Senate Rostrum

Disenfranchised Students
Who Are They?
page 13

also in this issue

A Commitment to Success for All:
Hiring Faculty to Serve the Needs of Our Diverse Students

by David Morse, President

Cleavon Smith, Equity and Diversity Action Committee Chair

Adrienne Foster, CCCCO EEO/Diversity Advisory Committee Representative

For many years, the diversity of the faculty has been a topic of discussion and concern in the California community colleges. Many researchers and others have noted the benefits of a more diverse faculty in terms of both the cultures of our institutions and, more importantly, student success[1]. Yet despite the many conversations that have taken place and the many calls for greater diversity in our hiring, little real progress has been made. According to data from the CCC Chancellor's Office, between 2005 and 2014, the percentage of non-whites among our student populations rose from approximately 54% to nearly 70%. In contrast, the percentage of non-whites among both full-time and part-time faculty rose only from the mid-twenties to around 30%.

This year community colleges in California have an unprecedented opportunity to move beyond conversations about faculty diversity and take real, concrete action. The California State Budget for 2015-16 included $62.3 million for the hiring of full-time faculty. This funding could bring more than a thousand new full-time, tenure-track faculty members to the system. With this unusual hiring boom, institutions should take the opportunity to engage in critical reflection on how to make real progress towards faculty diversity.

Any effort to increase faculty diversity must be thoughtful and coordinated. Many of our institutions have recruitment processes, hiring processes, and job descriptions that have existed for many years and that do not lend themselves toward inclusion or toward attracting more diverse candidates. With so many colleges hiring so many new faculty, the environment will now be far more competitive than ever before. Colleges and interview committees cannot take the unusual attitude that the candidates should be happy to receive an interview. The candidates will have choices, with the most sought after likely receiving multiple job offers. Instead, the colleges will need to sell themselves to the candidates and make themselves more desirable places to work in order to attract and retain the applicants that they most want to hire.

In order to make a more productive move from the long-standing conversations about faculty diversity to real, productive action, colleges that are considering revisions of their hiring processes would benefit from a change in emphasis. Many calls have been made to hire faculty who look more like our students or who more closely reflect the makeup of our student population, but a real solution that promotes student success is more complex. Simply looking like our students does not guarantee that an applicant understands the students, and neither looking like our students nor simply understanding them means one is dedicated to teaching our students or believes in the mission of our colleges. In addition, our system contains many examples of fine instructors who may not look like our students but who do an outstanding job of teaching them and understanding them. Rather than simply calling for hiring more diverse faculty, colleges should focus on hiring faculty who

---

can serve the needs of a diverse student body, who are committed to teaching and advocating on behalf of all of our students with a genuine and demonstrated understanding of their needs and capacity. The emphasis should not be on what the candidate looks like or where he or she comes from, but rather on what the candidate can do and wants to do for our students and on a sense of a cultural competence. If colleges adopt such an emphasis in their hiring practices, then in all likelihood those candidates who have closer connection and dedication to our students will in many cases be those who have more in common with the students. Thus the desired increase in diversity will be achieved, but in a manner that promotes serving students and helping them succeed rather than concern with diversity statistics.

Colleges might consider several aspects of their hiring processes in order to attract and hire candidates who are best able to serve our diverse student populations. Some of the needed changes will take time and consideration, such as state-level projects for recruiting more diverse candidate pools. Others, including job announcements, hiring criteria, hiring workshops, interview questions, and other issues, can be refocused in the current hiring cycle to be more inclusive and to identify faculty with the qualities our diverse students need.

BEFORE THE INTERVIEW: JOB ANNOUNCEMENT, COMMITTEE COMPOSITION, SETTING THE CRITERIA

A job announcement should do more than state what the college is looking for in the position; it should also convince the applicant that the college is a desirable place to work. In order to attract a diverse body of candidates, the job announcement should reflect the institution's mission, priorities, and interest in inclusion and diversity. Colleges

> Rather than simply calling for hiring more diverse faculty, colleges should focus on hiring faculty who can serve the needs of a diverse student body, who are committed to teaching and advocating on behalf of all of our students with a genuine and demonstrated understanding of their needs and capacity.

should look for every way possible to make all job announcement materials represent the institution's commitment to all students and to make them inviting to candidates of diverse backgrounds and perspectives.

Colleges may also wish to reexamine the traditional criteria by which candidates have been evaluated. In many cases, candidates have been looked on more favorably for holding more advanced degrees or even because of where they obtained their degrees. However, doctoral degrees are not required for faculty in the community college system, and in fact doctoral training may in many cases have very little relevance to the work faculty do with community college students. In other instances, candidates have been given preference because of their many years of classroom teaching experience. While some level of experience in teaching in the community college system and working with its students may be desirable, one does not need five or ten years of experience to be qualified to teach. Colleges might also consider ways to translate and give value to a candidate's experience facilitating learning in spaces other than the formal classroom setting, especially if that experience is with populations similar to the students our colleges are having the most difficulty engaging with their learning. Finally, in some cases hiring committees have looked for very specific sub-discipline expertise that significantly narrows the field of candidates. Committees should keep in mind that community college faculty who are competent to teach in a discipline can continue to learn and grow in their own expertise, and thus an applicant who has the proper mindset can often acquire additional instructional capabilities if they are truly needed.

In place of these often limiting aspects of the criteria used to make hiring decisions, committees should give fair consideration to all candidates who meet the minimum qualifications if those candidates exhibit sufficient discipline knowledge, the capacity and enthusiasm to acquire more skill or knowledge in both discipline expertise and pedagogical approaches, and a true commitment to the community college mission and students.

The composition and training of the hiring committee are very important, as the committee will make an impression on the interviewee that may be a factor in the decision of

a candidate with multiple offers. No committee should ever sacrifice discipline expertise for the sake of a more diverse committee makeup; however, if the discipline expertise does not supply significant diversity for the committee, then the college may wish to supplement the discipline faculty with additional faculty representatives who can provide differing perspectives.

IN THE INTERVIEW: STRUCTURE AND QUESTIONS

Most hiring committees are held to a specific set of pre-designed questions, and the interview invariably includes a "diversity question" that may often be so general as to give little real indication of the candidate's commitment to teaching diverse students. Instead, committees may consider not a diversity question but rather integrating diversity and equity concerns throughout many, if not most, interview questions. For example, many interviews include a question, either direct or in terms of a hypothetical scenario, regarding student discipline. Such a question could easily be re-phrased to ask the candidate how his or her answer might vary depending on a student's background. Such an approach would offer far more insight into the candidate's understanding of student needs and appreciation for cultural and other differences among students. Many other standard questions, as well as teaching demonstrations, could be re-worded or re-structured to offer a similar opportunity for the candidate to demonstrate his or her understanding of and commitment to diverse students.

In order to give full and fair consideration to all candidates, committees might also consider the number of interviewees, the length of the interviews, and how much time they can devote to the process. In truth, one can hardly get a clear understanding of a candidate's qualifications and priorities in a scripted forty-five minute interview, especially when it is the sixth interview of a very long day for the second day in a row. Giving equal and fair treatment to all candidates is difficult when the interview process involves extended sessions of back-to-back interviews with limited time and no meaningful interaction.

To address these issues, hiring committees need to make a commitment to spending more time on the process and on each interview, even if this decision means extending the process over several additional days in order to conduct fewer and perhaps longer interviews each day. Human resources departments must of course train committees to ensure against improper questions or questions that might create liability, but they can also help committees understand how to ask meaningful, appropriate follow-up questions that draw out the candidates' answers and make the interviews more substantial

AFTER THE HIRE: INCLUSION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Once a candidate has accepted the position, the college should consider how to ensure that the candidate feels valued and included in his or her department as well as the institution as a whole. For this reason, cultural competency training is not only necessary for the hiring committee but should be expected for the entire college community. New faculty should be invited not only to become a part of the college and department cultures but also to contribute to it in meaningful ways, allowing them to feel accepted and to see that their perspectives and talents are uniquely valued.

Ongoing professional development should be a commitment of the college for all faculty, both new and continuing. Before the new hires take place, the college should have a plan in place to provide any necessary pedagogical training or discipline expertise for those new faculty who may have less experience but more commitment and dedication to the students. All faculty should be brought together on a regular basis to exchange perspectives and discuss the ways in which they are serving their students, and new additions to the faculty should be encouraged to contribute their unique ideas and backgrounds and their more recently acquired experiences and observations to these discussions.

The task before community colleges is certainly a challenge, and change does not happen in a heartbeat. Yet with the augmented funding for hiring full-time faculty in the 2015-16 budget, a unique opportunity is current before the system. Students and colleges will benefit from hiring processes that promote inclusion and diversity. Such an effort will require additional commitment in terms of time and resources, but the results can only help to develop a stronger faculty with an enhanced ability to serve the diverse student population of the California Community Colleges System. ✒

Establishing CTE, Legislative, and Noncredit Liaison Positions

by Julie Bruno, Vice President

In the past few years the number of new statewide initiatives and programs impacting California community colleges has increased dramatically. As a system, we have addressed the Student Success Task Force recommendations, met requirements for Associate Degrees for Transfer, and established partnerships with our K-12 and adult education colleagues, to name just a few of these activities. Many of these efforts, mandated by legislation or initiated by the Board of Governors, are envisioned in consultation with our system, business, and community partners and rely on faculty and staff at local colleges for implementation. This trend is far from over. With the Board of Governors' adoption of the recommendations of the Task Force on Work Force, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy and the enactment of legislation affecting open educational resources and basic skills instruction, the need is now even greater for faculty to be informed about and involved in statewide projects, programs, and initiatives.

With so much happening, local senates have often struggled to keep faculty informed of and engaged with statewide issues. As these initiatives and programs are implemented, senate presidents not only assist the ASCCC in finding faculty volunteers to participate in state level activities but also ensure effective faculty participation in local efforts. In response to concerns raised by faculty about the difficulty of remaining active and involved with state matters, delegates at the ASCCC's Spring 2015 Plenary Session passed three resolutions (17.02 S15, 17.03 S15, and 17.05 S15) calling for local academic senates to identify faculty liaison positions to facilitate communication between the ASCCC and local senates on CTE, legislative, and noncredit issues. Establishing these liaison positions should help to take some of the workload and pressure off of the senate presidents while having the additional benefit of ensuring that the ASCCC will have faculty within these three areas to assist in ensuring statewide faculty representation when necessary.

To provide assistance in implementing the three resolutions, the ASCCC Executive Committee approved liaison guidelines submitted by the CTE Leadership, Legislative and Advocacy, and the Noncredit Committees. The guidelines for each liaison position may be found on the newly established liaison webpage *asccc.org/liaisons* on the ASCCC website. These guidelines are most useful when modified to fit with a local senate's organizational and governance structure.

When establishing a liaison position, local senates should consider how best to serve the needs and interests of the faculty at their local colleges. For example, a liaison position may be held by one faculty member, shared by two faculty members, or consist of a small group of faculty with one acting as the lead. Senates may also wish to include participation from faculty at the various college campuses, centers, or other locations that would enable the liaison position or positions to reach the largest number of faculty. Any of these models could be well suited to fulfilling the intent of all three resolutions, and therefore senates should choose the model that fits best with local senate policies and practices.

To facilitate the connection to the ASCCC and the CTE, Legislative, and Noncredit Committees, the ASCCC established a listserv for each liaison position. Of course, all ASCCC listservs are open to anyone who wishes to join, but we hope that these three listservs will assist the liaisons in fulfilling the specific responsibility of ensuring that his or her academic senate is informed and actively involved in the statewide CTE, legislative, and noncredit issues and efforts.

Once senates have established the three liaison positions, local senates should inform the ASCCC by email (*info@asccc.org*), including the name, position, and email address of the liaisons. The ASCCC will use this information to expand the listservs and allow the CTE Leadership, Legislative and Advocacy, and Noncredit Committees to reach out to their liaisons as necessary. If there are any questions regarding these positions, senate leaders should not hesitate to contact us at *info@asccc.org*.

Can The Demise of the COMPASS Placement Exam Lead to Improved Student Success at California Community Colleges?

A LOOK AT SOME RELEVANT RESEARCH AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS*

by William Silver, Professor of English, Evergreen Valley College, San Jose, California

ACT will be taking the COMPASS test off the market in the fall of 2016. As a replacement, California's Common Assessment Initiative (CAI) will complete development of its statewide online placement exams (CCCAssess) so they are available for use just as the COMPASS is discontinued—in time for spring 2017 registration. The CAI team is also working on a companion project to develop multiple measures using the Cal-PASS Plus data system of high school transcripts and performance. To better understand how changes in student placement could affect student success, one should be familiar with some relevant research.

The relevant research began with Clifford Adelman's seminal research at the U.S. Department of Education in 2005 and Thomas Bailey, Dong Wook Jeong, and Sung-Woo Cho's 2008 study of low student completion rates in developmental education courses, published by the Community College Research Center at Columbia University. Writing about a national sample of Achieving the Dream community college students, Bailey noted that, "between 33 and 46 percent of students, depending on the subject area, referred to developmental education actually complete their entire developmental sequence." He also pointed out that most of the students exited their required developmental course sequence because they did not enroll in an initial or subsequent course, not because they failed or withdrew from a course they were enrolled in.

> "between 33 and 46 percent of students ... actually complete their entire developmental sequence."

Building on this work, research by Moore and Shulock at CSU Sacramento, published in 2010, looked at enrollment patterns of California community college students. Their research found that students who reach certain progress milestones have much better success rates in completing certificates and degrees or transferring. For example, if students pass college English within their first two years of study, their success rate rises from 20% to 50%. If they accumulate at least 20 units of credit in their first year of study, the student success rate rises from 21% to 59%. Students gain "momentum" by reaching these progress milestones, the authors pointed out, leading to the term Momentum Points used in the CCC Student Success Scorecard. These research studies have helped inform a growing movement in California and across the country aimed at improving student success. Efforts at colleges and universities to accelerate students' progress through their developmental education courses, using "stretch" or other compressed course sequences, are illustrations of this growing movement.

*Note: The following article is not an official statement of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The article is intended to engender discussion and consideration by local colleges, and each college is encouraged to conduct its own research regarding issues such as student placement and curriculum redesign.

> "if they pass college English within their first two years of study, their success rate rises from 20% to 50%."

Many community colleges offer separate, parallel developmental reading and writing courses, some beginning three levels below college English, or six levels below for ESL students. Developmental math courses typically begin three levels below college math. Depending on their placement test score, students may be required to complete several lengthy developmental course sequences before they can take transfer-level gatekeeper courses or take courses that fulfill their educational and career goals. To help accelerate students' progress, some colleges have folded reading instruction into writing or content courses, thereby reducing the number of required courses.

The more time students take to complete their preparatory coursework, the greater the chances that family and financial obligations will interfere. A U.S. Department of Education study from 2007-2008 noted that six in ten community college students work more than 20 hours per week, and over 25% of the students worked 35 hours per week or more. When combined with family and financial obligations, developmental skills course requirements can cause students difficulty in reaching the higher success milestones that Moore and Shulock described.

The starting point and duration of a student's developmental program are decided in large part by a placement test—most often either the COMPASS or ACCUPLACER tests. Relying heavily on a single measure to determine placement, even a test instrument that has been used for many years and is approved by the state, is a doubtful practice, especially when placement is so important to a student's potential for success and completion. In fact, recent studies have found serious problems with the accuracy of both tests. Belfield and Crosta's 2012 study confirmed the results of prior research, noting that, "the tests do not have much explanatory power across a range of measures of performance including college GPA, credit accumulation, and success in gatekeeper English and math classes."

> The COMPASS and ACCUPLACER "tests do not have much explanatory power across a range of measures of performance including college GPA, credit accumulation, and success in gatekeeper English and math classes."

A closer look at course level cut-off scores serves to highlight the problem. Belfield and Crosta found "severe" error rates using cut-off scores in a large statewide community college system: Approximately 30% of students in English were "misaligned," with somewhat lower misalignment in math. Judith Scott-Clayton found similar error rates in her 2012 study of placement exams. She found that in math exams 75% of the errors placed students in a course that was too low, while in English 85% of the misplaced students were placed too low.

In another example, at one typical community college in California, 20% of all the COMPASS scores reported by the college for 2011 were just one to three points below a cut-off score. Academic counselors sometimes over-ride the test score, placing the individual student higher if there is other relevant information about the student to make the determination, although this practice is sometimes cited as a challenge to discipline faculty expertise and judgment. However, more students in this group of 20% of incoming test-takers—or the 30% of misaligned test scores—might reach progress milestones and achieve success if some of them were to have started their English or math course sequence one level higher than their placement score prescribed.

> 20% of all the COMPASS scores reported by one typical college were just one to three points below a cut-off score.

Title 5 of the *California Code of Regulations* requires that "When using an English, mathematics, or ESL assessment for placement, it must be used with

one or more other measures to comprise multiple measures." The need for multiple measures makes good educational sense. Students can be out of practice when they take the placement test, harried by registration obligations, or unaware of the importance of the test. For these reasons, colleges are increasingly helping students to prepare for the placement test or letting them re-take it if needed.

In addition, some colleges are increasingly experimenting with use of a student's high school GPA in predicting future academic performance. Belfield and Crosta showed that, "Alone, HS GPA was a better predictor of college performance than all other measures put together." The authors also pointed out that the number of foundation math and English courses taken in high school correlated with college performance. The value of high school GPA can also be seen in the number of colleges and universities making SAT scores optional and using high school GPA instead for admission purposes. The National Association for College Admissions Counseling reported negligible differences in reliability between admissions based on high school GPA and SAT scores.

> "Alone, HS GPA was a better predictor of college performance than all other measures put together."

The Research & Planning Group for California Community Colleges, working in partnership with the CAI team, has proposed using GPA data in conjunction with the forthcoming CCCAssess placement exams, encouraging colleges to place students according to whichever indicator is higher: high school GPA or CAI exam. Support for this approach can be found in research done by Scott-Clayton in 2012, also at Columbia University's research center. Working with a sample of 42,000 students from an urban community college system, she found that, "allowing students to test out of remediation based on the best of either their placement scores or high school achievement could substantially lower remediation rates (by 8 percentage points in math and 12 percentage points in English) without compromising success rates in college-level coursework."

The availability of high school GPA data relies on widespread participation in Cal-PASS Plus. Even with such participation, high school data is not available for some students who enter community colleges. The absence of high school grade records is a practical problem that all community colleges would have to face.

> Taken as a whole, the research suggests that significant numbers of students are not correctly placed when entering community colleges, and that some students could begin their developmental course sequence at a higher level.

Taken as a whole, the research suggests that significant numbers of students are not correctly placed when entering community colleges because of placement tests and that some students could begin their developmental course sequence at a higher level. However, the prevailing paradigm over the last few decades has been to increase the number of developmental courses offered, with the intention of giving the fullest possible preparation to underprepared students. Is it possible that the proverbial pendulum has swung too far in that direction? Should the pendulum reverse direction? Such a reversal could be the result of impending changes in placement in California community colleges. Any community college that follows the CAI recommendation, finding the relevant research compelling, is likely to see some of its students placed higher and move more quickly through required developmental courses, thus reaching progress milestones sooner. This could have a salutary impact on student success, especially if appropriate academic support services were available to students.

What should California community colleges do to anticipate changes in placement testing? And how might the colleges develop a more robust use of multiple measures to place students with accuracy, possibly including high school GPA? We would be well-advised to answer those questions some time during the 2015-2016 academic year. ✐

What You Need to Know About the Common Assessment

by Craig Rutan, Area D Representative, Vice Chair of the Common Assessment Steering Committee

As we enter 2016, the new common assessment system is only one year away from being used to place community college students. Whenever something that will affect every college is being developed, rumors will abound regarding how everything is going to change. To ensure that colleges are ready for the common assessment, this article provides answers to some of the most common questions.

Are colleges required to use the common assessment test?

If your college uses an assessment test and your college wants to continue to receive SSSP funds, then the assessment test used must be the common test once it is made available. The Student Success Act (SB1456, Lowenthal) includes the following:

> The requirement that any district or college receiving funding pursuant to this section agree to implement this article, implement the board of governors' system of common assessment, if using an assessment instrument for placement, and implement the board of governors' accountability scorecard, pursuant to Section 84754.5, when established during the period in which it receives that funding.

Colleges are permitted to use other measures for placement and continue to receive funding, but an assessment test other than common test would not be acceptable.

Our college likes our current assessment test; can we continue to use it?

A college's existing assessment test possibly could be used in conjunction with the common test as a multiple measure, but it cannot replace the common test without loss of SSSP funding.

Will a common test mandate common placement?

Placement decisions will continue to be made locally. The ASCCC's adopted position on placement of students comes from resolution 13.03 F11 that included the following:

> Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the establishment of a centralized standard assessment as an option provided there is a local determination of cut scores for placement and encourage local academic senates to support selection of this assessment option for local use.

Additionally, the new common test will not produce a single score; it will produce a competency map for each student that will be used to determine placement. The advantage of this system is that more information about a student's skills will be available to faculty. This new information will also come with the need to develop new placement models at each campus. Since each campus has unique curriculum, the system cannot feasibly have a single placement model for all colleges.

Will the common assessment include a writing sample?

Resolution 18.01 F2014 included the following statements:

> Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the Common Assessment Initiative include writing samples as a required component of the common assessment and that the writing samples are scored by human readers whose participation will inform assessment procedures that promote the growth of students across the composition sequence; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Common Assessment Initiative steering committee to ensure that English and ESL instructors with knowledge and experience as to how integrated assessment programs inform curriculum and pedagogy participate in the design and evaluation of writing samples to ensure that the assessment test is grounded in the latest research on language learning and assessment practices.

Since the passage of this resolution, the Common Assessment Initiative Steering Committee has been committed to including a required writing sample for both English and ESL students. The student's writing sample will be provided to colleges along with a machine generated score. The initiative has not yet purchased a machine scoring system, but the decision was made that one needs to be available for colleges that do not have the resources for human scoring. All colleges wishing to have the writing sample scored by hand will be able to do so, but those scores will not move with the student to other colleges.

What do faculty need to do to prepare for the common assessment?

The change from a single score to a skills profile means that each college will need to develop new placement models for the common assessment. To build these models, faculty should review the assessment competency maps available at cccassess.org and map the skills being measured to existing curriculum. As pilot colleges begin using the common assessment, professional development will be offered to help faculty with creating placement models. Additionally, basic skills descriptors are currently being developed by C-ID, and those descriptors will also be aligned to the competency maps to provide colleges with examples. Even though C-ID has reciprocity requirements, any alignment to the competency maps will only be provided as an example and colleges are not required to use them.

Will every college begin using the common assessment at the same time?

With 113 colleges, it is impossible to make this new system available to everyone at the same time. The Chancellor's Office is developing a schedule for when the common assessment will be made available to each college. A college will be granted access to the system one semester prior to usage to set up the technology and make certain that everyone on campus is properly trained to use the new system.

Will the common assessment system include any multiple measures?

The common assessment system will include some additional multiple measures that colleges may choose to use. The Common Assessment Initiative is currently piloting multiple measures, including the use of high school GPA and non-cognitive measures through the Multiple Measures Assessment Project. Colleges will not be required to use any of the multiple measures included in the system, but they are required to use multiple measures when placing students.

Will the common assessment change course offerings?

If more students are placed into higher level courses, colleges may need to change their course schedules. Additionally, colleges may choose to develop new curriculum to take advantage of the diagnostic data provided by the common assessment.

While this list does not exhaust all possible questions, it should give faculty and colleges an idea of what is coming. Colleges should begin planning, if they have not already done so, for the new assessment system. Each college should consider an implementation team that includes discipline faculty from math, reading, English, and ESL, discipline faculty with math or English prerequisites, counselors, assessment center staff, and IT staff. Local academic senates should take the lead in bringing faculty together to discuss curriculum alignment and create local placement models. The involvement of the senate will help prevent forming silos around assessment and will ensure that the entire campus community is involved in implementation.

As the work of the Common Assessment Initiative continues, professional development opportunities will be offered to answer questions and provide training. Three one-day trainings will be held during the spring semester, and additional trainings will be offered until the common assessment has been implemented at all colleges. Additional information about the common assessment can be found at cccassess.org.

The common assessment will affect every student coming into the community college system, but the system can only be successful with a strong collaboration among faculty, staff, and administrators at each college. This initiative offers an incredible opportunity for change and to help our students achieve their goals.

Reviewing, Evaluating and Improving the Curriculum Process—

A Local Academic Senate Responsibility

by John Freitas, ASCCC Curriculum Committee Chair

Recent efforts to address projected workforce needs in California have highlighted the central role of the California community colleges in meeting these needs through their career and technical education (CTE) programs. The commissioning of the Task Force for Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy (Workforce Task Force) by the Board of Governors in November of 2014 made CTE a top priority for the Chancellor's Office. The release in August 2015 of the *Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy: Report and Recommendations*[2] and its subsequent adoption by the Board of Governors in November 2015 is the culmination of the first phase of an effort improve the way the community colleges are meeting the needs of industry. The task force report includes twenty-five recommendations, six of which are directly related to curriculum.

Some critics of the community college system claim that local curriculum development and approval processes are slow and cumbersome and prevent CTE programs from meeting the rapidly changing needs of industry and therefore need to be radically revised. In fact, one of the recommendations from the Workforce Task Force directly addresses this perception:

8. Evaluate, revise and resource the local, regional, and statewide CTE curriculum approval process to ensure timely, responsive, and streamlined curriculum approval.

a. Provide state-level coordination to ensure a streamlined curriculum approval process at the Chancellor's Office.

b. Provide sufficient staffing and resources in the Chancellor's Office to accelerate the state-level curriculum approval process.

c. Identify and disseminate effective practices in local curricula adoption and revision processes and provide technical assistance for faculty and colleges.

Recommendation 8(c), in particular, relates directly to the mission of the ASCCC in its role as the official voice of the faculty of the California Community Colleges in academic and professional matters.

In response to 8(c), and as directed by Resolution 9.01 S15[3], the drafting of a paper on effective practices for local curriculum approval was given the highest priority by the ASCCC Curriculum Committee and will be brought for approval to the Spring 2016 Plenary Session for adoption. The paper will incorporate recommendations provided in *Ensuring Effective and Efficient Curriculum Processes—An Academic Senate White Paper*[4] on reviewing local curriculum processes and implementing effective practices for

---

2   Local senate presidents and curriculum chairs should review these recommendations and engage in local conversations with their administrations about how these recommendations may be addressed at the local level. The report is available at *doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/portals/6/docs/sw/BOG_TaskForce_Report_v12_web.pdf*

---

3   Resolution 9.01 S15 is found at *asccc.org/resolutions/curriculum-processes-and-effective-practices*

4   This white paper is available at *asccc.org/sites/default/files/Effective_Curriculum_Practices_White_Paper_Final.docx*

streamlining local curriculum approval processes without sacrificing quality. It will also expand on the contents of the white paper by providing guidance on various levels of professional development for college constituencies on the curriculum process and on advocating for sufficient resources to support the local curriculum approval process.

Soon after the release of the final draft of the Workforce Task Force report in August 2015, the ASCCC Executive Committee recognized the need for the Curriculum Committee to respond quickly to recommendation 8(c). Subsequently, the Curriculum Committee drafted *Ensuring Effective and Efficient Curriculum Processes*, which was approved by the Executive Committee at its October 2-3, 2015 meeting and subsequently disseminated to the field as an intermediate step in meeting this recommendation of the Workforce Task Force. Subsequently, at the Fall 2015 Plenary Session, the delegates adopted Resolution 9.08 F15[5] in which local senates and curriculum committees are strongly urged "to evaluate their curriculum approval processes in order to ensure that curriculum is developed, revised, and implemented in a timely manner, while preserving the integrity and rigor of the review process." While the white paper does not represent an official position of the Academic Senate because it was not voted on or approved by the delegates, it does represent the best advice of the Executive Committee to local senates on what they can do now to start evaluating and improving, as needed, their local curriculum processes.

Ensuring Effective and Efficient Curriculum Processes provides advice on how local senates and curriculum committees can start immediately to address recommendation 8(c) of the Workforce Task Force. Local senates are reminded of the legal role and authority of the curriculum committee, the importance of working collaboratively with administrators and students in the curriculum development process, the appropriate role of administrators, and the authority of the governing board. The paper provides guidance on how to review and evaluate local curriculum processes in order to identify any needed improvements, which includes important questions to ask when conducting the review and evaluation and a reminder of the importance of involving key individuals such as the curriculum specialist, articulation officer, academic administrators including

the CTE dean, and student representatives in the review and evaluation process. Finally, the paper offers effective practices for improving local curriculum processes, including recommendations for ensuring that the process is clear, ensuring technical review is efficient and effective, ensuring that curriculum committee meetings are run efficiently, ensuring that the overall approval curriculum process is streamlined, including recognizing the unique needs of CTE, increasing the frequency of curriculum committee and governing board approvals, and consideration of giving colleges in multi-college districts full autonomy over their curriculum. The contents of *Ensuring Effective and Efficient Curriculum Processes* will be incorporated into the position paper that will be brought to the Spring 2016 Plenary Session for adoption.

The recommendations of the Workforce Task Force will likely increase both external and internal pressure on colleges to revise their processes in order to ensure that curriculum, particularly CTE curriculum, is approved quickly. Colleges may even be pressured to create separate CTE curriculum processes that encourage expediency over quality and minimize the role of faculty discipline experts, which, of course, would be unacceptable. Governing boards, which represent the community, and industry partners will want to see action, and they will need to be reminded that curriculum is a matter of local senate purview within the 10+1 and that this purview extends not only to course and program content but also to curriculum policies and procedures. Therefore, local senates must be prepared to assert their authority and take the professional responsibility to lead the review and improvement of their local curriculum processes as soon as possible. Local senates and curriculum committees need to demonstrate that through these bodies community college faculty can provide the leadership needed to take all necessary action to improve their curriculum processes while ensuring quality and rigor in order to more effectively respond to the both the needs of industry partners and the needs of the students the California community colleges serve. ✒

---

5   Resolution 9.08 F15 is found at *asccc.org/resolutions/evaluation-effectiveness-local-curriculum-processes*

The 2015 Equivalency Practices Survey

by Lisa Cook, Laney College, Standards and Practices Committee Member

John Stanskas, Standards and Practices Committee Chair

According to Education Code §§87359 and 87360, individuals who do not possess the minimum qualifications for service may be hired as faculty members if they possess "qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications." The Disciplines List, a list of Board of Governors adopted minimum qualifications for hiring faculty, uses the term "equivalency" to describe processes to support this regulation. Education Code §87359 (b) requires that "[t]he process, as well as criteria, and standards by which the governing board reaches its determination regarding faculty members shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board."

To determine how academic senates are meeting their responsibilities for establishing and implementing equivalency policies and procedures, the Academic Senate surveyed local senates in fall 2015. Eighty-one responses to the survey were received, nearly all of them from faculty. The survey results indicated that while 94% colleges and districts have equivalency policies, only 42% indicated the policy was codified in a district board policy or administrative procedure. Thirty-nine percent indicated that it was a local academic senate or district academic senate policy.

The survey also asked who is responsible for determining equivalency at the college. Unfortunately, only 65% of respondents indicated that the college or district academic senate or a committee established by the academic senate was responsible for granting equivalency. In fact, 15% of respondents reported that the administration determines equivalency on their campuses despite the fact that equivalency is the purview of the academic senate. The evaluation of minimum qualifications, including those at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications, is the purview of the academic senate.

Of the respondents, 80% stated that their policy does specify criteria used for determining equivalent qualifications but many also commented that the criteria seemed subjective. Sixty percent of respondents indicated that eminence is not used at their college. Of the 59 colleges that are part of multi-college districts and responded to the survey, 34 reported that they coordinate equivalency decisions with the other colleges in their district while 25 reported that they do not. Once equivalency is determined, it must be ratified by the local governing board and is therefore granted for the entire district. A lack of coordination between colleges in the same district can be problematic and create bargaining unit issues.

Further findings indicate the need for regular evaluation, review, and revision of equivalency policies. Only a few colleges reported that a recent review and revision of their equivalency policy had occurred by the local academic senate.

Similarly, only a small number of senates indicated that training is provided to the senate, the senate equivalency committee, or the committee chair. One college reported being in the process of developing a handbook with instructions to be provided for faculty members involved in determining equivalency. This practice would be an effective way to ensure training is uniform and that all faculty members involved in determining equivalency at any time of the year had correct information.

The survey results and ASCCC Resolution 10.01 F14 highlight the need for a revision of the Academic Senate paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications* and for local dialog at academic senates regarding equivalency policies, procedures, and practices. Look for an update of the paper at the Spring Plenary Session. 🖋

Disenfranchised Students— Who Are They?

by the Transfer, Articulation, and Student Success Committee

Ginni May (chair), North Representative

Dolores Davison, Area B Representative

Vicki Maheu, San Diego Community College

April Pavlik, Los Angeles City College

Trevor Rodriquez, Long Beach City College

Shuntay Taylor, West Hills Lemoore College

Michael Wyly, Solano Community College

At the fall 2014 plenary session, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) passed resolution 20.01, regarding the provision of services for disenfranchised students. The resolution calls on the ASCCC to work with the Chancellor's Office to develop a plan to serve disenfranchised students. It reads,

Whereas, California's community colleges serve a diverse population of students, some of whom have emotional and/or environmental circumstances which may interfere with their ability to achieve their academic goals, as well as disenfranchising them from engaging in normal societal privileges and activities;

Whereas, These disenfranchised students may be homeless, may be suffering from untreated medical and mental ailments, may not have steady income or transportation, and are often highly disinclined to allow themselves to be identified as being in need of support because the common characteristic among these students is that they exist in a constant state of insecurity;

Whereas, California's community colleges are already overburdened with mandates to provide education plans for all students without sufficient resources, which are needed for these disenfranchised students in order to increase success, retention, and completion; and

Whereas, The California Community College System has established no future plans to provide the services that these disenfranchised students so badly need;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the

Chancellor's Office and Board of Governors to develop a long-range plan that will increase services for disenfranchised students. (Resolution 20.01, F14)

Indeed, it has become increasingly apparent that a significant segment of the California community college student population is disenfranchised. The resolution provides a broad definition of who a disenfranchised student is. Yet, understanding how we do or do not actually identify real students is the essential first step in addressing how the community college system may better serve all students to more directly promote student success.

SOUND FAMILIAR?

On Tuesdays and Thursdays, River first pauses at the doorway to plot a route to his seat which he then navigates with quick-paces and half-closed eyes. He removes several pencils he sets in parallel to the desk's edge, lines his folder up as true-to-center as he can, and waits for the class to begin.

In the first weeks, River is very much engaged in class. He tries to keep up with his note-taking. He asks questions. Periodically, he volunteers his observations. He turns most of his assignments in on time. He is responsive to invitations to use office hours. He responds well to the instructor's referral to a tutor. He says that he works with his counselor.

Yet, as the semester progresses, he seems more tired, more distracted. Some days he simply does not engage in class at all. With increasing frequency, he submits underdeveloped work, then no work. He emails apologies for not coming to office hours. He does not show for scheduled meetings with a tutor.

In a brief dialogue with the instructor after class, River explains that he is currently without a home and sleeping on the couches of friends, that sometimes he sleeps in his car. He is defensive in his confession and does not offer more detail. The instructor does not think he looks malnourished but feels uncomfortable even making such an assessment. River is clearly not willing to engage further on this subject except to say that he might drop the course. Moreover, should River choose to persist, the reality of his missing course work and missed class hours significantly diminish his chances of success.

DISENFRANCHISEMENT

To disenfranchise is to deprive of a franchise, of a legal right, or of some privilege or immunity.

The example of River's experience is just one scenario involving a student who, deprived of support services, no longer has equal access to higher education. Many students are similarly affected, although the how and why of their scenarios are likely as varied as our student bodies: students trying to separate themselves from gang affiliation, students who have become homeless, students who do not qualify for financial aid or for whom financial aid is not available in a timely fashion, students in need of mentoring and support who do not qualify for assistance through established programs such as EOPS, Umoja, Rise, CalWorks, or some of the newer programs coming out of Student Success and Support Program, Student Equity Program, and Basic Skills Program, and students that are in need of learning assistance but are simply unaware that there are services available. The list is long and examples of such students are plentiful.

WHAT CAN FACULTY DO?

The Transfer, Articulation, and Student Success Committee of the ASCCC is taking a first step to address resolution 20.01 F14 by surveying colleges about which types of services, if any, are available for disenfranchised students at the colleges as well as how colleges facilitate connecting these students to provided services. Responses from a wide range of college constituents, including faculty, staff, and administrators, will be used to inform the field regarding this issue and hopefully begin to provide models of effective practices that may be scaled to address the challenges these students face at all of our colleges. The survey will be circulated this spring, and the ASCCC asks that faculty leaders distribute it as widely as possible at their colleges. With the information gathered from the survey, the Academic Senate will pursue further directions through which we can serve our population of disenfranchised students and continue our efforts to provide authentic access to education to all students.

> Indeed, it has become increasingly apparent that a significant segment of the California community college student population is disenfranchised

Dual Enrollment: What Local Senates Need to Know

by Dolores Davison, Educational Policies Committee Chair

Wheeler North, ASCCC Treasurer

With the passage of AB288 (Holden, 2015), many colleges have begun to explore the use of dual enrollment on their campuses. Due to the nature of dual enrollment programs, academic senates need to be familiar with these programs and prepared to be involved with their creation and promulgation.

In very basic terms, dual enrollment or concurrent enrollment occurs when, under provisions of the California Education Code, K-12 students are permitted to take college classes as special admission students. While several nuanced versions of this practice exist, the most common type of dual enrollment involves K-12 students taking a college class offered on a K-12 campus, typically during the school day. This partnership should have a formal agreement between the two institutions, although such an agreement is not legally required. The other common form of dual enrollment involves the K-12 student enrolled in a college class as a student. This type of student enrollment can be accomplished through a formal partnership or by individual K-12 students registering and enrolling as special admission college students.

Dual enrollment has existed for many years, with some fairly specific requirements that both the K-12 institution and the college must fulfill. Following legal challenges in the early 2000s, many community college districts discontinued their dual enrollment arrangements and have remained hesitant to enter into new ones. This situation may change with the passage in 2015 of AB288, which allows districts to establish an optional dual enrollment program, called College and Career Access Pathways or CCAP, that operates under new rules spelled out in the legislation. While the new law

creates an entirely new option, nothing requires a college to exercise the option. Likewise, nothing prevents a college from enacting the provision and eliminating its current dual enrollment program, thereby in effect moving the existing program into the new provisions. However, colleges must choose one of the two options—continuing their current programs, or moving fully under the requirements of AB288—as colleges cannot pick and choose elements of the new legislation.

This new law essentially models what started as a one-time exception made for one district (Long Beach City College) that allows the college district and local K-12 school to create dual enrollment opportunities that do not require open access to the public. Parts of the new regulations parallel the existing dual enrollment requirements and others are completely new. Similar to the existing provisions in Education Code for dual enrollment, this new law has numerous implementation nuances. Moreover, some of the nuances have not been completely clarified at the policy levels; as a result, the Department of Education and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office may need to implement additional regulatory changes as well as develop a variety of guidelines.

Unlike the existing requirements, this new law requires a formal agreement between the institutions. It also makes very clear that both institutions can only collect FTES and ADA apportionment as long as they are not duplicating "the same instructional activity." This provision will essentially mean that a college course offered under the new CCAP may not directly repeat an

existing school class. It will also mean that both institutions will need to meet their respective apportionment requirements with the exception of providing open access.

Colleges without dual enrollment programs who are also not meeting their growth targets might consider these new provisions. Colleges can begin by engaging in the development of academic pathways while building partnership rapport with their respective K-12 partners. Those colleges that currently have dual enrollment offerings should work closely with their academic senates, K-12 partners, and the CCC Chancellor's Office to help implement this new and exciting option for students.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Who develops dual enrollment agreements and how often should they be updated?

Community college faculty must be the central component in the development and maintenance of dual enrollment courses since they are college classes. This statement does not mean that other stakeholders are not critical to the success of these partnerships. The K-12 faculty and administrators from both systems need to be active participants to ensure that all institutions remain compliant with all requirements.

The initiation of any program requires both immediate and regular review and evaluation. As the program continues, only unusual circumstances will be likely to require immediate attention, and the program could easily follow the same timeline as the college's regular program review processes. Program review, creation, and discontinuance are academic and professional matters, and as such the academic senate should be engaged in the conversation regarding dual enrollment programs and serving the needs of the community.

Are dual enrollment classes an academic and professional matter?

Yes. This conclusion is not debatable. Title 5 §51023.3 and §§53200-53205 are perfectly clear that curriculum and program development are strictly academic and professional matters as a minimum condition for apportionment.

What are the minimum qualifications to teach a dual enrollment class?

The minimum qualifications to teach any college class, credit or noncredit, are found in both law and regulation (Education Code §§87350-87360 and Title 5 §§53400-53430 respectively.) The requirements to meet minimum qualifications are the same as for any California community college course.

How do students fulfill college and degree requirements with dual enrollment, credit by examination and articulation?

Dual enrollment classes are regular college courses and therefore meet college and degree requirements without additional exams or certification.

Is the credit on a student transcript for a dual enrollment class different from other college credit?

No. A dual enrollment class is a college class. The credit listed cannot be differentiated from any other credit contained in the student's transcript. As a result, students must be allowed the same options allowed in any college course.

Can dual enrollment classes be basic skills classes?

The provisions for dual enrollment are generally silent on the type of courses to be offered, so they can be specifically tailored to meet remedial needs. The new CCAP does address specific requirements for basic skills dual enrollment courses, including that the agreement must include processes to certify that the students in remedial classes need the remediation to be successful in college.

What type of counseling and other student services should be provided for dual enrollment students?

The new CCAP does not require provision of these services for high school students, nor does it require the high school students to submit a Student Education Plan; however, students who graduate from high school and then enter a community college will be required to do so. Because dual enrollment offerings are usually not more than a few courses, the structural pathway is typically not difficult to establish. However, the means by which students can receive tutoring, counseling, academic advising, library service, and all other services specific to those courses must be agreed upon in advance.

Addressing the Silent Majority:

Part-time Faculty Issues Through the Lens of Equity, Engagement and Empowerment

by Roseann Berg, Foothill College; Arnita Porter, West LA College; Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, MSJC; The ASCCC Part-time Faculty Task Force

According to the numbers, part-timers make up a majority of the instructional faculty at our colleges. Both part- and full-time non-tenure-track appointments are increasing. Non-tenure-track positions of all types now account for 76% of all instructional staff appointments in American higher education. [6]

Part-time faculty challenges are reflected in the news. The following headlines have been seen in major publications:

"Someone Calculated How Many Adjunct Professors Are On Public Assistance, And The Number Is Startling" (Huffington Post);

"When a College Contracts 'Adjunctivitis,' It's the Students Who Lose" (PBS NEWSHOUR);

"Are Adjunct Professors the Fast-food Workers of the Academic World?" (The Guardian).

While a small percentage of part-time faculty are specialists or practitioners of a profession such as law or architecture, where teaching is ancillary to their primary occupation, this situation is the exception rather than the norm.[7] Often referred to as freeway flyers, part-time instructors are forced to travel between campuses to make ends meet. Essentially flying without nets, they are earning less with no health insurance, retirement benefits. The excessive use of and inadequate compensation and professional support for contingent faculty exploits these colleagues.[8] Reporter Gary Rhoades declared, "Adjunct professors are the new working poor." Rhoades continues on to say,

The dirty little secret is that higher education is staffed with an insufficiently resourced, egregiously exploited, contingent "new faculty majority." In addition to the 49.3% of faculty in part-time positions (70% in community

colleges), another 19% are full-time, nontenure-track. (These numbers do not include graduate assistants or postdocs.) [9]

Collective bargaining issues focus on pay parity, equal pay for equal work. However, with respect to academic and professional matters, the issues do not appear to be as clear-cut. According to the Delphi Project on *The Changing Faculty and Student Success*, the current policies and practices for non-tenure-track faculty are obstacles to providing effective instruction and student support that promotes positive student learning outcomes.[10] In order to build awareness and improve conditions among the faculty, tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) should be recognized as part of the same community—as one faculty. [11] These current policies and practices often exclude NTTF from governance and planning, although faculty are most committed when they can be engaged.[12] How one defines academic and professional matters as it relates to part-time faculty is key. Part-timers are encouraged to join committees, attend workshops, college-wide events, and be active participants in their departments. They are often told that having a college "presence" will reflect their commitment to the institution, make them more valuable and marketable, and increase their chances of being hired full-time. But these suggestions carry little weight, especially where activities are continuously scheduled during the day when part-timers are busy working and flying between colleges. Over time, these practices leave part-time faculty feeling disconnected, irrelevant, and disrespected. The part-time faculty may also disengage.

In an effort to address these issues, the Academic Senate Part-Time Task Force has been created, in part, to explore ways to engage "the new majority" outside of the

---

6   Background Facts on Contingent Faculty, American Association of University Professors, *www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts*

7   Background Facts on Contingent Faculty, American Association of University Professors, *www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts*

8   Background Facts on Contingent Faculty, American Association of University Professors, *www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts*

9   Adjunct Professors Are The New Working Poor, Gary Rhoades, *www.cnn.com/2013/09/24/opinion/rhoades-adjunct-faculty*

10 The Delphi Project on The Changing Faculty and Student Success, p. 12. *www.teaglefoundation.org/teagle/media/library/documents/resources/Delphi-Project_Report-on-Working-Meeting_Web-Version-2.pdf?ext=.pdf*

11 The Delphi Project,14.

12 The Delphi Project,14.

classroom. As we know with students, one of the easiest ways to get people engaged is to help them understand why they should care, essentially "what's in it for them." As individuals involved with academic senate or other college communities know, participatory governance is an essential part of being a faculty member.

We can learn from models for inclusion that already exist. Santa Monica College created an adjunct survey in 2014 which resulted in an Adjunct Committee that "provides the Academic Senate with input on both campus issues relevant to adjunct faculty; fosters respect and inclusion, collegiality, and professionalism among all faculty, full and part-time; and interacts with adjunct faculty statewide on both faculty and adjunct-specific issues." [13]

This notion of fostering "respect and inclusion, collegiality, and professionalism among all faculty, full and part-time" is important and, if carried out, can help to narrow the divide between full- and part-time faculty. Currently, education is being viewed through the lens of equity and social justice. A holistic approach to education is taking place. Practices are being implemented that provide access to learning and support services, promote engagement, and strengthen student success. Growth mindset[14] is being used as a tool to facilitate learning and increase achievement. Growth mindset popularity has no doubt sprung as a result of scientific research in the area, as well as Stanford psychologist Carol Dweck's book, *Mindset*. Dweck says, "Mindsets are beliefs—beliefs about yourself and your most basic qualities." Two basic mindsets exist, the fixed and the growth mindset. People who tend toward a fixed mindset harbor the notion that their abilities and intelligence level is unchanging and fixed, a sort of "you have it or you don't" take on personal talents. In contrast, those who tend toward a growth mindset see practice and effort as an integral part of achieving and developing their skills and believe that qualities they may not have now can be developed over time through dedicated effort. If we make a collective shift towards a growth mindset, which encompasses professional matters as it relates to treatment of part-time faculty and support, significant gains can be made for both faculty and student empowerment.

Studies have shown a connection between part-time faculty and student learning, such as private offices or shared workspaces at colleges, access to resources to support instruction, proper orientation for new hires, funding and programming to support professional development, and mentoring opportunities for non-tenure-track faculty to work.[15]

Studies also suggest the importance of participation in college governance, including meaningful and representative levels of inclusion in governance and decision making processes, in committees and working groups to address non-tenure-track faculty concerns, and in building awareness for issues.[16]

Part-timers are working diligently to shift the culture, but they need full-time faculty to help champion the cause. Good leaders and instructors create a resonant, authentic relationship with others they are in sync with rather than employing a top down alignment strategy. Through this relationship, one is able to excite, encourage, and challenge each other as colleagues, which allows the part-time faculty to find meaning in the subject and to be engaged, involved and empowered to move forward. Faculty, staff, and administrators that are connected, that model equity towards each other, will help students see that they chose the right college and that it is one that values people. Just like students, part-time faculty need to know that they made the right choice in teaching for the college. We are all more likely to stay somewhere where we feel valued. The common misconception that part-time faculty are always on the run and are not invested in any one college stems from the fact that they often drive from one college to another just to survive. If we are truly student-centered institutions, we need to develop the programs and dedicate the resources to train, value and retain high quality part-time faculty.

Bryan Stevenson, Founder and Executive Director of The Equal Justice Initiative, discusses his career as a criminal attorney fighting for the poor, oppressed, and disenfranchised in his memoir *Just Mercy: A Story of Justice and Redemption*.[17] In his Harvard John F. Kennedy Jr. Forum talk, Stevenson offers four ways to fix our broken justice system.[18] These suggestions are applicable in any situation where inequality exists.

1. Get proximate to the thing that matters. Proximity is essential and will change you.

2. Change the narrative that sustains the problem. You must stop allowing the narrative to be crafted by fear and anger.

3. Protect our hope. Use hope to respond to negativity.

4. Do things that make you uncomfortable. Choose to move beyond the comfortable and convenient in your fight for justice.

Shifting the culture will require full-time faculty to get proximate to the issues that matter to part-timers in order to facilitate changing the narrative to inclusiveness. We must collectively commit to doing what is uncomfortable and inconvenient and protect our hope in the process while we seek to eliminate the practices that marginalize part-time faculty and negatively effect student outcomes and the quality our workplace. We must work together as one faculty towards a common goal of creating and maintaining institutions of higher learning that promote student success and social justice for everyone. ✒

---

13   Santa Monica College, Adjunct Committee. *www.smc.edu/ACG/AcademicSenate/AScommittees/Pages/Adjunct.aspx*

14   Dweck, Carol. Mindset.

15   The Delphi Project, p. 39.

16   The Delphi Project, p. 38.

17   Stevenson, Bryan. Just Mercy: A Story of Justice and Redemption. (Spiegel & Grau, 2014)

18   Stevenson, Bryan. John F. Kennedy Jr. Forum. *forum.iop.harvard.edu/content/justice-era-mass-imprisonment*

In Memorandum of Doug Sabiston, Senator Emeritus

The following is a eulogy I delivered on behalf of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and all of Doug Sabiston's ASCCC colleagues during his recent memorial service. Many thanks to Greg Gilbert, past Executive Committee members and friend of Doug's, for drafting this eulogy. We will miss Doug at our plenary sessions and other events.

In the opening of his book, *Backpacking Two Miles High*, Doug Sabiston writes, "The adventures, forever trail heads to excitement, continue through years and more years, over the high passes where the sky opens up to the wilderness on the other side." For Doug Sabiston, life was not only comprised of trail heads to excitement, it was a journey rich in loving companionship.

My name is Julie Adams, and today I'm here representing Doug Sabiston's friends and colleagues from California's 61,000 community college professors. I had the distinct honor of serving as the Executive Director of the State Academic Senate for California Community Colleges for more than 18 years, an organization that counts Doug Sabiston among its founders. While the Senate is the largest non-union higher education organization in the United States, to Doug it was an assembly of friends and colleagues entrusted with the future of California's 2 million community college students.

Over the years, I've always counted on Doug as one of my early mentors, a true friend always. In fact, on his retirement, the Senate honored him with Emeritus status. And Doug not only retired Emeritus from the state Senate, but from Contra Costa College where he taught business courses and, yes, was the founder of their academic senate as well. For his many contributions to California's students, Doug was honored in 2008 as an inductee to the Contra Costa College Hall of Fame.

While most people would have been more than content with the accomplishments and accolades that embodied his professional life, there was so much more to Doug Sabiston's universe. First, above all else, there was his devotion to family, to his wife Adelia, Dee, his life's partner for 72 years, to his brother and his wife, and to all of the young women in his life: his daughters, granddaughters, and his great-granddaughters.

Doug's largeness of life embodied also that of a poet scholar whose love of nature was so vast that it spilled over into two books and a collection of poems that celebrate in poetic terms and with a scholar's attention to detail, the wonders of the natural world. In his second such book, *Backpacking Two Miles High*, he provides insight into his ability to cope with life's pressures when he describes how people are "attracted by the vision of a wilderness adventure far from the tensions of modern life, of wild and spectacular scenery, of granite crags and ridges, timberline basins and deep, blue lakes, secret trails, passes, creeks, and, yes, the rocks."

And for the many professors whose Senate Plenary sessions would not have been complete without their end of the day beer with Doug, there is the one journal entry that describes crossing 11,300-foot Hell-For-Sure Pass and passing Disappointment Lake and how reluctant to drink from a creek with livestock, the hikers turn to the remnants of a fifth of vodka and some left over tang.

But then not to place too fine a point on Doug's need for quiet release from life's demands, let us not forget that there was this description of "Professor Sabiston" published in 2011 in *New American Media*: "With one foot on the brake and one foot revving the engine of his 1964 Plymouth Fury, Douglas "The Professor" Sabiston keeps his eyes fixed on the orange light that will flash once, twice, three times, before it turns green. Suddenly his car rockets past the starting line, touching perhaps 115 mph on the quarter-mile track." The feature goes on to say, "Sabiston knows a lot about time -- he's 90.

The conclusion to Doug's hiking book goes full circle from his dedication to his wife Dee as "steady, fearless in tight places, always helpful," and honors all of us who shared his many trails, "You know who you are. We will all camp together, again, at that wildly beautiful place, next to the creek, deep and remote in the high wilderness.