

# **A Perspective on Faculty Responsibilities: Suggestions for Local Senates**

## **I. INTRODUCTION, SUMMARY, and HISTORY of THIS DOCUMENT**

### Introduction and Summary

"A Perspective on Faculty Responsibilities: Suggestions for Local Senates" was written in response to resolutions adopted by the Academic Senate at its 1994 Spring Session. The paper provides a basis for discussion by local senates, working with their collective bargaining units as appropriate, in order to describe and promote greater faculty responsibility, including participation in governance and other activities which ultimately enhance education for our students. The paper attempts to address in a systematic manner, responsibilities of community college faculty, especially as a result of recent legislation (AB 1725) and Board of Governors adopted Title 5 regulations. Appendices to this position paper include selected Title 5 regulations and portions of AB 1725 referring to faculty responsibilities (Appendices A and B). Included also in the paper is a brief history of the growth of community college faculty involvement in governance, along with some supportive, historical documents.

Local senates, working with their collective bargaining units in areas defined by law, may adapt ideas and statements in this paper to meet local needs and requirements. As with all Senate documents, acceptance and distribution of this paper by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges does not imply that there should be conformity by local senates who may, as with other Senate position papers, use or ignore, adapt or adopt, all or parts of the following discussion.

The focus of this paper is on full-time faculty. For Senate positions on part-time faculty, please consult the Senate position paper "Part-Time Faculty in California Community Colleges" adopted Fall, 1992, and related resolutions adopted at the same session.

In the discussion of faculty responsibilities, this paper refers both to individual faculty responsibilities, as well as to responsibilities that reflect the work of the "collective" faculty in groups, committees, and organizations.

The paper begins with a brief history of community college faculty involvement in governance and in establishing policies and procedures at their colleges. The paper then cites areas of faculty responsibilities and discusses the need for administration support and union/senate

cooperation. Suggestions are made for positive steps that can be taken to promote greater participation of faculty in these areas of responsibility.

### History of This Document

This paper began with discussions by the 1993-1994 Educational Policies Committee, chaired by Jim Locke, Senate past president. Draft documents were discussed at both the 1994 Spring and Fall Sessions. At the 1994 Spring Session two resolutions were adopted that serve as the immediate impetus for the current document, which was written in response to the following resolutions:

#### 18.1 S94

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges receive the paper "Faculty Ethics: Expanding the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Ethics Statements,@ as a guideline regarding community college ethical responsibilities, and

Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend to local senates that they, using their consultation processes, adopt an ethics statement, or revise their existing statement, taking as a point of departure, the recommendations in this expansion of the AAUP Ethics Statement, and

Be it finally resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to prepare for a future session, a breakout discussing implementation of this faculty ethics document.

#### 18.2 S94

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Executive Committee to create a joint committee representing the Academic Senate and the statewide bargaining agents (CTA, CFT, Independents) and FACCC to develop implementation strategies for faculty ethics and professional responsibilities at local colleges and bring a position paper on such strategies to a future session.

On December 10, 1994 a joint Senate/organization committee met to carry out the proposal in resolution 18.1 S94.

The following paper represents some of the consensus reached by that committee. In general the committee felt that the emphasis should be on positive motivation to enhance faculty participation in carrying out their responsibilities, using monetary, reassigned time, sabbaticals, load banking and other rewards. It was felt that it would not be in the scope of this paper to deal with colleagues who may not have met their professional responsibilities or who may have behaved in what may be perceived as unethical ways. The paper does not deal with punishment, policing, or threats.

## **II. BACKGROUND - 1963-1992**

Community college faculty leaders at Senate Sessions, Great Teachers Seminars, and other state forums have indicated a lack of consensus and definition of the professional expectations and responsibilities of faculty. These discussions have led to the conclusion that a dedicated core of faculty members has had to assume an ever-increasing role in establishing and carrying out college policies and procedures. This core has been called "the fatigued few" who have accepted the challenges of AB 1725 and recent Board of Governors Title 5 regulations expanding the role of faculty and especially of academic senates. But it has not always been this way. This situation is perhaps ironic to some community college faculty who remember the "K-14 Era" where the "the Principal knows best, teachers teach, and students are pupils" attitude dominated policy making (Vice Chancellor Tom Nussbaum, CCLC Conference, 1990; see References p.12.). Beyond occasional general faculty meetings, faculty meetings concerned discipline, department, or divisional matters. District policy recommendations to local boards were commonly developed by administrators with limited faculty input.

But beginning in 1963 a series of events occurred that gradually changed the responsibilities and expectations of community college faculty. The goal was to promote the "collegial" rather than "secondary" nature of Community Colleges by emphasizing that, like our four-year college colleagues, we too should have a voice in policy and decision making. (See statements on collegiality in Appendices C, D,, and E.)

- a. In 1963 the Assembly passed ACA No. 48 giving legal recognition to local academic senates (which already existed on some campuses) and asked that provision be made for establishment of additional academic senates which would have as their purpose representing local college faculty "in the formation of policy on academic and professional matters." Later Title 5 Regulations (1964-1967 and last modified in 1990) identified how local senates would be established and the scope of their duties and responsibilities.
- b. In 1969 the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges was formed, and from the very beginning adopted resolutions recommending to local senates areas for faculty responsibility: hiring, peer evaluation, curriculum, grading, diversity, articulation, transfer, and accreditation, among others.
- c. In 1975 SB 160, also called the Rodda Bill, was passed by the legislature authorizing collective bargaining for community colleges. A key provision stated that "nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to restrict, limit, or prohibit the full exercise of the functions of any academic senate or faculty council. . . with respect to district policies on academic and professional matters, so long as the exercise of such functions does not conflict with lawful collective agreements."
- d. At the 1988 Spring Session the Academic Senate adopted the American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics which said that faculty members should "accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution." This statement also said "faculty members determine the amount and

character of the work they do outside their institution with due regard to their paramount responsibilities within it."

- e. In 1988 among other important community college reforms, Assembly Bill 1725 established that:  
"Faculty members derive their authority from their expertise as teachers and subject matter specialists and from their status as professionals. As a result, the faculty has an inherent professional responsibility in the development and implementation of policies and procedures." Among the areas in which faculty are to be involved are hiring, peer evaluation, tenure, and minimum qualifications and equivalencies.
- f. In 1990 the Board of Governors, following a statement in AB 1725 calling for the Board to establish ways to strengthen local senates, adopted new Title 5 regulations giving, for the first time, a list of academic and professional areas in which local senates are to take the lead in policy development. Among these areas are grading, curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, student success, and professional development. (See Appendix B.)
- g. In 1992 the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, working with the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the state leadership of the Trustees and CEOs organizations, developed "Guidelines for Implementation" of the Title 5 regulations strengthening local senates.

### **III. PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

Expectations and roles of full-time faculty in California's community colleges changed with the growth and development of academic senates and SB 160's granting of the option to invoke collective bargaining representation. This faculty "empowerment" brought with it increased responsibility of the faculty in college governance, in maintenance of the quality of the education within the community colleges and in maintenance of an acceptable workload and compensation for the individual faculty members.

Local college policy development and implementation, as well as contract negotiation and monitoring, where applicable, require significant faculty participation. Faculty and academic administrator hiring and evaluation, tenure review, curriculum development and review, shared governance processes, college planning, budget development, and accreditation all place new demands on faculty time. At the system-wide level, there are expanding needs for faculty on Academic Senate for California Community Colleges committees, Chancellor's Office task forces and advisory boards, and in the other state-wide professional groups that need to be aware of, and participate in, the new decision making processes and procedures.

### **IV. DEFINING FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES AND EXPECTATIONS**

With community college faculty's new roles in institutional leadership, we are faced with several challenges:

- a. defining the faculty's new responsibilities.
- b. providing positive motivation for faculty to assume these new responsibilities
- c. exploring options that strengthen faculty participation

#### Faculty Involvement Required by Law

- a. Ensuring Effective Hiring Processes

Local academic senates have a specific mandate established by AB 1725 to reach joint agreement with local boards of trustees on the development and procedural implementation of local hiring policy. Significant demands on faculty time are required by faculty participation in the adopted hiring procedures, including the important obligation of understanding and implementing affirmative action regulations and policies. Faculty must also participate in the review of equivalencies to the minimum qualifications for hire, and in college procedures associated with administrative retreat to faculty status.

The challenge is to broadly involve faculty in these responsibilities and ensure the quality of new hires and administrators who are reassigned to the classroom.

- b. Ensuring Effective Evaluation and Tenure Review Processes

Where collective bargaining has been established, the local agents have a mandate, in consultation with local academic senates, to develop faculty tenure review and faculty "peer-based" evaluation. These tenure review and evaluation policies and procedures have made the maintenance of professional expectations for California Community Colleges a faculty responsibility. Faculty must accept the responsibility to evaluate colleagues and to view that evaluation as a means for improving instruction. The stress and time that accompany peer evaluation should be acknowledged.

It has been observed that the confluence of the need to assure, to the best of our ability, quality service to students, the individual faculty member's contribution to the profession and the general fiscal health of the college/district has brought many local academic senates and collective bargaining units together to address the hiring, evaluation, and tenure review issues in an integrated manner. The more integrated and effective of these plans, including new faculty mentoring programs, create more demands on faculty.

The challenge is to successfully involve faculty in evaluation and tenure processes which include clear professional expectations of faculty.

- c. Ensuring Effective Curriculum Processes

For local academic senates, the community college Board of Governors' regulations (see Appendix B) which implemented the AB 1725 mandate to strengthen local senates as the representative voice of faculty established important responsibilities in curriculum and related matters. The responsibility requires faculty participation in course approval processes which are deliberative and college-wide and assure that courses meet statewide Title 5 requirements. Before the "strengthening senates" regulations, Board of Governors had already adopted Title 5 language requiring that curriculum committees be committees of local academic senates or committees created by agreement with local senates. The primary role of community college faculty in curriculum has finally been established.

For example, the development of critical thinking components for all courses, infusion of multicultural perspectives into courses, writing across the curriculum, prerequisite and assessment reviews, and revisions to courses that maintain articulation to the senior segments, i.e., revisions necessary for meeting the requirements of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum, have created significant individual and collective faculty responsibilities. These activities are in addition to the individual faculty member's discipline specific research and analysis, course development, updating, or revision, classroom implementation, and evaluation for effectiveness.

The challenge is to broadly involve faculty in a variety of the collective and individual curriculum-related responsibilities.

d. Ensuring Faculty Involvement in College Policy Development and Implementation

AB 1725 established the necessity of assuring a faculty perspective in the entire range of academic and professional matters of the community colleges. Whether through "primary reliance upon" or "mutual agreement with" academic senates or through agreed-upon, college-wide "shared governance" processes, these agreements have made significant increased demands on both individual and collective faculty.

The challenge is to broadly involve faculty in a wide range of academic policy development and implementation processes.

Other Areas of Faculty Responsibility

Higher education faculty members are expected to serve their students, their communities, and their discipline organization needs beyond their classroom or primary assignments. There are a variety of student and community service activities that are provided by faculty which can benefit students. Faculty mentor individual students and support campus student organizations and clubs as advisers. At many colleges faculty offer academic advising. Faculty participate in activities designed to enhance the college-to-community relationship. Faculty often offer direct

assistance to their communities' needs with their expertise, in such ways as volunteering as speakers at community events. Community college faculty also attend conferences of their professional discipline organizations and participate in the work of these groups; some in California have been elected to state and national offices in these organizations. Serving the needs of students, communities and discipline organizations increase the demands on the individual community college faculty member as well as on the collective faculty.

The challenge is to broadly involve faculty in these service functions as appropriate to the community college mission.

## **V. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT**

AB 1725 established that community colleges need the type of administrator "who can lead, organize, plan and supervise; who understands the needs of faculty and the learning process; and who values institutional governance based upon a genuine sharing of responsibility with faculty colleagues." Many community college Boards of Trustees and administrators have genuinely accepted the importance of shared governance, while some others have resisted the faculty governance roles. Faculty should recognize that colleges need trustees and administrators to function and that at the same time trustees and administrators may need to be educated regarding the implementation of Section 53200-53204 of Title 5 (Strengthening Local Senates). This document is in Appendix B.

The challenge here is for faculty to work with administrators and local boards to achieve full and appropriate faculty participation in local governance.

## **VI. ACADEMIC SENATE/COLLECTIVE BARGAINING COOPERATION**

Academic Senates and, where they exist, collective bargaining agents have clearly defined roles, but they also have some important intersecting spheres of responsibility. AB 1725 originally called for a review of the Education Employees Relations Act and its appropriateness in light of the community college governance mandated by AB 1725. This study was never carried out, and in general, faculty senate and collective bargaining leaders have supported the suspension of this study given the development of the Title 5 regulations strengthening local academic senates and the Academic Senate/CCLC "Guidelines for Implementation of Section 53200-53204 of the Administrative Code of California" mentioned above (Gabriner, 1990; CPER, 1992; see References p.12.). There remain concerns, however, and the 1993 Fall Session of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted the following resolution: "Be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to study relations between local academic senates and their collective bargaining agents, making recommendations and developing a model outlining strategies toward effective collegial

relationships between these organizations." (For complete text of this resolution see Appendix F.) The Senate's Relations with Local Senates Committee is preparing a document attempting to meet the intent of this resolution.

## **VII. A FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL**

### Community College Faculty Professionalism

Community college faculty members are professionals. Faculty members are self-directed and, to a certain extent, decide the nature and the extent of their professional obligations. At the 1994 Spring Session the Academic Senate received a document entitled "Faculty Ethics: Expanding the AAUP Ethics Statement." This document, a revision of an earlier paper (Spring 1988: "Why the Academic Senate Should Adopt the AAUP Ethics Statement"), was recommended to local senates for their consideration in discussing local ethics policies.

### Development of Local Responsibilities of Community College Faculty

It is recommended that local academic senates work with their collective bargaining agents in addressing the issue of faculty responsibilities. Wide distribution by local senates of this paper and the Faculty Ethics paper referred to above may help the discussion. It is recommended that local faculty develop college strategies that provide positive incentives for faculty participation in the many areas of shared governance discussed in this paper.

Given the extraordinary workload demands on California's community college faculty, it is recommended that faculty be given significant flexibility to match their time, current interests, and talents to the specific responsibilities they assume during any particular period. Strategies adopted by the faculty and recommended for college policy should serve to increase the achievement of the individual and collective faculty responsibilities. The ultimate aim of this achievement is improved quality education for our students.

### Guidelines for the Definition of Faculty Expectations

Discussions with faculty leadership at breakouts on this topic at sessions of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges have suggested the following four categories of professional activities which higher education faculty perform beyond their classroom or student-contact responsibilities: (1) individual and collective pedagogical development; (2) local and statewide policy development; (3) scholarship; and (4) student/community service.

There has also been discussion, and disagreement, as to the extent that an individual faculty member should be responsible for involvement within this range of activities. There has been considerable debate at the state level regarding this issue focusing on whether or not faculty should be expected to act adequately in all areas or whether current working conditions of community college faculty make it difficult for every faculty member to perform effectively in



each of the areas.

While the four categories may provide a range of acceptable activities within them, it is suggested that the individual faculty member should have considerable choice in the major area(s) where they will concentrate their primary efforts. This strategy would recognize the current high workload for community college faculty, but would also accommodate the faculty member's current interests, abilities, and judgment about what will best benefit their students as a result of the faculty member's professional activities.

1. A Professional Development Category

This category would consider faculty work devoted to improvement of the skills of our profession. For example, faculty who work to develop their individual pedagogical skills or expertise and work with colleagues to improve the profession through faculty mentoring, workshops, conferences, individual consultation, publication, and serving on the boards of professional discipline organizations would be performing professional activities.

2. A Governance Category

Governance includes the work that faculty does to develop and implement local and statewide community college policies as well as legislative decision-making about the community colleges. Examples include the development of a statewide policy/legislation expertise and participation in state-wide, district, college, and department committees and local or state-wide governmental activities.

3. A Community College Research Category

While research is not normally expected of community college faculty, it is recommended that this category allow for consideration of faculty work devoted to classroom-based or wider research appropriate to the community colleges mission and functions. A wide range of possibilities exist and might include scholarly research and dissemination of research focused on improving community college instruction, fulfillment of the community college missions, student assessment, basic skills, multiculturalism, critical reading, writing, and thinking in addition to discipline specific issues. Discipline related and creative research activities are encouraged. Recognition should be given to authoring professional books, articles, and related materials.

4. Community/Student Services Category

This category would consider work devoted to the wide range of student or community service activities. Examples include campus student club or organization advising,

participation in student mentoring, or working with community organizations that further the educational and/or access goals of the community colleges.

### **VIII. ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

The Academic Senate recommends that local senates work with their collective bargaining agents to develop college and district policies which reward and encourage fulfillment of each faculty member's professional responsibilities. It is strongly recommended that incentives be considered as a way to promote participation in the many areas that are now expected of community college faculty.

Some strategies for consideration include:

X establishment of the professional expectations that individual faculty have in respect to the four categories;

X development of mechanisms that promote faculty fulfillment of professional expectations in tenure review and peer evaluation; (see also Academic Senate adopted paper "Toward a Model Four-year Tenure Process, "adopted November, 1990.)

X implementation of reassigned time policies;

X creation of professional development policies using faculty responsibilities criteria for awarding of funds;

X establishment of sabbatical leave policies with professional expectation components;

X criteria for use of flexible calendar time to pursue professional development and activities in the four categories;

X policies and practices which support new faculty in order to promote new faculty understanding of and fulfillment of their professional expectations and responsibilities; and

X development of professional achievement awards that promote excellence

beyond basic faculty expectations. (See the Foothill/DeAnza model in Appendix G.) The Foothill/DeAnza model includes monetary rewards using a perpetual fund.

#### Addressing Administrative Support

Faculty need administrative support in order to effectively participate in the development and implementation of policy on academic and professional matters. This administrative support should include clerical, technical, and other help.

#### Addressing the Academic Senate/Collective Bargaining Relationship

In working toward a new post-AB 1725 understanding of the community college faculty profession, this paper has focused primarily on ways to help local faculty accept and appreciate their professional responsibility, recognizing the role of collective bargaining in the process. Local senates and collective bargaining units should work toward a mutual understanding of their respective roles in the shared governance arena.

### **IX. CONCLUSION**

This paper has responded to requests for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to address the issue of faculty professionalism in the community colleges. The paper has maintained that local academic senates and collective bargaining agents (where they exist) have a shared responsibility to create a body of community college professionalism. It is toward this end that the paper was written. It is hoped that this document will promote local dialogue and provide a suggested framework in which that local dialogue may proceed.

#### **References:**

Nussbaum, T., 1990. Community College Governance: Issues for the Year 2000, A presentation at the Community College League of California (CCLC) Conference, November 1990.

*Adopted Spring 1995*

Gabriner, Bob, 1990, Letter of Support for Senate Regulations, Community College Council of the CFT, AFT, AFL-CIO, letter of November 15, 1990.

CPER, 1992, Senate-Trustees Pact Ends Criticism over Senate Role in Governance, California Public Employee Relations, Institute of Industrial Relations, UC. Berkeley, no. 95, August, 1992, pages 31-32.

## **1993 Fall Session of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges**

### **Resolution 12.3 F93 Local Senates: Senate-Union Relations**

Whereas AB 1725 mandates duties which are incidental to faculty's professional responsibility, and

Whereas AB 1725 recognizes local academic senates as the representative voice on all academic and professional matters, and

Whereas Title 5, Section 53204, mandates that a district's governance policy cannot impinge upon collective bargaining agents, and

Whereas faculty's interest is best served when academic senates and collective bargaining agents work collegially toward the greater good and welfare of faculty,

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to study relations between local academic senates and their collective bargaining agents making recommendations and developing a model outlining strategies toward effective collegial relationships between these organizations.

**Appendix A**

**Appendix B**

**Appendix C**

**Appendix D**

**Appendix E**

Appendix F      Appendix G

The Role of the Academic Senate  
in the Contemporary Community College

AB 1725 INTENT LANGUAGE

The Expansion of Faculty Responsibilities

Hiring and Ensuring Quality

Tenure and Ensuring Quality

A Perspective on Faculty Responsibilities:  
Suggestions for Local Senates

**ABSTRACT**

This paper was written in response to a Senate resolution, asking for a discussion of faculty responsibilities. The initial paper was written by the 1993-94 Educational Policies Committee, Jim Locke, Chair. That paper was discussed at breakouts at the 1994 Spring and Fall Sessions of the Academic Senate. Based on those discussions and on suggestions made by representatives from faculty organizations who met in December, 1994, the current paper was written by the 1994-95 Educational Policies Committee. The paper was adopted by the 1995 Spring Session. It is hoped that this document will be of use to local senates, who may choose to use or ignore, adopt or adapt, all or parts of the paper. Documents referred to in the paper may be obtained by calling or writing the Academic Senate Office.

The paper begins with a brief history of community college faculty involvement in governance and in establishing policies and procedures at their colleges. The paper then cites areas of faculty responsibilities and discusses the need for administration support and union/senate cooperation. Suggestions are made for positive steps that can be taken to promote greater participation of faculty in these areas of responsibility.

Educational Policies Committee  
1994-1995

Edith Conn - Ventura College, Chair  
Tony Gamble - West Los Angeles College  
Jim Higgs - Modesto Junior College  
Frances Lozano - Hartnell College  
Leslyn Polk - North Orange County Community College District  
Gloria Romero - Chaffey College  
Beverly Shue - Los Angeles Harbor College  
Robert Rockwell - Mt. San Jacinto College, CIO Representative  
Paul Mitchell - Orange Coast College, CalSACC Representative