sacramento.

Mccallum passed on his legacy of faculty leadership and community college activism to his son Patrick, who would become executive director of the Faculty Association for California Community Colleges and in that position helped to negotiate key provisions in AB 1725 (1988) that gave academic senates the powers they have today. Patrick now runs a community college lobbying firm and a national higher education consulting firm. He is donating and collecting contributions to create the Walter Mccallum science room at Sierra College. For more information on making a contribution, contact Patrick at (916) 446-5058 or email him at Patrick@mccallumgroupinc.com.