



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Roll Call Vote on recent budget decision		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: V. C.	
		Attachment:	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	M. Grimes-Hillman	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	First Reading	
		Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will hold an official roll call vote to retain a Human Resources (HR) Specialist lawyer at \$360 per hour.

BACKGROUND:

(Please include the following components: issue, implication, analysis, relevant ASCCC positions/resolutions/policies, or any other useful data or information.)

The Senate President asked the Executive Committee via email on March 7, 2014 to consider retaining a HR Specialist Lawyer at \$360.00 per hour. Although email was exchanged, it is not the official mechanism for budget decisions. While the conclusion was to retain a lawyer, it is important that all budget decisions be held in a regular open session.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Recommendation to Retain an HR Firm		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: V. D	
		Attachment: YES / NO	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith, Julie Bruno, Dan Crump	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	First Reading	X
		Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will consider for approval funds to hire and retain an HR firm for general support and expertise on personnel matters

BACKGROUND:

The Senate occasionally runs into human resources matters that are best handled by a third party, and this type of work can be outsourced to companies that provide such services for an hourly fee or by contract for specific services. One such firm has already provided a bid of \$100 per hour to provide such services. We are soliciting other bids for the work. At this time, we would like Exec to authorize expenditure of funds to hire and retain a firm that can assist with HR matters in a timely way.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Elections		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: V. E	
		Attachment: YES / NO	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Dan Crump	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will consider how best to address proposed resolution 1.01 S14 to modify the ASCCC Rules related to elections if the delegates pass the resolution.

BACKGROUND:

(Please include the following components: issue, implication, analysis, relevant ASCCC positions/resolutions/policies, or any other useful data or information.)

Proposed Resolution 1.01 S14 requests that the Elections Chair "announce from the podium the names of delegates whose signatures need to be validated and allow up to five minutes for the individuals to report to the Elections Chair to provide validation prior to discarding the ballot and totaling votes. Effective for the Spring 2014 Plenary Session." If this resolution is presented, debated, and adopted at this plenary session it would go in to effect immediately. However, the intent of the resolution may not be accomplished since the elections begin prior to the resolutions voting. The Executive Committee will consider how best to address concerns raised by the author of the resolution while respecting the ASCCC current policies and practices.

The problem is that our Elections Rules require us to distribute the election process to the delegates the day prior to the elections, specifically I. G. Elections Procedure 1) states "The process by which the election will be conducted shall be distributed in writing prior to the day of the election," which implies that the full process is known to all delegates prior to the day of the election.

In reviewing the current Election Rules, the approved Election Guidelines, and past practice, the Elections Chair recommends the following for the Executive Committee to consider:

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

The Elections Chair recommends that the Executive Committee consider the following recommendation: Address the concern and try to accommodate the request without changes to the Elections Rules. For example, if a ballot is disqualified, the Elections Chair will immediately seek out the individual to verify identity. If the individual is not identified by searching the room, the Elections Chair will, from the podium, ask for the individual to meet the Elections Chair at the registration table immediately. If the individual does not immediately see the Elections Chair, the ballot will be disqualified.

The Executive Committee will also discuss the Officer candidate forum format.



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Survey of ASCCC Committee and Task Force Evaluation		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: V. F	
		Attachment: YES / NO	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	First Reading	X
		Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will approve a survey to be distributed to Exec members and current committee and task force members about their experiences this year.

BACKGROUND:

For the last few years, the Executive Committee has merged, put on hiatus, or added new committees and task forces in order to accomplish the work of the Senate. Last spring, the Executive Committee was surveyed about the merging of some committees and the effectiveness of that strategy. For this year, some committees were separated again, and task forces were added to address specific resolutions, paper writing, or other work. A survey should go out to all committee and task force members to gather feedback for assigning work for next year. A draft survey is attached.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

Evaluation of Committee and Task Force Structure for Exec and Assignment of Committee Members

Over the last few years, the Senate has been piloting different committee structures to accomplish our work, placing some committees on hiatus and adding task forces, and along with modifications to the number and scope of committees, we also tried a different approach to the process for selecting committee/task force members. The results from this survey will help the Executive Committee assess the strengths and weaknesses of the strategies employed so far.

1. Please identify who you are:

Executive Committee member

Returning member to the committee or task force this year (you served on this same group last year)

New member to this committee and with prior experience serving on an ASCCC committee or assignment

New member to this committee with no prior experience serving on an ASCCC committee or assignment

2. How many committee or task force assignments did you have this year?

3. The work of our committee or task force was clearly defined (need a way for Exec members and some faculty to address multiple assignments).

Yes/No - Comment

4. I understood my role on the committee or task force (ditto from #3).

Yes/No - Comment

5. If you served on any ASCCC committees, task forces, or other assignments in the past, how did your work this year compare with your experiences of past committees/task forces?

6. If you could change one thing about your committee/task force this year, what would it be?

7. How did the process for appointments to a committee/task force work for you this year?"

8. Other comments for improving the committee process



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Recommendation on Deferral Payback		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: V. G	
		Attachment: NO	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	David Morse	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

Offer feedback or if appropriate direction to the Senate president and vice-president regarding Senate positions on the State Budget to be used in a meeting with other faculty leaders.

BACKGROUND:

(Please include the following components: issue, implication, analysis, relevant ASCCC positions/resolutions/policies, or any other useful data or information.)

At the March 19 COFO (Council of Faculty Organizations) meeting, attendees suggested a special meeting to discuss the state budget and, if possible, to develop a unified set of faculty positions and priorities regarding the budget that all of the faculty organizations could support. This special meeting will take place on Thursday, April 17 at the FACCC Office in Sacramento. The purpose of this agenda item is to equip the Senate representatives on COFO, the Senate president and vice-president, with appropriate input and direction to guide them in the special meeting.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Board of Governors/Consultation Council Meetings		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: VII. A.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Information and Written Reports	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith/David Morse	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Tonya Davis	Action	
		Information	x

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will be updated about the Board of Governors and Consultation Council Meetings.

BACKGROUND:

President Smith and Vice President Morse will provide highlights of the meetings. Members are encouraged to review the agendas and summary notes (website links below) and come prepared to ask questions.

Full agendas and meeting summaries are available online at:

<http://extranet.cccco.edu/SystemOperations/BoardofGovernors/Meetings.aspx>

<http://extranet.cccco.edu/SystemOperations/ConsultationCouncil/AgendasandSummaries.aspx>

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

Officers of the Board

Manuel Baca, *President*

Geoffrey L. Baum, *Vice President*

Chancellor's Office

Brice W. Harris, *Chancellor*

Members of the Board of Governors

Manuel Baca

Jena Barrera

Geoffrey L. Baum

Natalie Berg

Joseph J. Bielanski, Jr.

Danny E. Hawkins

Lance T. Izumi

Deborah Malumed

Henry A.J. Ramos

Gary Reed

**March 3-4, 2014
Chancellor's Office
1102 Q Street, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811**

**2014 Board of Governors
Meeting Schedule**

Sacramento, CA

January 13-14, 2014

March 3-4, 2014

May 19-20, 2014

July 7-8, 2014

September 8-9, 2014

*November 17-18, 2014
(Foothill-De Anza CCD)*

**2015 Board of Governors
Meeting Schedule**

Sacramento, CA

January 20-21, 2015

March 16-17, 2015

May 18-19, 2015

July 20-21, 2015

September 21-22, 2015

November 16-17, 2015

Mission Statement

**“Empowering Community Colleges Through
Leadership, Advocacy and Support.”**

The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, by statute, provides leadership and policy direction in the continuing development of the California Community Colleges system. Among its charges are establishing minimum academic and personnel standards; evaluating and reporting on the fiscal and educational effectiveness of the 72 districts; conducting research and providing appropriate information services; and administering fiscal support programs (both operational and capital outlay).

The 17-member board, appointed by the governor, includes 12 public members (two of whom must be current or former elected members of local boards); one voting and one non-voting student member currently enrolled in a community college; two voting tenured faculty members; and one voting classified staff member.

The work of the board is supported by the staff of the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office.

Board of Governors Meeting

Monday, March 3, 2014

12:00 noon*

Chancellor's Office

1102 Q Street, 3rd Floor

Sacramento, CA 95811

916-445-8572

All Board of Governors meetings are held in locations that are wheelchair accessible. Other disability-related accommodations, such as alternate media materials, sign language interpreters, or real time transcription, will be provided to persons with disabilities upon request. Persons requesting such accommodations should notify Clarissa Rangel at 1102 Q Street, Sacramento, California, 95811 or crangel@cccco.edu, 916.445.8508, no less than five working days prior to the meeting. The Chancellor's Office will make efforts to meet requests made after such date, if possible.

Public testimony will be invited in conjunction with board discussion on each item. A written request to address the board shall be made on the form provided at the meeting.

Persons wishing to make a presentation to the board on a subject not on the agenda shall address the board during the time listed for public forum.

Items placed on the consent calendar will be voted on by a single board action, without staff or public presentations, and without board discussion. Any board member may remove an item from consent by informing the president of this intent. A member of the public may request that an item be removed from consent by filling out a request to testify in accordance with section 41 of these Procedures and Standing Orders of the Board of Governors, or by asking a board member to remove an item from consent. The item shall then be removed from consent if any board member exercises his or her authority to remove an item from consent.

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance

President's Report

Chancellor's Report

Chancellor's Office

Brice W. Harris
Chancellor

Erik Skinner
Deputy Chancellor

Michelle Goldberg
Interim
General Counsel

Paul Feist
Vice Chancellor for
Communications

Linda Michalowski
Vice Chancellor for
Student Services and
Special Programs

Patrick Perry
Vice Chancellor for
Technology, Research, and
Information Services

Vince Stewart
Vice Chancellor for
Government Relations

Van Ton-Quinlivan
Vice Chancellor for
Workforce and Economic
Development

Dan Troy
Vice Chancellor for
Fiscal Policy

CONSENT CALENDAR

January 13-14, 2014, Meeting Minutes (Erik Skinner) Item 1.1

This item recommends approval of the January 13-14, 2014, board meeting minutes.

Approval of Contracts and Grants (Erik Skinner) Item 1.2

This item recommends that the Board of Governors approve entering into the contracts and grants described in the March 2014 agenda.

Trustee Election Waiver at a Community College District (Michelle Goldberg) Item 1.3

This item presents a trustee election waiver request submitted by the San Bernardino Community College District.

ACTION

Approval of Los Rios Community College District's West Sacramento Educational Center (Frederick Harris) Item 2.1

This item requests board approval of the West Sacramento Educational Center in the Los Rios Community College District.

INFORMATION AND REPORTS

Joint Appearance of the Three Leaders of California's Public Higher Education Systems (Paul Feist) Item 3.1

This item presents information on areas of mutual interest and collaboration among the three systems of public higher education.

Foundation for California Community Colleges Fiscal Sponsorships: Partnering for Success (Keetha Mills) Item 3.2

This item presents information on the Foundation's fiscal sponsorship services.

New Board of Governors Fee Waiver Regulations Impact (Linda Michalowski) Item 3.3

This item presents information on questions asked by the Board of Governors regarding the impacts of the Board of Governors fee waiver.

Assembly Bill 86 Adult Education Consortium Program: Implementation Update (Van Ton-Quinlivan) Item 3.4

This item presents information on the status of the adult education regional planning under Assembly Bill 86, Section 76, Article 3.

State and Federal Legislative Update (Vince Stewart) Item 3.5

This item presents information on state and federal legislative activities.

**The time listed for the Board of Governors meetings are approximate. Meetings may begin earlier or later than scheduled, depending upon when a previous meeting adjourns.*

PUBLIC FORUM

People wishing to make a presentation to the board on a subject not on the agenda shall observe the following procedures:

- A. A written request to address the board shall be made on the form provided at the meeting.
- B. Written testimony may be of any length, but 50 copies of any written material are to be provided.
- C. An oral presentation is limited to three minutes. A group wishing to present on the same subject is limited to 10 minutes.

NEW BUSINESS

RECESS

Tuesday, March 4, 2014
9:00 a.m.*
Chancellor's Office
1102 Q Street, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
916-445-8752

INFORMATION AND REPORTS

2014 Hayward Award for Excellence in Education (Beth Smith) Item 4.1

This item presents the four 2014 Hayward Award for Excellence in Education recipients.

Update on Student Success Initiative Implementation – System Goals (Patrick Perry) Item 4.2

This item presents information on the goals aligned with student success for the California Community Colleges system.

California Community Colleges Baccalaureate Degree Study Group Report (Erik Skinner) Item 4.3

This item presents information on the Report from the California Community Colleges Baccalaureate Degree Study Group.

Board Member Reports Item 4.4

Board members will report on their activities since the last board meeting.

PUBLIC FORUM

People wishing to make a presentation to the board on a subject not on the agenda shall observe the following procedures:

- A. A written request to address the board shall be made on the form provided at the meeting.
- B. Written testimony may be of any length, but 50 copies of any written material are to be provided.
- C. An oral presentation is limited to three minutes. A group wishing to present on the same subject is limited to 10 minutes.

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

**The time listed for the Board of Governors meetings are approximate. Meetings may begin earlier or later than scheduled, depending upon when a previous meeting adjourns.*

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLORS OFFICE**

1102 Q STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811
(916) 445-8752
<http://www.cccco.edu>



**AGENDA
Consultation Council
Thursday, March 20, 2014
Chancellor's Office, Room 3B and 3C
9:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
1102 Q Street, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811**

The items on this agenda will be discussed at the upcoming Consultation Council Meeting.

1. February 20, 2014, meeting summary
2. Student Senate Update
3. State and Federal Legislative Update
4. Faculty Obligation Number
5. California Community Colleges Baccalaureate Degree Study Group Report
6. Quality Education
7. Enrollment Priority Regulations
8. Other



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: C-ID/TMC Update		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: VII. B	
		Attachment: NO	
CATEGORY:	Executive Committee Discussion Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	J. Bruno	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	First Reading	
		Action	
		Information	x

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will be updated by on the work of C-ID/TMC and the issues, processes, and policies.

BACKGROUND:

Update on C-ID/TMC:

- C-ID
 - 112 CCC's
 - 6699 courses with C-ID designations approved (as of 3/24/2014)
 - 12 CSU campuses have identified 1183 CSU courses as comparable to C-ID descriptors (as of 3/24/2014)

- TMC
 - 1147 AA-T and AS-T degrees approved by the CCC CO as of 2/26/14

 - TMC Vetting:
 - Open - Biology (Closes April 7, 2014)
 - Closed - Child and Adolescent Development and Nutrition/Food Science/Dietetics
 - Model Curriculum Vetting:
 - Open - Engineering (Closes May 5, 2014)
 - Closed – Nursing and Information Technology/Information Systems

More information may be found on the March 2014 C-ID Newsletter and on the C-ID website

Update on ICW:

The following items and issues were addressed at the February 24th ICW meeting:

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

- ICW is investigating possible benefits to developing model curriculum in the following disciplines: Communicative Disorders, Nursing, Engineering, Hotel/Hospitality, Family and Consumer Science, Recreation Administration, Public Administration and Political Science.
- The Chemistry TMC with the addition of the Math 900s descriptor will be distributed to the public.
- In response to SB440, ICW has approved exploring the following disciplines for possible Area of Emphasis degrees: Ethnic Studies, Exercise Science/Allied Health, STEM, and Global Studies/International relations.
- The ICAS IGETC Standards subcommittee has incorporated IGETC for STEM into the IGETC Standards. Model catalog language for ADTs using IGETC for STEM will be discussed at an upcoming ICW meeting.
- A draft MOU between the CSU and the CCC is under discussion at ICW.

All approved ICW policies may be accessed on the C-ID website: <http://www.c-id.net/policies.html>



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Presidents Report		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: VII. C	
		Attachment: YES / NO	
CATEGORY:	Information and Written Reports	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	First Reading	
		Action	
		Information	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

To inform the Executive Committee of the activities of the President.

BACKGROUND:

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

Julie Adams

From: Beth Smith <bethmathsmith@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 9, 2014 5:49 PM
To: Beth Smith; crico@sdsccd.edu; Dan Crump; David Morse; Dianna Chiabotti; Dolores Davison; freitaje@lacitycollege.edu; John Stankas; Julie Adams; Julie Bruno; Lesley Kawaguchi; Michelle Grimes-Hillman; Philip Smith; Wheeler North
Subject: Weekly Update for Exec March 9
Categories: Executive Committee

Hi everyone,

The last week was filled with fabulous faculty, funding, and another visit to a college - Columbia. What a gorgeous place! And we were treated to a thunderstorm during the night.

1. BOG - The meeting was focused on the BOGFW and the regulations that exempt some cohorts of students from maintaining academic standards in order to keep the waiver. Many individuals testified on behalf of adding EOPS, DSPS, CalWORKS and CARE students to the exemptions allowed for foster youth.

The performance metrics and goals were also reviewed by the BOG. It was basically the same presentation that was shared at Consultation Council on Feb. 20. The goals will go back to Consultation for more discussion this month or in April, and the BOG will take action on them in May. David and I can both address the goals at the Area meetings since both of us heard the same presentations at BOG and Consultation. The baccalaureate was also discussed, and I testified about our 2010 oppose position to expanding the mission of CCCs and possible resolutions on the topic at spring plenary.

The Hayward Award winners were treated to dinner with the BOG, Chancellor, and Chancellor's Office staff along with David and me. The presentation on Tuesday was wonderful, and we recognized our first two part time faculty winners ever. Here is a snippet of the thank you note I received from one of the PT winners, Rebecca Sarkisian, music, (Fresno City College):

"I am deeply honored and most grateful. Allow me to say, how proud I am to be in the first group of adjunct faculty honored in this way. Thank you for extending the award to include part time faculty. As I said, I believe this reflects the executive committee's (and all others involved with this decision) insight, understanding and appreciation of the contributions of adjunct faculty. It truly sends a significant and positive message. Thank you."

My thanks to MGH, S&P, and all the staff involved in selecting the winners and facilitating the dinner and presentation ceremony at the BOG.

2. Department of Finance - I met with DOF analysts again this week to discuss the faculty perspective of the governor's proposed budget and an increase to the Senate's budget. When the analysts hear of the magnitude of work that the Senate does, its legislative mandates, and its goodwill to support all the student success initiatives in the state, it's easy to convince them that the

Senate's budget is inadequate. I've asked treasurer Wheeler to prepare a draft letter that we can send to DOF as a request for increased funding. Depending on timing, the budget and finance committee may be able to discuss it at our meeting later this month, but if not, we'll circulate something via email. The amount on the table right now as a possible increase for next year is \$150,000 which would bring our Senate grant to \$618,000 and represents a 32% increase, if we get it. FACCC is also advocating for an increased ASCCC budget, and they were instrumental in securing our budget increase last year. Thank goodness for FACCC. Laying this groundwork now with DOF will make it easier to protect our funding in the future. Please try to find a lucky charm during this month of leprechauns to ensure a positive result in the May revise!

3. Student Success Center for California - Congratulations to California! We are one of three states in the nation to receive funding to create a student success center for community college students. The Senate is part of a coalition of goodwill partners brought together by the Chancellor's Office and the Foundation for CCCs. The invitation to join the groups engaged with the project represents an important change about how the Senate is viewed within the CO and FCCC. More faculty appointments will be necessary in the near future as the work begins this spring.

4. Columbia College - The CIO and DE coordinator at the college invited Pat James Hanz and me to visit with the college to talk about online education. We were there most of the day on Wednesday with presentations and activities to help them develop policies and next steps for the DE program at the college. Half of the program was streamed to Modesto Junior College so it was a district wide event. The college is in a beautiful part of the state and has a stream running through the middle of campus with a lake on the grounds too.

5. Council of Chief Librarians - I was invited to give a report on hot topics for the Senate to the CCL. The program had a great combination of interesting speakers, and the keynote presenter might be a good choice for a future plenary. She spoke about how technology is changing the world or work which is a good segue into why GE matters and the need to create engaging GE.

6. CTE Regionals - Wheeler mentioned in one of his emails the success of the regional meetings for CTE. I'm glad to hear it since I didn't attend the regional meetings but look forward to speaking with faculty about their experience over the next few weeks. We seem to get a big bang for our buck, so to speak, by sponsoring regional meetings on select topics. I think faculty like one day events where a lot of information is shared in a short amount of time.

Beth

--

Beth Smith

President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Professor of Mathematics, Grossmont College

beth.smith@gcccd.edu

619-249-3114

Julie Adams

From: Beth Smith <bethmathsmith@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 16, 2014 6:16 PM
To: Beth Smith; crico@sdccd.edu; Dan Crump; David Morse; Dianna Chiabotti; Dolores Davison; freitaje@lacitycollege.edu; John Stanskas; Julie Adams; Julie Bruno; Lesley Kawaguchi; Michelle Grimes-Hillman; Philip Smith; Wheeler North
Subject: Weekly Update for Exec March 16

Hi all,

Area meetings are next week! I know you have been working feverishly to finish breakout descriptions and preparing for our first review of resolutions for spring plenary. Thanks in advance for all the good work you're going to do next weekend, and thanks Area reps for your leadership at these important meetings with the field.

1. Curriculum Regionals - I attended the south regional meeting at the San Diego Continuing Education campus. It was a great opportunity for faculty to discuss curriculum issues and gain support for the challenging work of curriculum leaders. Good work John S and your committee!
2. CCCAOE - I was invited to present at the conference for the vocational administrators and faculty on the Common Core State Standards for K-12 and the impact on community colleges. It was a great conversation with a packed room. We really have an opportunity to be leaders in the state regarding CCSS and how to improve the transition from high school to CCCs for all students.
3. More on CCSS - The National Governors' Grant to determine a plan for higher education partners to help the transition to CCSS was launched on Friday last week. We had several faculty participate, including David and me, and important options will be forthcoming.
4. Student Equity - Dianna attended a conference on student equity in my stead on Friday that was sponsored by CCLC. Equity is a main theme for them this year. Now that colleges must submit student equity plans in the fall, we need to give academic senates help with writing the new plans. Thanks Cynthia for including student equity plans in your breakout at plenary.
5. Rostrum - The latest edition should be out soon. I know that there are some timely articles in it for you and faculty, including messages that you wanted faculty to know before Area meetings and plenary. Hopefully, it should be out soon. Thanks to Dolores for keeping tabs on it.
6. Attorney and Mediator - Julie B, Dan and I will meet with the attorney this week. Mediation has finally been scheduled for the first week of April.

Beth

--

Beth Smith
President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Professor of Mathematics, Grossmont College

beth.smith@gcccd.edu

619-249-3114

Julie Adams

From: Beth Smith <bethmathsmith@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2014 6:02 PM
To: Beth Smith; crico@sdccd.edu; Dan Crump; David Morse; Dianna Chiabotti; Dolores Davison; freitaje@lacitycollege.edu; John Stanskas; Julie Adams; Julie Bruno; Lesley Kawaguchi; Michelle Grimes-Hillman; Philip Smith; Wheeler North
Subject: Weekly Update to Exec Mar 29

Hi all,

Area meetings were a great success! Thanks to all of you for helping take minutes, providing information about resolutions, and creating goodwill among the faculty. Plenary is fast approaching and I know that you have a ton of work to do to prepare. Thanks in advance for all your efforts. (Some of these events took place the week of Area meetings making this report rather long.)

1. Implementation Oversight Committee - The oversight group for SB 1440/440 continues to meet to work out details for awarding associate degrees, communication to CSU, admission issues, TMC development, and other related concerns. Our colleges continue to make excellent progress with 1176 approved ADTs.
2. COFO - Once again our colleagues on COFO discussed the opportunity to seek funding for hiring more full time faculty. We also discussed several pieces of legislation to learn of each other's positions. David will have more to report at Exec next week.
3. Consultation Council - We spent a good amount of time discussing quality education experiences for students and how the FON and similar laws and regulations can impact a college's ability to create a high quality environment. Also related to that conversation is the required budget match for SSSP funding, and there is consensus around trying to reduce the required match. A task group will be formed to review issues surrounding the FON.
4. Meeting with Brice - I had my regular meeting with Brice to discuss the mission of community colleges, the parcel tax legislation, performance metrics, and accreditation issues. He and I seem to be able to find common ground on a number of issues which helps to strengthen the position of the Senate.

I heard from the CSU Senate Chair that Brice spoke at the CSU board meeting and gave a wholehearted shout out to all the faculty working on SB 1440/440.
5. Budget and Finance Committee - Recommendations from B&FC will be headed to Exec in the next agenda.
6. College and Career Readiness - The system response to CCSS and how to help transition to the new standards and assessments are under development, but everyone agrees we need to get more information out to faculty. We should have an agenda item about this topic at our Exec meeting after plenary, including what's being done in 12th grade, how to learn from our high school counterparts about CCSS, and what the assessments mean for colleges using EAP.

7. Chancellor's Circle - These wonderful events to bring news to different regions in the state are terrific and sponsored by the Foundation for CCCs. The latest event was held at Sierra College with a wonderful collection of administrators and faculty from Areas A and B. It's a great opportunity to show how well the Senate is working with and is respected by the Chancellor's Office and other partners.

8. Labor Counsel - Julie B, Dan and I have met twice with the attorney. Here are our recommendations:

a. To assist with HR matters, retain a firm that can assist the Senate with such issues. We are in the process of obtaining information about two such firms. An agenda item will be forthcoming for our April meeting from the three of us that outlines the information we have received.

b. Members of the Executive Committee are to keep all aspects of the Executive Director's contract strictly confidential. The contract should not be discussed except in closed session.

c. Mediation is being used to address the concerns raised in November by Julie A and Beth.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Beth

--

Beth Smith

President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Professor of Mathematics, Grossmont College

beth.smith@gcccd.edu

619-249-3114



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Executive Director Report of Activities		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: VII.D	
		Attachment: No	
CATEGORY:	ASCCC Written Reports	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Julie Adams	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Holly Macriss	First Reading	
		Action	
		Information	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will be informed about the executive director’s activities since February 25.

BACKGROUND:

Events Registration

Event Registration (as of March 28, 2014):

- Faculty Leadership = 34 registrants
- Spring Plenary = 241 registrants
- Foundation Table sold = 5 tables and 30 tickets (total – 70 individuals)
- Curriculum Institute = 163 registrants

Grants

C-ID (1440/ICW/SCP)

- Assisted in planning the April meeting, which included working with staff to drafting the agenda; discussing agenda items and needed action with Pilati and Bruno; finalizing agenda; and attending the meeting; and reviewing minutes.
- Discussed related issues with Chancellor’s Office staff and other interested constituents.
- Worked with Pilati and staff to facilitate AO Wednesday standing meetings.
- Attended AO regional meeting with Pilati.
- Attended IOC and Discipline Reviewer meetings.
- Served as the connection between the work of C-ID and SCP.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

Committees, Task Forces, and Advisory Groups

Committee Support

- Worked with S&P to finalize draft Disciplines List Handbook.
- Worked with OOC members on the next steps for OOC.
- Worked with the Foundation Spring Fling.
- Worked with Resolutions Chair on resolutions and attended resolution meeting.
- Attended Area A meeting.
- Prepared budget performance information for Officers Meeting and attended the meeting.

Executive Committee Agenda

- Worked with staff to draft the Executive Committee meeting minutes for review by the secretary.
- Worked with staff to develop the Executive Committee agenda for review by the president.

Other

- Attended the California Society of Association Executives (CalSAE) with Tonya and Lashonda. A report will be included on the May meeting agenda providing more information about breakout sessions and other knowledge we gained.
- Spoke with the mediator in preparation for the April 4, 2014, mediation between Beth and I.

Administration

- Financial:
 - Continued transiting to the Tax Office and reviewing policies and procedures to reflect new practice. No policy changes are needed; however, language will need to be modified.
 - Treasurer and I discussed change with the Auditing firm and scheduled next audit.
- Events:
 - Worked with staff on plenary session planning including program, materials, hotel arrangements, website update, and other associated tasks.
- Office:
 - Submitted a proposal for three properties, which included our current location. One counter proposal (Natomas) looks very promising—resulting in a \$173,000 costs savings over the life of the contract. We hope to complete the selection process by April. The move will not take place until October/November. Updates will be provided to the Executive Committee as we move forward with securing a space.



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Academic Senate Foundation		Month: April 2014
		Item No: VII. E
		Attachment: YES / NO
CATEGORY:	Information and Written Reports	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:
REQUESTED BY:	Julie Bruno	Consent/Routine
		First Reading
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	Action
		Information
		X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

To inform the Executive Committee of the activities of the Academic Senate Foundation.

BACKGROUND:

Spring Fling

The Academic Senate Foundation Inaugural Spring Fling event will be held on Friday, April 11th. Guests will enjoy dinner, dancing, wine, and a silent auction with the James Todd Quartet will providing the dinner music. A special reception for table sponsors and their guests will be held prior to the dinner with champagne cocktails, hors d'oeuvre, and opportunity to place bids on items in the silent auction. As of March 26th, we have 4 table sponsors and 30 individual tickets purchased. We hope to sell out by plenary session.

Silent Auction

The silent auction will begin Thursday at noon and conclude Friday evening.

The Silent Auction has a number of different items including hotel packages, wine, whisky, jewelry, gift bags, sporting event tickets and a handmade quilt.

An updated list of items available for bidding at the Silent Auction may be found at:

<http://asccc.org/2014-foundation-silent-auction>

Scholarship Recipient

Larry Veres, Business, Computer Studies and Economic Development faculty member from Antelope Valley College, was the recipient of the 2014 Spring Plenary Foundation Scholarship.

Finally, the AS Foundation will once again sell lanyards and I (heart) Curriculum t-shirts at the plenary session and we are always quite happy to separate individuals from their money so send them our way.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

ASCCC CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
February 26, 2014

CCC-Confer	Presenter Info: 719-785-4469	3021902
	Participant Info: (888) 450-4821	590582

Committee Members:

- John Stankas, Chemistry, San Bernardino Valley College(jstankas@valleycollege.edu)
- Elizabeth Atondo, Articulation, Pierce College (eatondo@piercollege.edu)
- Eric Narveson, History, Evergreen Valley College (eric.narveson@evc.edu)
- Marie Boyd, Library, Chaffey College, continuing member (marie.boyd@chaffey.edu)
- Greg Burchett, Biology, Riverside CCD (greg.burchett@rcc.edu)
- Deanna Heikkinen, Humanities, LA Valley College (heikkidl@lavc.edu)
- Kathleen Rose, CIO, Gavilan College (krose@gavilan.edu)
- Aundrea Pinto, Student, L.A.Valley College (aundrea.pinto@studentsenateccc.org)

Members Present:

John Stankas, Elizabeth Atondo, Eric Narveson, Marie Boyd, Deanna Heikkinen

AGENDA

Meeting Start 11AM

I Updates

Chancellor's Office has little staff and much of the work we are waiting for is not going to be accomplished soon.

The Academic Academy last weekend about the Value of General Education went well. We might need to be prepared to discuss this more at the Curriculum Institute.

II Regional Meetings

The bulk of this meeting centered around assignments for Curriculum Regional meetings. It was agreed that Eric and Elizabeth will work collaboratively on a presentation regarding Courses Related in Content (up to 45 minutes). Deanna will work with Kathleen (if she agrees) or Marie regarding Types of Course Offerings (15-20 minutes).

III Spring Plenary Session: April 10-12, Burlingame (San Francisco Airport)

One breakout and Office Hours. John, Elizabeth, Eric, Marie and Deanna will all be present.

IV Curriculum Institute: July 10-12, San Jose Hayes Mansion

The ASCCC Executive Committee will review the draft program and provide feedback to the committee next weekend.

V Future Meetings

We need to meet in two weeks. We may need a different time so that Greg and Kathleen can participate. A doodle poll will be sent by the end of the week.

Meeting Adjourns 11:35

ASCCC Spring Curriculum Regionals

Friday, March 14, 10AM – 3PM, San Diego Continuing Education Center

Saturday, March 15, 10AM – 3PM, Diablo Valley College

The Agenda: Curriculum Creeping on the Down Low

A. Welcome	10AM
B. Statewide Update	10:15 – 11:45
1. 1440, 440, C-ID and TMCs	
2. IGETC for STEM	
3. Concern about the Creeping Unit	
C. Types of Course Offering	11:45 – 12:00
D. Lunch	12:00 – 12:30
E. Line in the Sand – Credit and Noncredit Curricular Options	12:30
– 1:45	
1. Progress Indicators	
2. AB86 and Adult Ed. Primer	
3. Articulation and Coordination using CB21 Coding	
F. Courses Related in Content	1:45 –
2:15	
G. Question and Answer	2:15 – 3:00

SPRING REGIONALS BLURB

Colleges continue to respond to internal and external pressures meant to improve, refine, and otherwise reconfigure the hearts of our colleges. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is again hosting regional curriculum meetings to assist colleges navigating

- expectations regarding AD-Ts,
- the launch of IGETC for STEM,
- determining the appropriate instructional offerings to support student success,
- how AB 86 regional consortia may affect local curriculum and offerings, and
- the implementation of repeatability requirements

while maintaining the standards and integrity that best serve our students. Attendees are encouraged to bring other curricular issues for discussion during the question and answer period. Curriculum chairs or committee members, Academic Senate leaders, administrators and support staff are welcome to attend.

**PLENARY SESSION BREAKOUTS
APRIL 10-12
BURLINGAME, (SFO)**

Thursday, April 10, 4:15PM
1 hour and 15 minutes

Curriculum from Design to Apportionment: Enrollment Management at 30,000 ft

John Stankas, San Bernardino Valley College
At least one more Curriculum Committee Member...

Recent changes to Title 5 regarding credit course repetition have pushed many colleges to rethink and recreate their curriculum. Current recommendations regarding credit basic skills from the Legislative Analysts Office (LAO) and the upcoming pressures to align pathways with adult education in AB 86 may require further reconsiderations of curriculum by local college faculty. What is the landscape of enrollment patterns now? Where are colleges finding the means to serve students given the credit course repetition guidelines? As local experiments with community service, noncredit, and auditing play out, what lessons have been learned? Join us for a discussion of current statewide enrollment trends and the impact of statewide enrollment management mechanisms on local curricular offerings.

Curriculum Q&A Friday, April 11, 4-5PM

CURRICULUM INSTITUTE PRELIMINARY SCHEDULE
JULY 10-12, 2014
HAYES MANSION, SAN JOSE

BREAKOUT SESSION 1

THURSDAY 10:00 – 11:30

1. COR 101
2. Title 5 Language and Update
3. SLO Assessment
4. Prerequisites, Corequisites and Advisories
5. DE Approval – Evaluating DE modality in Curriculum

Newbie
Statewide Issues
Other
Newbie
DE Strand

WELCOME
LUNCH
KEYNOTE ADDRESS #1

THURSDAY 11:45 – 1:45

BREAKOUT SESSION 2

THURSDAY 2:00 – 3:30

1. Training Curriculum Committees – Efficiency and Standards
2. Running Effective Meetings
3. SSTF Update
4. Noncredit Curriculum Development
5. Labor Market Rationale in Curriculum
6. ***Interacting with Local Senates***

Newbie
Newbie
Statewide Issues
Noncredit
CTE
Discussion

BREAKOUT SESSION 3

THURSDAY 3:45 – 5:15

1. Content Review
2. Resources for Curriculum Chairs
3. Community Service, Credit, and Noncredit, Oh, My!
4. G.E. Bloat and Unit Creep
5. Role of Advisory Committees in Curriculum Development
6. ***Curricular Review of the COR 1***

Newbie
Newbie
Statewide Issues
C-ID
CTE
Discussion

NO HOST RECEPTION

THURSDAY 5:15 – 6:30

DINNER ARRANGEMENTS

BREAKFAST

FRIDAY 8:00 – 9:00

BREAKOUT SESSION 4

FRIDAY 9:00 – 10:15

1. Disciplines list, Assigning Courses to Disciplines
2. Title 5 Language and Update (repeat)
3. C-ID and TMC 101
4. D.E. – Regular Effective Contact
5. Innovation in Curriculum – Experimental Courses

Newbie
Statewide Issues
C-ID
DE
Other

BREAKOUT SESSION 5

FRIDAY 10:30 – 11:45

1. Course Level Accounting and Repeatability
2. Training Curriculum Committees – Efficiency and Standards (repeat)
3. AB 86 Regional Requirements and Curriculum Discussions
4. Low Unit Certificate Approval and Regional Needs
5. ***Curricular Review of the COR II***

Staff
Newbie
Noncredit
CTE
Discussion

LUNCH

FRIDAY 12:00 – 1:30

KEYNOTE #2

BREAKOUT SESSION 6

FRIDAY 2:00 – 3:30

1. PCAH and CI Navigation
2. Credit Course Repetition Guidelines
3. Curricunet Meta
4. G.E. Bloat and Unit Creep (repeat)
5. Career Pathways and Regional Efforts
6. ***Facilitating Difficult Discussions***

Newbie
Newbie
Staff
C-ID
CTE
Discussion

BREAKOUT SESSION 7

FRIDAY 3:45 – 5:15

1. What Deserves College Credit (+Units to Hours)
2. CB 21 and AB 86: Evaluating Outcomes
3. Content Review Processes (repeat)
4. MOOC-ness
5. G.E. Patterns and IGETC for STEM
6. ***Curricular Review of the COR III***

Newbie
Noncredit
Newbie
DE
C-ID
Discussion

DINNER ARRANGMENTS
KARAOKE/DANCE PARTY

FRIDAY 8:00 – 11:00PM

VII. F 1.

BREAKFAST

SATURDAY 8:00 – 9:00

BREAKOUT SESSION 8

SATURDAY 9:00 – 10:30

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| 1. Prerequisites, Corequisites and Advisories (repeat) | <i>Newbie</i> |
| 2. Curricular Considerations for Student Access and Success | <i>Noncredit</i> |
| 3. Curriculum Committee Q & A | <i>Discussion</i> |
| 4. Chancellor's Office Q & A | <i>Discussion</i> |
| 5. CCC-Mission | <i>Statewide</i> |

KEYNOTE #3

SATURDAY 10:45 – 12:15

CLOSING REMARKS

NOTES ON POSSIBLE KEYNOTE ACTIVITIES

1. Invite Paul Steenhausen from the LAO to address curricular issues from the LAO perspective (Saturday)
2. Panel Discussion CTE – Doing What Matters/Sector Navigators– Nora Campos (legislature), Rock Pfothenauer, Cabrillo CTE Dean – Bay Area Consortia.
3. Panel Discussion AOs Judy Haugh (AO trainer from ASSIST), Laverne Cook (Hartnell), Bernie Day (Foothill), Elizabeth Atondo (LA)
4. Welcome and address by the new Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

NOTES ON BREAKOUTS

Breakouts are loosely identified by strands to evaluate the balance of differing topics at different times.

The strands identified as *** Discussion *** are intended to be open facilitated discussions about what happens at individual campuses and trouble-shoot any potential local problems. The COR discussion is divided into three parts for discussion about different sections of the COR review.

Operational Oversight Committee
Wednesday, February 19, 2014
Agenda
ASCCC Offices
1:30pm - 4:00pm

Present: Julie Adams, Joseph Bielanski, Ginni May, David Morse, Craig Rutan, Katie Townsend-Merino, Phil Smith

Scribe: Julie Bruno

- I. Approval of Agenda - Approved
- II. Meeting minutes of January 27, 2013 approved
- III. ASCCC Review Process
 - a. The committee discussed revisions to the two documents - Guidelines for the Review Process and Review Criteria - and incorporated changes. Julie B will send the documents with changes to David for editing and then out to the committee for approval.
 - b. Once the committee approves the revised documents, Julie B will forward the documents to the Executive Committee as an information item on the Executive Committee meeting agenda.
- IV. Resolution
 - a. The committee members discussed the draft resolution for adoption of the Guidelines for the Review Process and the Review Criteria documents. It was noted that the timeline for completion established in Resolution 1.02 Sp13 is not achievable. The committee members recommended pushing back the timeline so that the process would be completed by spring 2016. This will allow enough time to determine the reviewers and complete the process. Julie B will incorporate the changes discussed and send the document to David for editing.
 - b. Once the committee approves the revised documents, Julie B will forward the document to the Resolutions Committee chair.
- V. Next Meeting: TBD

Resolutions assigned to the OOC

1.02 Sp13 Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate

Whereas, Commitment to the public good and accountability to its members and the public at large are core values of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges as noted in its Code of Ethics Policy (10.00), including the eight domains of personal and professional integrity, mission, governance, legal compliance, responsible stewardship, openness and disclosure, program evaluation and improvement, and inclusiveness and diversity;

Whereas, Colleges and universities in the United States are regularly assessed in order to assure internal and external stakeholders about an institution's quality and its commitment to the standards it sets for itself as well as to assist the institution in improving the effectiveness of its programs and operations in order to meet its stated goals, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, a nonprofit organization, might benefit from an enhanced regular evaluation process of its eight domains; and

Whereas, Peer and external reviews are the preferred tools in higher education not just for advancing scholarship but also for assessing and improving policies and processes within institutions and organizations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create a task force consisting of equal numbers of Executive Committee representatives and member delegates to develop a process of periodic institutional review for assessing the operations, processes, policies, and programs of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges including the composition of the review team, what standards of accountability will be used, what components would comprise such a review, the number of years between reviews, and how commendations and recommendations will be offered at the conclusion of the process; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges task force's recommendation be presented to the body for adoption by the Spring 2014 Plenary Session so that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges can undergo and complete its first periodic review by the Fall 2014 Plenary Session.

1.04 Sp 13 Academic Senate Annual Report on Accomplishments and Operations

Whereas, In keeping with its principles and commitment to excellence, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges regularly reviews its organizational effectiveness by conducting evaluations after every event, commissioning external audits to assess its policies including internal controls and financial viability, reviewing and revising processes for tracking and completing resolutions, reviewing the executive director's performance every other year, and

periodically evaluating and reconsidering its committee structure, diversity statements, and other key policies;

Whereas, In spite of a 32% cut in 2008 to its funding and reduced revenues, the Academic Senate continues to demonstrate its operational effectiveness through audits and budget performance reports, low registration fees, efficient events, increased services, and highly visible leadership and influence in key conversations such as the Student Success Task Force, SB 1440, CTE Critical Conversations, Board of Governors, Consultation Council, and other Chancellor's Office advisory committees, task forces, and work groups as well as testifying before the Legislature;

Whereas, Although the Academic Senate Executive Committee implements its review and evaluation processes and takes seriously its fiscal and legal responsibility in oversight of the organization, internal and external stakeholders may not be familiar with its practices or even its key success in these areas; and

Whereas, Most nonprofit organizations develop an annual report to share their accomplishments, organizational changes, and results of review processes with their stakeholders, and such a report by the Academic Senate would be beneficial in conveying this information to faculty statewide and other constituencies inside and outside the California Community College System;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges communicate all recommendations and commendations from committees and task forces that review the organization's processes for assessing the operations, processes, policies, and programs and any planned changes based on those recommendations through a breakout session, a Rostrum article, or other appropriate means no later than Spring 2014; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, similar to other nonprofit organizations, develop an annual report to publicize its self-review results and ongoing accomplishments on behalf of the faculty statewide, with the first publication of this report to be completed by Fall 2014.

Operational Oversight Committee
Friday, March 7, 2014
Agenda
ASCCC Offices
3:00pm – 5:00pm

Present: Julie Adams, Ginni May, David Morse, Craig Rutan, Katie Townsend-Merino, Phil Smith

Scribe: Julie Bruno

- I. Agenda Approved
- II. Approval of February 19, 2014 meeting minutes -tabled
- III. Executive Committee Evaluation Process – comments from Executive Committee
 - a. Julie B. shared that the Executive Committee reviewed the documents and provided the following comments and suggestions:
 - i. Guidelines document -
 1. Change the title
 2. Too many reviewers - maybe 5 is a better number for a pilot
 3. Choose randomly from each area
 4. Align language in Review Cycle with language in Resolution (this comment is more about the resolution than the Guidelines document)
 - ii. Review Criteria -
 1. Questioned using the seven areas from the ASCCC policies
 2. Change the Governance area - rephrase to state that the mission is set by the Academic Senate (not the Exec committee) and state that resolutions drive the actions of the Academic Senate
 - iii. Overall Comment from Exec: Provide more than one option (In other words, create two processes and ask the body to choose one)
 - b. It was noted that the suggestions and comments are not directives but things for the OOC to take into consideration. David and Phil clarified that there was not consensus on these comments and suggestions rather the comments came from individual Executive Committee members. The committee noted that they have limited time to make changes since the documents in their final form are required by the Executive Director and the Resolutions Chair by Saturday, March 8th so that the documents may be disseminated to the field in time for the Area meetings.
 - c. Members discussed the comments and identified appropriate changes to the documents.

- d. Julie B will make the changes and send the documents to David to do a final edit. When David has completed the editing, Julie will send to committee members for one last look. Committee members will respond by 12pm Saturday March 8th with any changes or approval of the documents. Julie will submit the documents when all committee members have approved.
- IV. Plenary Breakout
- a. Committee members discussed the breakout for plenary session. It was agreed that the breakout should include a brief presentation on the Periodic Review as well as a brief overview of the organization's status as a nonprofit.
 - b. The committee discussed the draft description Julie B composed for plenary and offered suggestions. Julie will revise and send out to committee members for approval.
 - c. Committee members available to participate in the breakout: Julie B, Julie A, David, Katie, Ginni and Craig.
 - d. Julie will send out the draft description and a doodle poll to determine the next meeting which will be devoted to planning the breakout.
- V. Next Meeting – TBD.

Resolutions assigned to the OOC

1.02 Sp13 Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate

Whereas, Commitment to the public good and accountability to its members and the public at large are core values of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges as noted in its Code of Ethics Policy (10.00), including the eight domains of personal and professional integrity, mission, governance, legal compliance, responsible stewardship, openness and disclosure, program evaluation and improvement, and inclusiveness and diversity;

Whereas, Colleges and universities in the United States are regularly assessed in order to assure internal and external stakeholders about an institution's quality and its commitment to the standards it sets for itself as well as to assist the institution in improving the effectiveness of its programs and operations in order to meet its stated goals, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, a nonprofit organization, might benefit from an enhanced regular evaluation process of its eight domains; and

Whereas, Peer and external reviews are the preferred tools in higher education not just for advancing scholarship but also for assessing and improving policies and processes within institutions and organizations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create a task force consisting of equal numbers of Executive Committee representatives and member delegates to develop a process of periodic institutional review for assessing

the operations, processes, policies, and programs of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges including the composition of the review team, what standards of accountability will be used, what components would comprise such a review, the number of years between reviews, and how commendations and recommendations will be offered at the conclusion of the process; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges task force's recommendation be presented to the body for adoption by the Spring 2014 Plenary Session so that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges can undergo and complete its first periodic review by the Fall 2014 Plenary Session.

1.04 Sp 13 Academic Senate Annual Report on Accomplishments and Operations

Whereas, In keeping with its principles and commitment to excellence, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges regularly reviews its organizational effectiveness by conducting evaluations after every event, commissioning external audits to assess its policies including internal controls and financial viability, reviewing and revising processes for tracking and completing resolutions, reviewing the executive director's performance every other year, and periodically evaluating and reconsidering its committee structure, diversity statements, and other key policies;

Whereas, In spite of a 32% cut in 2008 to its funding and reduced revenues, the Academic Senate continues to demonstrate its operational effectiveness through audits and budget performance reports, low registration fees, efficient events, increased services, and highly visible leadership and influence in key conversations such as the Student Success Task Force, SB 1440, CTE Critical Conversations, Board of Governors, Consultation Council, and other Chancellor's Office advisory committees, task forces, and work groups as well as testifying before the Legislature;

Whereas, Although the Academic Senate Executive Committee implements its review and evaluation processes and takes seriously its fiscal and legal responsibility in oversight of the organization, internal and external stakeholders may not be familiar with its practices or even its key success in these areas; and

Whereas, Most nonprofit organizations develop an annual report to share their accomplishments, organizational changes, and results of review processes with their stakeholders, and such a report by the Academic Senate would be beneficial in conveying this information to faculty statewide and other constituencies inside and outside the California Community College System;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges communicate all recommendations and commendations from committees and task forces that review the organization's processes for assessing the operations, processes, policies, and programs and any planned changes based on those

recommendations through a breakout session, a Rostrum article, or other appropriate means no later than Spring 2014; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, similar to other nonprofit organizations, develop an annual report to publicize its self-review results and ongoing accomplishments on behalf of the faculty statewide, with the first publication of this report to be completed by Fall 2014.



**Academic Senate
for California Community Colleges**

VII.F.3.

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

Resolutions Committee

Friday, March 14, 2014

4:00 – 5:00 PM

CCC Confer

888-450-4821

719-785-4469 (cell phone users)

Passcode: 150747

Draft Minutes

-
- I. Meeting called to order at 4:03pm
 - a. Members present: John Freitas (chair), Julie Adams, Kenneth Bearden, Randy Beach, Dolores Davison, Michelle Grimes-Hillman
 - b. Note taker volunteer: Dolores Davison

 - II. Public Comments (3 minutes each) : None

 - III. Approval of the December 16, 2013 minutes : Approved by consensus

 - IV. Review of tasks for pre-session area meetings and at plenary session
 - a. Pre-session Area meetings:
 - i. Change in Resolutions Committee structure to include members from each area to assist the Area Representatives and the areas with resolutions:
 1. Tasks:
 - a. Liaison at areas meetings and a resource for area reps
 - b. Write down suggested edits and amendments
 - c. Discourage minute changes, but listen for issues regarding clarity or confusion
 - d. Make edits within the area packet (typos, etc)
 - e. Make certain that new resolutions and amendments are in presentable form (maximum of four whereases, four resolve clauses, acronyms spelled out in the first usage, etc)
 2. Primary role in summary: assisting the area reps by taking down info, serving as a scribe during the process, and determining if there should be other duties for the area resolutions committee members going forward
 - b. During plenary:
 1. Tasks:
 - a. Help on site during resolution/amendment meetings on Thursday and Friday afternoons/evenings
 - b. Resolutions chair: responsible for overall oversight of resolutions; provide assistance to the field during resolutions meetings; ensure that resolutions packet is sent to printers and copies are given to president and parliamentarian (Spring 2014 = John Freitas)

VII.F.3.

- c. Resolutions Editor: responsible for inputting resolutions and amendments to packet for Friday and Saturday sessions (Spring 2014 = Dolores Davison)
- d. Executive Director: responsible for supplies for resolution committee (including food) and uploading resolutions packet to the website and presidents' listserv.
- 2. Areas of concern during session resolution meetings:
 - a. Ensure dates for specific tasks to be completed are included in resolutions
 - b. Cell phone #s/contact information is available
 - c. Seconders are all registered delegates
 - d. Determining typos/clarification versus need for amendments
- c. Week after plenary: To be discussed at session

V. Review of draft revisions to resolutions documents – to combine or not to combine?

- a. Review checklist/timelines
- b. What if the resolutions committee was involved in statuses and tracking?
 - i. Freitas will bring this forward potentially as an agenda items
- c. Davison will compile various manuals, eliminated redundancy, and bring document to next in person meeting
- d. Possibility of resolutions committee meetings in August and January to prepare for upcoming plenary sessions?
- e. Next meeting: Friday, 18 April 2014 at Mt. San Antonio College

VI. Adjourned at 4:59pm



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Resolutions Committee Report		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: VII.F.3.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Written Reports	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Freitas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Tonya Davis	Action	
		Information	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME: The Executive Committee will receive an update on the activities of the Resolutions Committee.

BACKGROUND:

(Please include the following components: issue, implication, analysis, relevant ASCCC positions/resolutions/policies, or any other useful data or information.)

The Resolutions Committee met by phone on March 15, 2014. Please see the attached minutes. The committee reviewed its tasks responsibilities for the Spring Area meetings and for Spring Plenary. The committee also reviewed the initial draft proposal for combining the various documents on the resolutions processes brought forward by Freitas. Davison agreed to further edit and eliminate redundancies. The current goal is to bring the first draft revision to the Executive Committee for first reading in May. The committee agreed to meet in person after Spring Plenary on April 18 at Mt. San Antonio College for the purpose of reviewing the effectiveness of the new resolutions committee structure (member from each Area to assist at Area meetings), to review the draft revised resolutions document, and to discuss the feasibility of giving the Resolutions Committee a significant role in tracking resolutions.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

Standards and Practices Committee:
Notes
February 25, 2014
CCCConfer
9:30AM-10:30AM

Present: Julie Adams, Julie Bruno, Dan Crump
Recorder: Michelle Grimes-Hillman

- I. Approval of minutes – January 28
Minutes were approved
- II. Diversity Award norming
Members engaged in norming of applications
- III. Plenary Breakout Discussion
MQ – Dan Crump is the facilitator
Dan will contact Kale to see if he wishes to participate. Julie B and MGH will attend to answer Discipline List Handbook questions.
- IV. Discussion of S&P Charge
Members were reminded that part of the charge of S&P includes by-law changes. The members discussed the need for multiple by-law changes to bring senate documents into alignment with the by-laws. Julie B and Michelle GH will take the lead to draft an agenda item recommending possible changes to the by-laws.

Standards and Practices Committee:

Notes

January 28 2014

ASCCC Offices

Present: Julie Adams, Julie Bruno, Kale Braden (phone), Dan Crump

Recorder: Michelle Grimes-Hillman

- I. Approval of minutes – January 14
 - a. Notes were approved
- II. Hayward Award selection
 - a. Members discussed selection and the rubric
- III. DL Handbook – Reviewed Exec comments
 - a. Discussed changes



Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

VII. G.1.

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

Academic Integrity Task Force

Thursday, March 27, 2014

11:00 AM – 12:00 PM

CCC Confer

888-450-4821

719-785-4469 (cell phone users)

Passcode: 248785

Minutes

I. Call to order and approval of the agenda: 11:06am

- a. Members present: Dolores Davison, Don Gauthier, Debbie Klein
- b. Note taker: Dolores Davison

II. Public Comments (3 minutes each): none

III. Review of tasks for plenary session

a. First breakout: Effective Practices in Academic Integrity

- i. First Breakout Session, Thursday 10 April, 8:30-9:45am
- ii. Description:

"From Punitive to Instructive: Changing the Conversation on Academic Integrity"

The legal decision from the CCCCCO regarding plagiarism and the option of failing students for a single act of cheating has long plagued faculty, especially when that act appears to be particularly egregious. While that decision is coming under increased scrutiny, its original interpretation has led faculty to develop methods for maintaining academic integrity in their courses and programs. This interactive breakout will present some of those methods and seek suggestions from the participants, towards the goal of creating a "best practices" document for all faculty to use.

1. Dolores created a rough power point for this topic and distributed it to the members of the committee. The committee talked about framing the discussion around the topics from last fall and the information gathered there, and then broadening the list of effective practices and means by which to promote academic integrity. Part of the discussion could be in terms of classroom practices (assignments, etc), and part of it would be around the professionalization of integrity and modeling that professionalism for students; treating students as adults rather than as children, providing them with reasons for the need for responsibility, possibly providing resources for faculty to help them do the same in the classroom.
 - a. Committee will compile a list of effective classroom practices for the breakout and will ask for additional suggestions from the audience; effective practices will be used to write a Rostrum article regarding effective practices
 - b. Don will seek out resources for the breakout slide; Debbie and Dolores will work on lists of effective practices and reach out to others for their practices.
 - c. Power point to be ready to review by Sunday, 6 April.

- b. Second Breakout: Academic Integrity in Distance Education
 - i. Second Breakout Session, Thursday, 10 April, 10-11:15am
 - ii. Description:

"Distance Education IS Different: Issues with Academic Integrity in DE Modalities"

Anecdotal evidence suggests that violations of academic integrity policies are more likely to occur in distance education courses than those held face to face. What kinds of problems do distance education instructors face that are different from their colleagues that teach in traditional classroom settings? How can those issues be resolved or mitigated so that faculty can ensure integrity in their classes? Join your colleagues in a discussion of ways to promote a culture of academic integrity in distance education classes and what to do when that culture is compromised.

- 2. Dolores created a rough power point of current issues in DE integrity (authentication, financial aid fraud, etc). Will incorporate the information from the CCCCO's report on DE (August 2013) regarding cheating and issues more specific to DE courses. Dolores emailed the DE report to the committee members so they had ready access. John Freitas will be the facilitator on this breakout. Committee will also solicit information from the audience about best practices (including ways of dealing with proctoring, authentication, etc) and will use that information to help inform the article for the Rostrum
 - a. Power point will be ready for final review on Sunday, 6 April
- 3. Previous resolution had asked for the compilation of a resource library on academic integrity; writing a Rostrum article or a paper with a list of sources might effectively complete this resolution. Committee will continue discussion of how to best serve the body (article, list of effective practices, possible paper) going forward.
- 4. Committee will try to meet for dinner before plenary on Wednesday night; failing that, we will have a quick conversation Wednesday night in the Westin lobby about the PPTs.

IV. Adjournment at 11:49am



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Distance Education Task Force Report		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: VII.G.2.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Written Reports	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Freitas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Tonya Davis	Action	
		Information	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME: The Executive Committee will be updated on the activities of the Distance Education Task Force.

BACKGROUND:

(Please include the following components: issue, implication, analysis, relevant ASCCC positions/resolutions/policies, or any other useful data or information.)

The Distance Education Task Force met by phone on March 14, 2014. The main focus of the meeting was to plan and organize the breakout session on DE Hot Topics for Spring Plenary. The entire task force will present at the breakout. The task force also reviewed the status of its assigned resolutions. Two resolutions (9.03 S13 and 19.06 S13) will be addressed in the breakout session as the primary focus will be on student and faculty preparation for distance education. Resolution 9.04 S13 on MOOCs is being addressed through breakout sessions (fall 2013) and also infused into the Spring breakout. L. Storm also published an article in the March *Rostrum* on her MOOC at Hartnell College as part of the efforts to address 9.04 S13 and inform the field. It should be noted that 9.03 S13 also calls for investigating what is allowed under Title 5 regarding required student preparation for taking distance education courses, and if necessary, what changes would need to be made. J. Freitas discussed this with LeBaron Woodyard from the CCCCO on March 14. L. Woodyard will convene ETAC and bring this matter forward as an agenda item, and will work with President Smith on this going forward.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.



Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

Distance Education Task Force

14 March 2014

-DRAFT MINUTES-

- I. Call to Order at 10:04
 - A. Present: John, Greg, Chris, Lisa, Stephanie
- II. Approval of the Agenda
 - A. Approved without objections
- III. Public Comments (3 minutes per speaker)
 - A. No public attended
- IV. Approval of February 21, 2014 minutes
 - A. Approved without objections
- V. Review of status of tasks from February 13 meeting
 - A. tasks discussed
- VI. Planning for spring plenary
 - A. Review of proposed rough outline
 - B. Refinement of topics
 1. focus on faculty and student prep (cut accreditation, accessibility, MOOCs)
 2. mention moocs as best practices in these two areas
 3. plug the other DE breakouts (academic integrity, OEI)
 4. mention union issues
 - C. structure?
 1. divide time and focus half on faculty prep and half on student prep
 2. each of us talk a few minutes but with some background first
 3. John does introductory background (accreditation, equity gap, success gap, retention gap, resolution reference,
 4. Union fits into faculty prep (Chris to take lead with Lisa)
 5. Greg takes lead on student prep with Lisa
 6. John will edit presentation (send John slides) by 3/31
 7. April 7 to review presentation
- VII. Distance education paper draft development – status updates
 - A. status discussed
- VIII. Assessment of progress on addressing resolutions assigned to the task force (time permitting)
 - A. Resolution 13.03 S13 (attendance accounting)
 1. Stalled due to factors outside our control

- B. Resolutions 9.03 S13 and 19.06 S13 on student preparation and faculty preparation for online instruction
 - 1. focus of breakout
- C. Resolution 9.04 S13 (MOOCs)
 - 1. tough for us to address fully (tough when MOOCs are changing so much)
 - 2. no extant positions
 - 3. Lisa's *Rostrum* article on MOOCs will cover this as will other proposed articles
- IX. *Rostrum* articles
 - A. February *Rostrum* delayed and should have Lisa's article on "MOOC Magic" (student prep)
 - B. June deadline is "after plenary"
- X. Announcements
 - A. ASCCC Area meetings March 20 and 21, locations vary. Contact your area representatives.
 - B. ASCCC Spring Plenary Session, April 10-12, 2014, SFO Westin Hotel. (Book your rooms today!)
- XI. Adjournment at 10:40am – Next meeting Friday, April 25, 10 – 11 AM, CCC Confer

CCCAOE Notes – note taker – W. North

Meeting opened at 0830

Agenda Updates and review.

Stephanie Rodriguez reviewed the minutes action items, completed and in progress. Several items were revised to completed and others were updated.

Beth Pratt reviewed the budget, things are pretty normal for the current state going into the Spring conference. Several of their budget summary documents are now made public via their website. Their grant that is being used to support some of the leadership academy is being managed through Mt. San Jacinto College. They currently do not have a mechanism in place for how to bill the college for these funds. At this point CCCAOE is carrying this expense. And they will be sorting that out.

Finance/check control costs are about \$12K but this includes managing all the taxes. There was some discussion about continued use of an outside fiscal service.

Jonathan gave his legislative update. He provided a list of those who CCCAOE has met with in advocacy. There is a lot of concern that 3% growth is too much, only SDCCD, LACCD and a few others are actually growing, the rest aren't. 1.7% is more accurate.

On the student success act the first \$100M is being proposed on a 3:1, match which districts will struggle with.

There is proposed ACR #119 that the author is looking for CCCAOE to be the lead sponsor on this one. It's a non-binding mandate to begin dialog about how to better fund CTE. The Board voted to do this. The upside of this is it does set the legislative agenda but it does not need the Governor's signature.

The Board also voted to take a soft oppose to SB 850 Applied BS degrees, because there has been no real justification for this. We would never start a program without demonstrating need, why would we add a whole new mission without justifying need.

The Board discussed their Leadership Academy. They believe they are saturating their market and they need to consider how to evolve things to be of benefit to their membership. The project also needs to morph to another because Eva is stepping down from some of her state roles.

Conference

365 are registered. Plus there is an overflow of another 30 who are mostly one-day presenters. Breakouts will be both bottom and second floor and top floor. Fall

Session, Downtown LA Hyatt, Oct 22-24, 2014. July 2014 retreat will be in July. 2015 Spring will be with the CCCCIOs in SFO. Fall and 2015/Sp 2016 not yet set.

ASCCC Report

CTE Regionals – were well received. Kim S recommended we might consider working with the DSNs to have some sector specific professional development opportunities regionally.

Curriculum Regionals

CTE strand in the Curriculum Institute - July

Spring Session has a few resolutions that are interest to CCCAOE – I forwarded the packet/appendices to the Board.

SACC Report

Many have left the CO in Academic Affairs which has left SACC empty.

Stand alone sunsetted – there is some concern voiced that this might impact CTE some

Conjoint programs was removed from the PCAH but there is a conversation about collaborative programs which is aimed at ADTs. Not clear why this would be different from CTE conjoint efforts. In any case the allowance would be allow program approval based on shared courses. The PCAH just left the conjoint language out and they are now realizing this is still needed.

VP's made their reports

Much of the dialog was on the dysfunction that is occurring in the regions with respect to SN, DSNs and now the CPTF. Keystone Cops was the metaphor.

Grant fatigue. In fairness to the DSNs they were given no time or real support on what they are to do and how to do it relative to the complexity of their roles.

Some regions are bidding for both the \$6 and \$15 million grants in an integrated manner. But ultimately this is exhausting and really not serving students well due to the distraction the crazy grant models are causing.

The afternoon was reserved for members only to have a organizational strategic dialog.

Lunch 1200-1300

Friday – March 14th.

Introduced the new board members and welcomed them. Leaving board members were thanked.

Post-conference



**Advisory Committee Meeting
Economic & Workforce Development
Wednesday, January 22, 2014**

I. Van Ton-Quinlivan, Vice Chancellor, Workforce & Economic Development Division, CCCCCO, opened meeting at 10:00 a.m. with welcome and introductions of Advisory Members.

Members Present, WEDPAC:

- ✓ Ms. Van Ton-Quinlivan, Vice Chancellor, Workforce & Economic Development Division, CCCCCO
- ✓ Ms. Debra Jones, Dean, Career Education Practices, CCCCCO
- ✓ Mr. James Mayer, President/CEO, CA FWD
- ✓ Mr. Rafael Solorzano, Student Senate
- ✓ Mr. Wheeler North, Academic Senate, San Diego/Miramar College

Members Present, EDPAC:

- ✓ Ms. Sylvia Amitoelau, M.S.I.T., Coastline Community College
- ✓ Dr. Deborah Blue, Chancellor, State Community College District
- ✓ Mr. Jack A. Buckhorn, Business Manager, IBEW Local 551
- ✓ Dr. Sunita Cooke, President, Grossmont College
- ✓ Mr. Chris Flask, Manager, Operational Excellence, Genentech, Inc.
- ✓ Dr. Doug Houston, Chancellor, Yuba Community College District
- ✓ Ms. Mary Kimball, Executive Director, Center for Land Based Learning
- ✓ Mr. Bernie Kotlier, Executive Director, Sustainable Energy Solutions, Labor Management Cooperation Committee, CA
- ✓ Mr. Rob Sanger, Manager, Training Services, California Manufacturing & Technology Association
- ✓ Dr. Bill Scroggins, President & CEO, Mount San Antonio College

Others:

- ✓ Dean Simon Hoffman (sat in for Linda Rose)
- ✓ Ms. Mary Wylie

II. Updates and Review (Van Ton-Quinlivan)

- Review: Goals of jobs and economy and top level indicators.
- Phases of increased system responsiveness to workforce needs: administrative fixes, empower regions, rethink funding.
- Focus on empowering of regions by facilitating more regional collaboration and facilitation.
- Last meeting: reviewed administrative fixes by targeting investment by regions and sectors by providing incentive investment (EWD, SB70, Perkins), braided funding and established common accountability metrics. Funding streams approved and supported by EDPAC and BOG.
- Rethink funding; reflects Nancy Shulock report. Agreed upon enhanced funding and deliberated on three designs with outcomes in learnings and long term policy questions. Deliberations of administrative fixes were presented to Deputy Chancellor Skinner and Chancellor Harris for support.
- Innovation fund for emerging occupations.
- Governor's Office of GoBiz has taken part of toolkit for Economic Development, how to "slingshot" regional economies.
- Suggestion to have future conversations not scripted.
- Issues between WIBs and community colleges still exist.

- Proposal: Prioritize growth fund to innovation fund for developing and re-tooling CTE curriculum for emerging occupations based on regional economic needs. Work on differences between flexibility and long term funding.
- To do: EDPAC CEOs conversation to further shape policy.

III. Empowering Regions

- Regional Economies (Jim Mayer): CA FWD, a Governor's reform. In working with regional partners, challenge in setting and aligning policies for economic activities. Harmonized the conversation to move the needle and; created action teams. Support regional economies; get job creation on City Council agenda. Need state policies to allow regional leaders to lead. Help align government leaders to make decisions that align with needs. Active in terms of advocacy.
- SDICCA Decision-making Model (Dr. Sunita Cooke, Mary Wylie): CEOs of the nine colleges meet monthly. The center of organization communication is the Workforce Development Council (WDC), enabling vertical and horizontal communication. Structure set with goals, a better process, empower existing groups, shed college hat, establish trust and relationships, share resources, and work with other regions.
- SB 1070 Response by Regions (Debra Jones): Design to scale, working regionally. Reinforce regional coordination (Grants: 2013 US DoL TAACCCT, SB 1070, Key Talent Grants, AB 86 Adult Education, Prop 39, and Career Pathways Trust. Future Grants: 2014 DoL TAACCCT, US DoE Perkins Reauthorization, US DoE WIA Title II Reauthorization, 2015-16 New Adult Education Consortia, IDRC Short Term grants).
- Thoughts on Open Questions: Need to design funding for access for the rural and limited economies. To take advantage of Recovery Act, need to strategize to utilize for job training. Find ways to incentivize partner and collaboration between urban – rural partnerships. Better utilize conference technologies. Utilize information from national organizations. Task force to put together training for urban – rural areas.
- The EDPAC CEOs scheduled to meet with Vice Chancellor of Fiscal to discuss instructional equipment and use of growth funds.

IV. Round Robin

- Industry Representatives: Provided an update and 1 – 3 year look ahead of industry.
 - Chris Flask, Life Sciences/BioTech: Top 6 of 12 Biotech strongest in CA. Sector growth remains focused in SF Bay Area, L.A. County and San Diego County. By degree requirement, Associates Degree, more of trend in manufacturing and compliance officers. Gaps in problem solving, life sciences mismatch, and adjustment of life sciences.
 - Mary Kimball, Ag, Water and Environment: Agriculture currently in drought, causing loss of jobs. In general, expanding workforce. Model emerging from top agriculture company, Roll Global, there is an unmet need for training programs to prepare students for in demand 21st Century farming jobs. Creating Ag Tech Career Academy between Roll Global and community colleges. Governor's budget eliminating the categorical funds that currently fund vocational high schools expansion of Ag programs. If growth in RFI money, work rural, sector, and apprenticeship intersection money.
 - Rob Sanger, Advanced Manufacturing: Manufacturing is most fragmented. The National Association of Manufacturing has a good model to follow. Employers need to invest in higher level people to work with community colleges to train workforce properly. Specialty in California is Additive manufacturing, 3D parts. Manufacturing jobs for production will remain steady but the more technical jobs require specialized people. Changes in type of training to 80 % that is on-line and 20% in classroom. Automation will increase. Challenge in wage gap and income gap.
 - Bernie Kotliar, Energy and Utilities: Electrical contracting in California for conventional building is in need in Silicon Valley and coastal areas. In terms of new and emerging technologies, there is need across state. Design build function is growing. Regulation of Title 24 is increasing needs in all areas of building. There is collaboration with community colleges but more will be needed.

- Overview of ITT Digital Media workforce trend is mobile. Workforce trend to digital and data as a fuel.
- EDPAC/WEDPAC Members: Describe dots that need to be connected.
 - Online education and hybrid partnered with industry. Develop soft skills via MOOCs. California Virtual Campus (CVC) is marketplace for online education through community colleges. Online devices needed for rural areas.
 - CID, matrix for college courses portable to any community college. Courses are moving to CTE model curriculum for regional statewide curriculum (vetting curriculum templates).
 - Construction industry working with employers to identify trends and refresh curriculum, integrate hybrid learning. Workforce developing high hopes for Central Valley do to infrastructure of high speed rail. Need private sector funding to return for robust economy in construction.
 - Advocating for 1358 which will raise representation fee for better connection to community college students. Make college students aware that the Student Senate represents all college students. In process of identifying a student representative to the BOG.
 - Connect present with future. Connect students with jobs that exist. Decisions need to be data driven and accelerated. Workforce is not siloed and need regional silo busters. Governor moving toward subsidiaries. Community colleges need to rethink funding and curriculum development that are adaptive to fundamental issues.

V. Consent Items

- Minutes from October 30, 2013 EDPAC moved and approved.
- Note: Next WEDPAC/EDPAC on May 28, 2014 from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

VI. Public Comment

- In regards to career pathway funds, found disturbing that administration believes that money will be distributed, this is not reality. Fill workforce pipeline has been concentrated in high school academies and pathway programs and now a structure is in the works that is parallel. Creating micro programs of study as foundation.

VII. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m.



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

**Final ICAS Minutes of Meeting
Thursday, December 12, 2013**

Tsakopoulos Library Galleria, 828 I Street, Sacramento, CA
ICAS Website • <http://icas-ca.org/>

In Attendance:

- CCC Senate: Beth Smith, President; David Morse, Vice President; Julie Bruno, Secretary; Phil Smith, North Representative; John Stanskas, South Representative; and Julie Adams, Executive Director
- CSU Senate: Diana Wright Guerin, Chair; Steven Filling, Vice Chair; Glen Brodowsky, Secretary; Darlene Yee-Melichar, Member-at-Large; and Susan Gubernat, Member-at-Large
- UC Senate: Bill Jacob, Chair; Mary Gilly, Vice Chair; George Johnson, BOARS Chair; Ross H. Frank, UCOPE Chair; Tim Labor, UCEP Chair; and Martha Winnacker, Executive Director
- Staff: Krystinne Mica (CCC)

I. Consent Calendar

- *Approval of the December 12, 2013 Agenda*
The agenda was approved with a note that item XIV will be discussed earlier.
- *Approval of the September 26, 2013 Meeting Notes*
The notes from September 26, 2013 were approved with minor changes from the body.

The consent calendar was approved. Yee-Melichar, Brodowsky (MSC)

II. Announcements

Bill Jacob, Chair, UC Academic Senate

President Napolitano announced seven initiatives during her first 90-days in office. The first three initiatives were to award \$5 million each to undocumented student services, graduate student improvements, and post-doctoral programs. At the Regents meeting, President Napolitano announced the other four initiatives: zero tuition increase for the upcoming year; CCC transfer; technology transfer; and net zero-carbon campuses by 2025. During the regents meeting in November, presentations were made about the funding of doctoral programs, as well as a request that the state fund the UC employer contribution to the retirement system in the same way it funds CSU contributions to CalPERS. An informal enrollment management work group met and had conversations to develop a shared understanding of issues to be resolved in relation to the guarantee and the master plan, transfer, and how money is distributed between campuses. The faculty total remuneration study continues to move forward. Cross-campus enrollment is now available for some online courses. UC is concerned about the pension reform initiative that may appear on the November 2014 ballot. The ICAS letter on the segments' initiatives to strengthen the K-14 pipeline in STEM fields was presented at

Assemblymember Susan Bonilla's hearing. There will be another initiative to push forward the next generation sciences.

Diana Wright Guerin, Chair, CSU Academic Senate

The meeting at Fullerton College highlighted that the creation of the transfer pathway under SB1440 needs funding, as more students seek admission into the CSU system. A draft of the CCC BA study group summary was released and Academic Affairs asked the Executive Committee to write a formal response. ASCSU continues to have issues with getting a trustee appointed and is now working on legislation with the Chancellor's Office to maximize the possibility of having another faculty trustee position. Chancellor White is planning on re-launching the Academic Conference to bring stakeholders together to discuss issues of concern. A website was launched that highlights faculty recognized for their outstanding work. There is legislative interest in the fate of Ethnic Studies programs; the Chancellor formed a task force to look into history and trends, and make overall recommendations. One resolution presented at the ASCSU November plenary expressed concern about the potential to eliminate Cal State Online Advisory Board. Last year, the board decided to set the number of units at 120 for all BA/BS degrees. Engineering continues to have problems with meeting this limitation. Suggestions included Engineering be referenced in Title 5 as it was previously (limit before was 140 units and CSU is suggesting 132 units). There is also a discussion regarding having a new CSU campus south of San Diego to accommodate the 20,000 eligible students turned away from admission into CSU and one about underrepresented students, particularly Latino and African American students in CSU.

Beth Smith, ICAS Chair and President, CCC Academic Senate

Fall Plenary was held in November and a number of resolutions were brought forward. The presiding judge denied the lawsuit brought forth last spring against the CCC Board of Governors and the authority of the local academic senates. The Veteran's Summit event was successful. ICAS may want to consider discussing parameters for credit by exam in light of the work on military curriculum by the American Council on Education (ACE). San Francisco State provided the venue for a successful event on behalf of City College of San Francisco (CCSF), where Senate leadership and leadership of CCSF laid out important principles and steps for CCSF's future direction on accreditation. Work is being done on the implementation of SB 440, as policies and timelines will need to be set to meet the bill's mandates. Because ICAS is now mentioned directly in legislation, it may be subject to the Bagley-Keene Act; this is still being investigated.

A proposal to include an agenda item on Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) and campus responsibilities was brought forward by Brodowsky. This will be included on the upcoming agenda.

Action:

- Brodowsky will bring forward information regarding ROTC for the next agenda.

Governmental Relations

III. Policies and Job Duties for Implementing SB 1052 and SB 1053 – B. Smith

B. Smith presented a draft document with proposed guidelines on OER Council and ICAS' responsibilities to enact SB 1052 and SB 1053. CSU is the fiscal agent for the grant and will be the recipient of the funds from all grantors including Hewlett, Gates, and the Legislature. The members discussed the document as presented and posed questions and concerns including:

1. the possibility of increasing the frequency of ICAS meetings to coordinate with council meetings;
2. a request for a final copy of the grant to be distributed to ICAS;
3. a question on ASCCC's role as it was written in the grant;
4. which segment has the responsibility for seeking additional funding;
5. how the information will be hosted online (through ICAS or a separate webpage);
6. who will manage the website development; and
7. if ICAS and the council should partner with other constituents who are already doing similar work.

The roles of the council and council members were discussed. There were concerns raised such as the feasibility of convening the council in early January, the magnitude of work facing the council in a very limited amount of time, and the identification of necessary processes to run the work of the council effectively. Members deliberated on the role of the project coordinator and voted on having the project coordinator restricted to faculty members (including retired and non-instructional faculty), who will also chair the council as the tenth non-voting member.

Qualifications of the project coordinator/chair were also determined. Members also deliberated on the role of administrative staff and whether the determination of 20% to each segment was still appropriate. They voted that the 20% time for each segment will be combined to one 60% staff, and the needs and role of the staff will be deferred to the council to determine. The development of the website will be deferred to the council, but ICAS recognized the need to discuss this to give direction and guidance to the council. It was also stated that a timeline for the application for the project coordinator/chair will be worked on by B. Smith, Gilly, and Guerin.

Action:

- B. Smith, Gilly, and Guerin will work on a timeline and position description for the project coordinator/council position.

IV. Legislative Update

The three segment chairs will invite their respective Government Relations Officers (GROs) to the next ICAS meeting. There was consensus between the three chairs that the off-season visits to the capitol were very effective. Jacob reported that he anticipates a potential legislative effort to have UC grant similar guarantees as CSU now must do under SB 1440. Guerin spoke with legislative office staff on the difference between online instruction and Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCs), and reported that CSU students are working on releasing a white paper on this topic. Guerin stated that Senator Block is proposing to bring back his bill on baccalaureate degrees for CCC, and the CSU senate was encouraged to write a letter of non-decision. There is also interest in [AB 1348](#) moving forward. There are several issues returning for CSU including: undocumented Nursing students not being able to take the nursing exam; offering tax credit for businesses that provide internships; student loan and bankruptcy; and Oregon's [HB 3472](#) (Pay Forward pilot program). B. Smith stated that some ideas moving forward for CCC are:

legislation on accreditation; concurrent enrollment for students in high school and community college; and a cap on fees for students with the maximum number of unit load (encourage students to go full-time).

B. Smith asked whether there was interest by the group to have ICAS write formal responses to the reports provided by Guerin on increased funding for higher education; Lt. Governor's report; and State Auditor's report. It was proposed by ICAS that the segment chairs would write short responses to the higher education report and the State Auditor's report, but no response will be provided for the Lt. Governor report. Morse requested ICAS should write a response to AB 1348; members suggested that each segment talk to their GROs regarding this bill and a possible response.

Action:

- The three segment chairs will invite their respective GRO to the upcoming ICAS meeting.
- The segment chairs will write a response to the higher education report and the State Auditor's report.

Transfer

V. Transfer Data – D. Guerin

Highlights were shared on the number of students who transferred using Associate Degrees for Transfer (AD-T) from CCC to CSU. Nine hundred and eight students with AD-Ts transferred into the CSU in Fall 2013. From 2012 – 2013, 402 students transferred during both semesters. The top three community colleges producing transfer students were Saddleback, Fullerton, and Golden West. The top three CSUs accepting transfer students were Fullerton, Sacramento State, and East Bay. The top disciplines students were graduating from were Psychology, Sociology, Speech, Communication Studies, and Criminal Justice. It was noted that the disciplines with the most students were the first disciplines that released TMCs.

VI. Articulation by COR vs. Syllabus – D. Morse

The question of articulation by course outline (COR) or syllabus resurfaced. It was noted that ICAS previously released a statement on this in June 2011, authored by B. Smith as the ASCCC Curriculum Chair. The UC representatives stated that there is a disconnect between how faculty interpret what is written in a COR and understanding what is being taught in class. In particular, it is hard to discern what literature is being covered in a COR; therefore, UC faculty ask for syllabi to see the covered literature. A suggestion was made to have written guidance about how to read course outlines and how to write effective CORs. Members felt that this topic should come back to the next ICAS meeting.

Action:

- This topic will be revisited at the next meeting, along with suggestions for how to address the issue.

VII. Credit by Exam – B. Smith

Numerous conversations are being held regarding credit by examination (CBE) and the differing approach of each segment. It was proposed that ICAS make recommendations regarding CBE and the possibility of pulling together a task force. Morse shared that there is currently a group of CCC faculty working on a CBE paper and suggested that a connection be made with the work they are doing and what ICAS is proposing to do. The importance of CBE was highlighted, as 46,000 veterans are now in higher education and there is a current push to recognize prior

learning in military contexts recommended by ACE for credit. Gubernat proposed that ICAS come up with a broad policy statement of two to three sentences stating their position on CBE. Other members agreed and tasked Gubernat with coming up with a draft policy statement for the next meeting.

Action:

- Gubernat will draft a broad policy statement for CBE and bring it back to the next ICAS meeting.

VIII. UC President's Initiative on Transfer – B. Jacob

Jacob shared this information during announcements, but stated that he would send along the bullet points from the President's memo to ICAS members.

Action:

- Jacob will email the bullet points from the President's memo to ICAS members via email.

General Education

IX. Value of GE/Goals of Higher Education

This item will be carried over to the next agenda.

X. Recommendation from Natural Science Scoping Committee

The Natural Science Scoping Committee provided a document with recommendations to ICAS on how to update the science competency statements to align with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) recommendation for science in K-12. Members discussed the findings and suggestions of the scoping committee and noted that it may be best to approach the alignment through the lens of A-G requirements, rather than advocating for four-years of science in high school. It was recommended that the Scoping Committee review the Math Competencies statement to see how it aligns with A-G, and if that statement could help shape the way they make their recommendations. ICAS determined that feedback will be given to the Scoping Committee on the document, and that the committee will continue the work and will provide a report to ICAS at its June 2014 meeting. Segment chairs will check-in with their appointments to ensure that they are willing to continue with their participation in the group.

Action:

- ICAS will provide feedback to the committee on their recommendations and will task them with continuing the work they have done.
- The Scoping Committee will present their work to ICAS by the last June 2014 meeting.
- Segment chairs will check with their appointments to see if they are willing to continue working on the committee

XI. IGETC Standards Subcommittee – D. Morse

The goal was to finalize the membership of the IGETC Standards Subcommittee. The membership consists of nine people, three from each segment consisting of a system office representative, faculty member, and articulation officer (AO). The members voted on having Morse continue to chair the group. An issue arose with the appointment of AOs as AOs are faculty members and bylaws state that ICAS is the proper body to appoint faculty to this group and not CIAC. Faculty representatives are being finalized for CSU and UC, and chairs will reach out to their appointments to confirm.

Action:

- UC and CSU chairs will confirm their IGETC faculty appointments.

General Issues

XII. Discussion of ICAS role with CCSF Accreditation – B. Smith

At this time, ICAS stated there is no further action on CCSF and accreditation.

XIII. Online Course Exchange – B. Smith

A proposal to collaborate on online course exchange was made by B. Smith, as all three segments are currently working on this separately. It was suggested that a collaborative effort could look at common course learning outcomes, student learning outcomes, and leaving unit count to be determined by each segment. Members also discussed the need for students to have a foundational course on taking online classes and experience with using the operating system. It was determined that a joint report was not needed; however, the segment chairs will work on a statistical report on their respective online systems and include it in their report for the next meeting.

Action:

- Segment chairs will work on a statistical report on their online system and provide information on their segments online courses at the next meeting.

XIV. UC Admissions Outcomes – G. Johnson

The BOARS report is the first detailed look at what first year admissions look like under the new freshman admissions policy adopted in 2009 and implemented for Fall 2012. BOARS looked at the early results of how students did during their first term at the UC. The cohort that began in 2012 showed a marked increase in their first term GPA in comparison to students from 2010 and 2011. The biggest challenge identified in moving forward is calibrating the size of the guaranteed admission pool: the new policy anticipated a yield of roughly 10.5% of California high school graduates students who would be guaranteed an offer of admission. In reality, the policy captured close to 12.5%, leaving less room for other students. BOARS will undertake a number of conversations about how to move.

BOARS is drafting a clarification statement concerning basic math for admitted UC students to ensure that the BOARS statement is clear that UC expects students to complete the math preparation defined by the college-ready standards of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics prior to enrolling in UC-transferable math courses but will not designate specific high school courses as prerequisites. The BOARS Articulation and Evaluation subcommittee made the recommendation that various Statway courses should be reviewed by UC faculty. Currently, there is a CSU pilot study being conducted on Statway, however, there is not sufficient data or student participation yet to yield accurate results. Guerin offered to check on the number of students who are participating in the Statway pilot program.

It was also noted that there continues to be a decline in CCC applications to transfer into the UC system. The CSU representatives concurred, and stated that CSU transfer applications are also slightly down by 2.6%. However, the real issue for CSU is the significantly lower number of credential and graduate student applications—down to 60% enrollment across the board for CSU. It was asked whether ICAS should tackle this issue and figure out workforce demand.

Action:

- Guerin will check the number of students who are participating in the Statway pilot program and bring this information to the next meeting.

XV. Obama's Scorecard – B. Smith

This was deferred to each segment to determine whether a response is necessary from ICAS.

XVI. Report from CCC Baccalaureate Degree Study Group

ICAS discussed the recent report from the CCC Baccalaureate degree study group. The study group was not intended to be a recommending body, and the inclusion of the recommendations at the end of the document raised concerns for several members in the group. It was noted that the language will likely change in the future to reflect the need for a more in-depth study to be conducted prior to making recommendations. Members discussed concerns they had with having CCC grant BA degrees including limitation on funding, a potential risk of losing sight on the community college mission, and public perception on the creation of the new BA degrees and lack of funding for existing degrees. P. Smith pointed out the need for a discussion around Career and Technical Education (CTE) BA degrees, as CSU does not currently offer four-year degrees in CTE. The collegial collaboration between CSU and UC on the addition of doctorate degrees at CSU was discussed and recommended for future conversation on CCC and BA degrees.

XVII. Principles for Identifying and Using Accountability Measures – D. Guerin/P. Smith

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

Action:

- This item will be included on the next agenda to determine next steps.

Meeting adjourned at 3:48 p.m.
Minutes prepared by Krystinne Mica



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

**DRAFT ICAS Minutes of Meeting
Thursday, February 6, 2014**

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
1102 Q Street, Sacramento, CA
ICAS Website • <http://icas-ca.org/>

In Attendance:

- CCC Senate: Beth Smith, President; David Morse, Vice President; Julie Bruno, Secretary; Phil Smith, North Representative; John Stankas (via phone), South Representative; and Julie Adams, Executive Director
- CSU Senate: Diana Wright Guerin, Chair; Steven Filling, Vice Chair; Glen Brodowsky, Secretary; Darlene Yee-Melichar, Member-at-Large; and Susan Gubernat, Member-at-Large
- UC Senate: Bill Jacob, Chair; Mary Gilly, Vice Chair; George Johnson, BOARS Chair; Ross H. Frank (via phone), UCOPE Chair; Tracy Larrabee, UCEP Vice Chair; and Martha Winnacker, Executive Director
- Staff: Krystinne Mica (CCC)
- Guests: Steve Juarez, Director- UC State Governmental Relations; Andrew Martinez, Senior Legislative Advocate- CSU Advocacy and State Relations; Vincent Stewart, Vice Chancellor- CCC Governmental Relations; Katherine Harris (via phone), COERC Chair

I. Consent Calendar

- *Approval of the February 6, 2014 Agenda*

The agenda was approved with addition of the following items:

- Resolution on unit load for high-unit majors
- Transfer Action Team—update

(Yee-Melichar, Johnson) MSC.

II. Approval of December 12, 2013 Notes

- *Approval of the December 12, 2013 Meeting Notes*

The body discussed the notes from the December meeting and a request was made to have clear motions for approval of items. There was discussion on the COERC job description for the chair, and members agreed to defer the conversation later in the afternoon. The minutes were approved (Brodowsky) MSC.

Governmental Relations

III. Counsel from Segment Government Relations Leaders

The Government Relations leaders from each segment will join ICAS for briefing on potential legislation.

Steve Juarez, Director, UC State Governmental Relations

Juarez gave a brief report on legislation currently being pursued by the University of California which includes:

- A bill for a student loan program for undocumented students
- Exemption on restricting students under 21 years of age to participate in brewing classes
- Additional streamlining of contracting process for residential property to raise threshold from \$500,000 to \$1 million
- Veteran student non-resident tuition exemption (similar to state operated Yellow Ribbon program)

Juarez updated ICAS on the state budget and impact on the UC segment. The original ask was \$240 million dollars, and UC received \$142 million. He stated this was a great start, but more will be needed to get UC back to where it was prior to 2008.

Andrew Martinez, Senior Legislative Advocate, CSU Advocacy and State Relations

Martinez provided information on the two legislative measures that are being pursued by California State University, which includes:

- Modification of service for faculty trustee on the Board of Trustees
- A request to defer dissemination of the Early Start Program report to mid-year

Martinez stated that the CSU segment is also interested in the exemption for under-age tasting in brew classes, and noted that the budget is of great interest this year, as they are seeking \$95 million more from the state budget.

Vincent Stewart, Vice Chancellor, CCC Governmental Relations

Stewart enumerated the three different legislative measures that the California Community College is pursuing, which includes:

- Removal of certain barriers and restrictions on dual enrollment between high schools and community colleges
- Commitment on professional development for faculty, staff, and administration, contingent on additional funding
- Statutory relief for City College of San Francisco (CCSF) to hold funding at the same level for one year during a dip in enrollment

Stewart reported that the CCC is mostly satisfied with the budget, although there are areas which could use more augmentation. During his upcoming trip to the White House, he reported that they will continue to lobby for the four major areas of additional funding for veteran student support services, reauthorization of the higher education act, workforce investment act, and funding for PELL grants.

ICAS asked the three government segment leaders to speak on Senate Bill 850. The government leaders each highlighted the concerns on SB 850, and noted that concern for UC is based on duplicative work and ensuring that the creation of the baccalaureate (BA) degree fulfills a need that is not being met; CSU stated there is discussion happening, although they do not have an official position; and CCC is having conversations on applied BA degrees as a means to address workforce needs, particularly for Nursing, where the movement from ADN to BSN is rendering CCC degrees impractical. They were also asked to comment on the future value of the higher education system to California (“rainy day fund”) and all segment leaders noted that investment in the higher education system is crucial for California to be able to compete in the global workforce. The conversation also involved questions on taxes and where future revenue will be

generated; predictability of student fees and tuition; continuous appropriation; campus based fees.

The three ~~segment-government relations~~ leaders ~~provided-suggested~~ names of people that might be of interest to invite to the upcoming April 29 meeting including Assemblymember Toni Atkins (SD), Senator Kevin DeLeon (LA), Assemblymember Shirley Weber, new budget committee subcommittee Member Al Martucci, and John Sawyer (proposal to have similar measure that would charge student tuition on future salary).

IV. **Planning for April 29, 2014 Meeting in the Capitol**

ICAS reviewed potential people to invite to the April 29 meeting including: Kathleen Chavira, Principal Consultant for Senate Education Committee; Camille Esch, Common Core Standards; Laura Metune, Chief Consultant for Committee on Higher Education; Senator Marty Block; Monica Henestroza; Judy Heiman and Paul Steenhausen, Legislative Analyst Office; and Assembly Fellow Israel Landa.

Guerin presented an agenda for the upcoming legislative briefing on online education, highlighting their proposed topics and presentations for the day, and asked ICAS for suggestions or recommendations to be added into the agenda. Morse offered to provide Guerin and the rest of ICAS with a copy of a report conducted on Los Rios students to be included as a resource for the presentation. As the three segment leaders (Chancellor Harris, Chancellor White, and President Napolitano) are working together to leverage public higher education, it is important for ICAS to be present at these types of meetings to show their joint efforts in legislation for higher education. The members agreed that the upcoming briefing on online education is a good way to show what the three segments are doing with regard to online education.

Action

- Morse will provide the report on Los Rios students to ICAS and Guerin.

V. **General Announcements**

Diana Wright Guerin, Chair, CSU Academic Senate

Guerin provided a brief overview of the resolutions from the January 2014 Plenary. She discussed some of the ongoing issues Engineering departments continue to have with the newly imposed 120-unit max, and the ASCSU attempt at including wording in Title 5 that would allow Engineering to have 132-units. Chancellor White provided a State of the CSU address, and noted the \$50 million budget focus on student completion, as well as the recent campus climate issues at San Jose State University. A brief update on the CSU online course match was provided, and issues noted included unit exchange between quarter and semester campuses, differing number of units offered by campuses, and course articulation. It is anticipated that by 2016, roughly 2500-2600 online courses will be offered.

Bill Jacob, Chair, UC Academic Senate

Provost Dorr gave a presentation on online education at the UC Regents meeting in January and noted that there are 30 courses that are being funded with 45 students currently enrolled in the cross-campus system. There are also conversations on streamlining transfer in the future. Conversations are happening on enrollment

management, as UC has not had a plan in the last three years. If a plan is devised, it would allow UC campuses to have a clear target for student enrollment. President Napolitano is interested in the online degrees and online education proposed at Arizona State University.

Beth Smith, ICAS Chair and President, CCC Academic Senate

B. Smith noted that ICAS is not under obligation to follow the Bagley-Keene Act. B. Smith noted upcoming events for ASCCC including Accreditation Institute and Academic Academy in February, as well as the upcoming Spring Plenary Session in April. There are recent staffing vacancies at the CCC Chancellor's Office, which may affect some work and implementation of initiatives. The CCC online course exchange is underway, with roughly \$16.9 million dollars invested in the development of housing the online courses, as well as funding logistical work on e-transcripts, financial aid, and other parts-efforts that will support the online courses.

California Open Education Resource Council

VI. COERC

Filling made a motion to approve the job description (distributed by B. Smith and crafted based on the Dec 12, 2013 meeting) and hiring of the COERC chair by the three ICAS leaders. Members were unanimously in favor of adopting the job duties and description for COERC. B. Smith noted that the council voted in favor of combining the three 20% appointment of staff support to one 60% staff.

Katherine Harris, the new COERC chair was introduced to ICAS. Harris is an English faculty member from San Jose State, who helped to create several digital literature libraries and has extensive experience in crafting online libraries. She provided an update to ICAS on the progress made by the council and presented three action items for ICAS to approve:

- A communication plan, broken into two parts: an internal process that communicates information to campus chairs, deans, faculty, and students; and an external process that provides information to news agencies and the general public.
- A proposal to house the COERC webpage on the ICAS site.
- Letters of appointment for all council members.

Harris elaborated on the council's plan to involve students in the process of reviewing textbooks, and noted that a rubric will be crafted for them to provide guidelinesfeedback. Since students cannot judge the pedagogical content of text, that will remain under faculty discretion. She also noted that staffing support for the council is not yet in place and Hanley offered to have a staff member from his office help with travel arrangements. They have several upcoming meetings, including an in-person meeting before the end of February to finalize criteria for textbooks and procedures. They anticipate that Hanley will be able to announce the OER librarian by February 14.

Members discussed the three action items for approval by ICAS. There was some concern about the overall governance structure of COERC and ICAS's role. Some felt that ICAS should have more of a high-functioning oversight role, and allow the council to have more responsibility. There was a request to have an organizational chart drafted to show specific responsibilities; B. Smith stated that a council member made a mapping structure, which she will forward to ICAS. Because ICAS does not meet as regularly as

COERC, P. Smith motioned to allow COERC to receive direction from the Academic Senate Chairs with the understanding that the chairs will evaluate issues and if a broader discussion is needed, the whole body would be involved. There will also be a monthly report from COERC for ICAS. Members agreed and the motion was carried. (P. Smith, Filling) MSC.

ICAS discussed the use of its website by the council and the current procedures for updating, and asked whether ICAS wanted Harris to have the ability to make changes on the website. They were concerned around the use of individual segment's logo, as this would have to be approved by their segment's public relations office and discussed whether the use of the ICAS logo is permissible. It was noted that the ASCCC office currently manages the content on the website. Morse suggested to have Harris work with Adams on the addition of the COERC webpage to ICAS and content management. Johnson made a motion to have the webpage put onto the ICAS website and have Adams work with Harris on how to create and manage the webpage. A copy of the changes and documents will be sent to the body. This motion was approved. (Johnson, Yee-Melichar) MSC.

There was a motion to combine the allocation for each segment of 20% staff into one 60% staff and have the three segment chairs create the job description and hire the staff in consultation with Harris. (Johnson, Yee-Melichar) MSC. This person will be housed under the ASCSU. They discussed the appointment letters and Winnacker will forward a draft letter to the B. Smith to edit and confer with Hanley on the language. B. Smith will follow up and figure out how to move forward with the appointment letters. They also conversed about a potential conflict of interest policy and it was determined that the three segment chairs will go to their legal counsel to seek help on the document. Since the CSU is the fiscal agent, it will ultimately be by the CSU general counsel that will sign off on the document.

Action:

- The three segment chairs will seek guidance from their legal counsel on the conflict of interest policy.
- Winnacker will forward a draft copy of the UC appointment letter to B. Smith
- B. Smith will follow up with Hanley about the language for appointment letters
- Adams will work with Harris on the COERC website and send any changes or documents uploaded to the COERC website to ICAS
- COERC will receive direction from the three academic senate leaders with the understanding that the chairs will evaluate issues and if a broader discussion is needed, the whole body would be involved
- There will be a monthly report from COERC council for ICAS.
- The three segment chairs will create the job description and hire the staff member in consultation with Harris

Transfer

VII. Credit by Exam

Gubernat drafted a one page Credit by Exam document for ICAS to review, edit, and approve for use. Members commended Gubernat on the document and provided some feedback on the language, as well as the structure of the document. Members pointed out

issues currently happening with course articulation in their own segments. They agreed on timing the release of this document along with the release of the credit by exam paper being crafted by the CCC. They suggested having the document be sent out to the members via email and have the document edited in that manner. A motion was made by Yee-Melichar and Bruno. (MSC).

Action:

- Gubernat and Morse will work on editing the document and send out to ICAS to review via email

VIII. Articulation by COR vs. Syllabus

Frank suggested that ICAS may want to look at guidelines that all three segments can use to figure out what CORs are and use them to evaluate campus articulation. Filling asked whether the C-ID project can help address this issue. Several members who are involved with C-ID spoke on the criteria and template that is used to evaluate course outlines submitted against course descriptors and noted the fairly prescriptive nature of the C-ID descriptors. As both the CCC and CSU have participated in C-ID, the language is common between the two segments, but will be new to the UC. B. Smith asked whether a group should be convened for this work, and members suggested seeing sample descriptors from C-ID to start the conversation. Bruno will provide sample documents, including the C-ID policy document. Johnson previously pulled descriptors from the C-ID website and will forward over to Frank to review.

Action:

- Bruno will provide ICAS with the C-ID policy documents for review
- Johnson will forward copies of C-ID descriptors to Frank

General Education

IX. Value of GE/Goals of Higher Education

This item will have further discussion by individual senate segments and will be brought back to the second meeting of ICAS during the 2014-15 academic year.

General Issues

X. Online Course Exchange

This topic was covered during the segment chair reports.

XI. Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC)

This topic is deferred to the next meeting.

XII. Principles for Identifying and Using Accountability Measures

P. Smith and Guerin will bring this item back at a later meeting.

XIII. Resolution on Unit Load for High-Unit Majors

B. Smith informed ICAS that CCC continues to have issues with unit-creep and asked other segment faculty whether this is also happening in their system. Although UC and CSU faculty indicated they are not noticing this pattern in their segment, it was mentioned that there are questions posed to their segment regarding what constitutes a unit (UC), and faculty using more class time in courses to teach missing prerequisites (CCC). Members agreed to research between three to four majors to see if unit-creep is

happening across the board in majors and will bring their research back to the next meeting.

Action:

- Members will begin their research by looking through three to four majors and identifying if this is happening across the board. This will come back to the next meeting.

XIV. UC Transfer Action Team - Update

Johnson reported that the Transfer Action Team is close to finalizing a series of recommendations to President Napolitano. The team is fashioning a report on ideas of simplicity, an easier process for students to navigate transfer and application to UC, transparency and application for students, and diversity. Another issue is student success after transfer. Johnson mentioned that he believes UC should be involved with C-ID, however faculty involvement continues to be an issue. The landscape for associate degrees for transfer (AD-Ts) has also changed after SB 1440 was passed and UC will need to work on identifying major preparation for programs in terms of existing AD-Ts for students.

Johnson informed ICAS about a suggestion made to have President Napolitano and Chancellor Harris to commit to spending time on CCC campuses to speak about transfer in the hopes that this would improve the flow of students between CCC and UC. A question about how each segment defines success was asked. UC mentioned that success is defined by having prepared students coming into their system. Members once again discussed AD-Ts and perception of having AD-Ts as the premier pathway of choice. CCC faculty agreed that there are still other pathways that can get the student to transfer, however if the budget tightens once more, there may be a movement to push students to AD-Ts. UC is interested in partnering with CCC to work with advisors and transfer center coordinators on messaging to students about transfer.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.
Minutes prepared by Krystinne Mica

DRAFT C-ID
Advisory Committee Minutes

February 18, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

555 Capitol Mall, 9th Floor Conference Room, Sacramento, CA 95814

In Attendance:

Deanna Abma, Articulation Officer, City College of San Francisco
Julie Adams, Executive Director, ASCCC/C-ID
Cathy Beane, Articulation Officer, CSU Long Beach
Julie Bruno, Communication Studies, Sierra College
Dan Crump, C-ID Project Director, American River College/ ASCCC
Aurelia Long, Articulation Officer, UC Berkeley
Ken Nishita, Psychology, CSU Monterey Bay
Barry Pasternack, Business, CSU Fullerton
Michelle Pilati, C-ID Faculty Coordinator/ Rio Hondo College
Bob Quinn, Specialist, Transfer and Articulation , CCCCCO
Barbara Swerkes, Consultant, CSU System Office

Guest:

Cris McCullough, Policy Alignment and Outreach Workforce and Economic Development, CCCCCO

Staff:

Krystinne Mica, Administrative Assistant, ASCCC/C-ID
Lashonda Shannon, Administrative Assistant, ASCCC/C-ID

I. Announcements and Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved with the following addition from Pilati on section IV: discussion of the processes for the development and review of descriptors that are intended for community colleges only.

II. Introduction and Review of Committee Charge

Brief introductions were conducted by members of the committee.

Pilati distributed the C-ID steering committee binders and informed members that the group would be tasked with reviewing it as many policies and documents needed to be updated.

Adams explained that the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW) assumed a number of the steering committee's responsibilities but this group needed to be reconvened as new processes (that do not involve ICW) are developed.

III. C-ID Overview

A. C-ID Current Status

Pilati informed members that because of SB 1440, C-ID is continuously evolving. She also noted that C-ID's visibility has increased as its descriptors are the foundation of the transfer degree process; both community colleges and California state universities are working diligently to ensure the quality of the descriptors and courses in the C-ID system.

Pilati stated that C-ID funds are depleted. The project is currently being supported by the Statewide Career Pathways (SCP) grant and, thus, C-ID is focusing on the development of TMCs and descriptors in CTE disciplines. Pilati mentioned that stipend payments (for the past six months) for course outline of record evaluators (COREs) totaled more than \$100,000.

Pilati added that C-ID leadership hopes to initiate several technology updates in the near future. One of these updates includes the ability for colleges to see their current C-ID course submissions in a "preview" version of a TMC aligned degree.

B. C-ID and SB 1440/440

Pilati reported that C-ID has added pressure to complete its work for SB 1440 as there is an 18 month mandate for degree development after a TMC has been created. She also explained that SB 440 has expanded C-ID's purview to include work on areas of emphasis.

C. C-ID and Statewide Career Pathways

Pilati informed members that C-ID and Statewide Career Pathways are convening CTE faculty in disciplines that may or may not transfer; they have been tasked with descriptor development so that students are able to move between community college campuses. She noted that although these CTE disciplines are concentrating on community college to community college relationships, CSU participation is welcomed (if there is an interest).

D. Future Directions

Pilati explained that three large technology based grants were recently funded. One of these grants included expanding the California virtual campus and creating a centralized place for students to access online courses. These online, statewide courses have demanded a discussion of prerequisites and comparability. There needs to be a clear channel of communication across campuses so that students are able to seamlessly register for a class that has a prerequisite from another college. She noted that there are a number of transferrable prerequisite courses in C-ID but this effort would require more. Pilati also highlighted the facets of the other two projects which are focusing on a statewide degree audit and common assessment. C-ID will have a role in all three initiatives.

IV. C-ID Processes and Policies

A. Existing Policies – Review of Binder

Pilati asked members to review the documents in the C-ID Advisory Committee binder. Members agreed that a number of C-ID documents needed to be updated including the statement on C-ID in ASSIST and the grandfathering of LDTP courses. Pilati informed members that an AO subgroup was created to replace Pam Brown Schachter (the previous C-ID AO consultant); they are addressing the expired LDTP courses in C-ID.

Members continued to review the binder while Pilati gave updates and background information on several ICW policies including the process for modifying a finalized TMC and the recently adopted language regarding model curricula. Pilati explained that there are two types of model curricula available. One type is developed for certificates or degrees not designed for transfer; the other is designed for transferable degrees that do not fit the current 60 + 60 structure and are not readily available on a CSU campus.

Pilati also gave insight on several other documents:

- The standard and CTE TMC checklist;
- The C-ID policy on reciprocity;
- The TMC Development Process – TMC Posting and CCCCCO Template Availability; and
- C-ID course status definitions.

The C-ID course status definitions document lead to a lengthy discussion about the number of backlogged courses in the C-ID system. Members were concerned that a degree might be delayed because of the time it takes C-ID to review a course. Pilati assured members that C-ID leadership is actively working to address the backlog by having a mass course outline review session, recruiting additional CCC and CSU reviewers, and discussing the idea of having some courses only be reviewed by CCC COREs.

Pasternack asked which descriptors have the highest “not approved” rate. Pilati explained that there are a number of variables that influence this number and she would have to complete research so that the data she provides regarding this question are meaningful.

Action:

- **Pilati to bring back a document to the next meeting that identifies descriptors with a high fail rate.**

B. Course Content in Excess of Descriptor Requirement

Pilati informed members that some course outline of record evaluators are weary of approving a CoR that has a substantial amount of content in excess of the C-ID descriptor requirements. She stated that the committee needed to make a decision to address this issue.

Pasternack suggested that descriptors represent 90% of what is in a course outline; this would allow flexibility but also limit the amount of information permitted in a CoR. Pilati, Burno and Swerkes stated that enforcing this rule may be difficult and creating such restrictions should be determined by discipline faculty as they would have more insight on course content. Members discussed the advantages and disadvantages of setting parameters for the content covered in CoRs; they worried that creating a “maximum content” policy would contradict the current message being sent to faculty which states descriptors are the bare minimum for what information a CoR should contain. Pastnerack concurred.

Abma suggested adding discipline specific guidelines for course reviewers but Adams thought this variability could cause confusion in the field. Members continued to discuss ideas and agreed that reviewers should focus on a CoR’s ability to adequately cover the content outlines in the C-ID descriptor. Pilati explained that this decision is not a new policy but, instead, is more of an addendum for the current review process.

Action:

- **Pilati to determine where this addendum should be added and bring this C-ID policy back to the next meeting.**

C. 5-Year Descriptor Review Process

Pilati explained that Agriculture initiated their 5 year descriptor review process and explained to members what the process entailed. Members discussed the process (referencing attachment II) and provided recommendations.

Crump suggested creating technology that would enable Primary Reviewers to track the descriptor related issues that arise over the years so that there is a “pool” of concerns and FDRG are not purely relying on feedback from the field. He stated that having such a database would help make the review process more efficient and meaningful. Members concurred.

Abma asked Pilati how the Chancellor’s Office would handle courses that were not reviewed by the end of the five year review cycle. Pilati stated that extensions are a possibility and would be granted on a case-by-case basis as there are a number of different reasons why an extension might be needed (such as a college’s curriculum review process).

D. Appeals Process

Pilati asked members to review the appeals process document (attachment III). Members proposed modifications and agreed that:

- The document should be written in present tense so that it is more direct; and

- To remove the last sentence in item 6, to strike items 7, 8, and 9 entirely and to make item 10 number 7.

Members agreed that these modifications would prevent AOs for asking for multiple appeals which would add additional strain on the C-ID system. Adams worried that removing these aspects of the document would not address the concerns of the ICW; this workgroup did not want community college Primary Reviewers to override the decision of a CSU CORE. Members had a lengthy discussion regarding the appeals process and how the group should incorporate the recommendations proposed by ICW. The committee agreed that the language in item 6 should read *and* rather than *or*.

Pilati reminded members that appeals are rare and are usually resolved with clarification from the Primary Reviewer and/ or FDRG—most AOs just want additional information that their discipline faculty can use when revising CoRs deemed *conditionally* or *not approved*. Quinn stated that all appeals should be tracked and documented for historical purposes.

Action:

- **Pilati to create a flowchart to illustrate the appeals process.**
- **Pilati to modify the document based on the feedback from this meeting and send the new document to members (via email) for feedback and possible approval.**

E. Discipline Designation Issues

Pilati informed members that some reviewers were concerned with where courses are listed as this does not always reflect who is teaching the course.

Pilati gave an example of an anthropology course submitted against an administration of justice descriptor. Administration of Justice faculty did not want to approve the course because of where it was listed. Pilati stated that this is a reoccurring issue and the committee needed to create an official C-ID position.

Members asked why the course designation is considered and believed that reviewers should only be reviewing how a CoR's content compares to the C-ID descriptor. Pilati explained that the member's position reflected current C-ID policy and therefore, the policy would not be amended.

F. Prerequisites

Pilati informed members that the Biology FDRG added prerequisites to nearly finalized descriptors and this created controversy in the field. Biology ultimately modified these prerequisites and made them advisories but this action brought about the need for C-ID to establish a policy on adding prerequisites to a descriptor.

Pilati suggested requiring a content review and explained to members what such a process would entail. In sum, a content review would require the FDRG to holistically review descriptors so that college campuses and AOs have a resource to look to in understanding why a prerequisite is listed.

Action:

- **Pilati to bring back a document that would outline the steps of a content review.**

- G. Development and Review of Descriptors Intended for Community Colleges
Pilati explained that there needed to be a process for developing and reviewing descriptors intended solely for community colleges so that the CSU system is aware of where their participation is needed.

Swerkes asked if there would be model curricula or certificate programs developed for these types of courses which lead to a lengthy discussion about whether CSU participation is warranted. Adams stated that including CSUs may delay the process and it would be more beneficial to have them look at finalized products.

Pilati stated that these types of community college to community college courses would require an ongoing dialogue. Members decided that the committee needs to determine where CSU faculty should be involved and a policy needs to be created for determining if a course intrasegmental.

Mica provided members with a CTE update:

CTE FDRGs that are being convened:

- Addiction Studies— waiting on two more CCC members
- Automotive Technology — finalized last CCC member; may participate in 3/28 in-person meeting
- Biotechnology — attending the 3/28 in-person meeting to discuss descriptor and model curriculum development
- Commercial Music – waiting on appointments for CCC faculty
- Culinary Arts — waiting on appointments for CCC faculty
- Emergency Medical Services — attending the 3/28 in-person meeting to discuss descriptor and model curriculum development

The CTE FDRGs are waiting on the CSU appointment(s), if deemed fit by the CSU system.

V. Future Agenda Items and Next Meeting Time/Place

Future Agenda Items

- Members to review revised C-ID policies
- Review the appeals process and appeals process flowchart
- Review report from AO subgroup
- Review most recent C-ID AO newsletter

The next meeting will be held on April 15, 2014 in Sacramento. The meeting time will be determined based on flight availability.

VI. Adjournment

Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup Minutes (Final)

January 30, 2014

Academic Senate Office—9th Floor Conference Room
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 525, Sacramento

In Attendance:

Deanna Abma, Articulation Officer, City College of San Francisco
Julie Adams, Executive Director, ASCCC/C-ID
Kevin Baaske, Faculty Affairs, CSU Academic Senate/CSU Los Angeles
Julie Bruno, ICW Meeting Facilitator, Secretary, ASCCC/Sierra College
Sheila Lau, Articulation Officer, College of Alameda
Michelle Pilati, C-ID Faculty Coordinator, ASCCC/Rio Hondo College
Jim Postma, Immediate Past Chair, CSU Academic Senate
Erik Skinner, Deputy Chancellor, CCCCCO
Jeff Spano, Dean, CCCCCO
Barbara Swerkes, Consultant, CSU System Office
Mary K. Turner, Vice President of Instruction, Sacramento City College
Mark Van Selst, Professor of Psychology, San Jose State University

Staff:

Krystinne Mica, Administrative Assistant, ASCCC

I. Announcements and Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented. (Baaske) MSC

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes were approved with the change of *ICMC* to *ISMC*. (Baaske) MSC.

III. TMC Policies and Processes

A. TMCs for Other Languages

Postma asked members to consider having a modified TMC creation process for those disciplines with a smaller number of transfer students (100 or less). The proposal would look at CSU foreign language departments and present them with the Spanish TMC to determine whether the course structure could work for their language. Once the faculty determined if it is a structure that could work, the creation of a TMC would move forward. Postma indicated there may be backlash to this proposal from those disciplines that were told in the beginning that they could not create a TMC. As an alternative cost-saving measure, Postma proposed, in addition to the language TMC model, would be to use only already articulated courses for the TMCs created in this way, so as to not add additional burden on C-ID.

Members considered the two proposals on the table: creation of the foreign language TMCs modeled against Spanish, and the use of already articulated courses (local articulation). There was concern surrounding the use of local articulation for the foreign language courses, as some members felt that it would be counterproductive to the work

already forged by the C-ID project. Members were encouraged to think of ways in which forward movement on the creation of more TMCs can be made, as legislation is constantly seeking progress on transfer. Although members agreed that legislation is constantly pushing for increased progress on transfer, it was not clear whether all members agreed that creating more TMCs is the answer. Some argued that it was necessary to clean up the work on the existing TMCs first before implementing a new process for TMC creation. Others concurred with Postma's warning that the creation of this new type of TMC could garner resentment from disciplines that were excluded from the original TMC process. A philosophical conversation may be necessary to think about establishing a new process including implications for the future. ICW considered the advantages and disadvantages for those smaller disciplines that do not have a TMC. A perceived disadvantage is that if a discipline does not have a TMC, the discipline would get eliminated first as they do not have a preferred method of transfer for students.

Members deliberated on how to move forward with the proposal to have foreign language departments review the Spanish TMC to see if it would work for their language. They conversed about ways to convene the discipline faculty together to talk about the creation of the TMC, but did not come to a solid conclusion on the best method. There was hesitation regarding starting the process with CSU faculty, as ultimately this would be a CCC degree and should have CCC faculty involved in the forefront. There was a suggestion to put together a webinar that presents what Postma highlighted to faculty and see if this could garner enough participation to move forward. Members revisited this conversation at the end of the day and Postma and Pilati were tasked to have conversations off-line regarding putting together a concrete proposal for ICW to review and possibly approve at the next meeting.

Action:

- Postma and Pilati will draft a proposal detailing how this might move forward to present for possible approval to ICW at the next meeting.

B. Model Curriculum Policy

Pilati sought to have the revised document adopted by ICW and proposed to have this posted on the C-ID website for the public to view. There were suggestions on how to restructure the document to make it clear that model curriculum existed prior to TMCs, as well as the different types of model curriculum now in existence. Members asked to strike the paragraph beginning with "*As of January 30*" as it is informational and not part of the policy. As this was approved previously, Pilati will incorporate the body's suggested edits and send out again via email for final approval. If there are no comments received after Pilati sends out edited document, then it remains approved.

Action:

- Pilati will incorporate suggested edits and send out via email. If there are no comments back, the document is considered an adopted policy of ICW.

C. Guarantees for High-Unit Degrees

ICW considered guarantees for degrees that do not fit the SB 1440 model, specifically Nursing, Engineering, and ICT. CSU faculty and system office representatives stated that the acceptance of high unit majors has gotten increasingly complicated for CSU, as a new mandate was included in their Title 5 regulations which establishes that the maximum number of units required for any degree be 120. Even engineering departments are now being asked to adhere to the 120-unit limit as an individual campus was able to demonstrate that they could fit their degree within this cap. Although Nursing was able to come up with the 70 – 50 split in units, ICW will still need to figure out other guarantees for students who complete this model curriculum, as admissions guarantee does not seem a likely possibility due to impaction.

Postma asked whether it would be prudent to have this conversation once the model curriculum for Engineering, Nursing, and ICT are accepted by the ICFW. In that way, there is a concrete model curriculum they can review and determine, on a case by case basis, potential guarantees. As Nursing seems to be the closest model curriculum that has the most concrete need to have this conversation started, Postma was tasked to speak with the Nursing faculty regarding what guarantees they see for the model curriculum. Pilati will create a document that spells out potential guarantees for model curriculum and 1440 benefits, and bring back to the next meeting.

Action:

- Postma will speak with Nursing faculty about possible guarantees for the model curriculum and bring the conversation back at the next meeting.
- Pilati will draft a document of model curriculum and potential 1440 benefits and bring back to the next meeting.

D. ICW Statement on GE Component

Pilati brought forth this document at the last ICW meeting and is seeking approval after requested edits were made. The document is intended to clarify that a campus can offer different GE patterns (CSU GE Breadth or IGETC), and only one is required to get the students out in 60 units. When a campus submits a degree to the CCC Chancellor's Office, there is some uncertainty whether the pattern they submit fits into the 60-unit guarantee. Pilati mentioned that a document that clearly defines that either one could be used would be helpful since the language could then be included in the college catalogs. The AOs agreed.

MSC (Turner, Postma) to approve the document as amended.

The use of IGETC for STEM on the Chemistry TMC was discussed. Since IGETC for STEM is approved, but is not currently included in the IGETC Handbook, there is still some time to ensure that the use of IGETC for STEM can be included on the Chemistry TMC prior to the CCCCO template release in September. Pilati and Postma agreed to work on the inclusion of IGETC for STEM in the Chemistry TMC.

Action:

- Pilati and Postma will work on including IGETC for STEM on the Chemistry TMC.

IV. IGETC for STEM Implementation

Pilati presented a resource document that provides examples on the use of either IGETC for STEM for CSU or CSU GE Breadth to double-count units in AD-Ts. Currently, only the Chemistry TMC has opted to include IGETC for STEM for CSU as a GE pattern option and the units may pose an issue for CHEM once the template is available. Pilati will continue to draft this document, including feedback from the group, and bring it back to the next meeting.

Action:

- Pilati will work on the document and will present the edited document at the next meeting.

V. Discipline Updates and Discussion

Pilati updated the group on the progress of the Biology FDRG and the removal of the prerequisites on the A&P descriptors. She also informed the group that the TMC for Biology will be posted for vetting soon, along with two descriptors (BIOL 150 and BIOL 155). There are several TMCs and model curriculum vetting for disciplines that will close in February. Several FDRGs are currently being convened for their first meeting. The Kinesiology primary reviewer is retiring and C-ID is in the processes of training and replacing the primary reviewer for this discipline.

VI. Areas of Emphasis

Pilati distributed a draft document on the proposed definition of areas of emphasis. The two definitions were proposed during the last meeting and crafted into a document for review and approval. Some members felt that it was necessary to include that areas of emphasis have existed pre-440 legislation and should be distinguished in the document. Members discussed the two definitions and tried to determine whether one definition was desirable over the other. Postma reminded the group that he previously proposed a STEM TMC that could potentially be converted into an area of emphasis under the newly proposed definitions.

In their discussion, they noted that the first definition is closer to the spirit of the original SB 1440 legislation. Several members suggested combining both definitions into one, as well as changing the wording on “home department”. They discussed whether areas of emphasis would lead to a TMC in that discipline, or if a different label should be created given that TMCs are only for those that fit the 1440 guidelines. Pilati felt that the two definitions could not be combined and proposed amending the document to reflect the changes that members wanted. This document will be a working definition of areas of emphasis, and will include the year in which areas of emphasis was introduced into the CCC vernacular. The members brought up the idea of having a STEM transfer degree, and Pilati offered to include language on STEM in to the working definition.

Action:

- Pilati will incorporate suggested edits and send out via email. If there are no comments back, the document is considered an adopted policy of ICW.

A. Social Science

Van Selst will bring his research to the next meeting.

Action:

- Van Selst will bring research on the Social Science area of emphasis to the next meeting.

B. Ethnic Studies

Abma and Pilati reviewed existing Ethnic Studies programs, which included African American Studies, Chicano Studies, Asian American Studies, and Women's Studies. They noted that most programs had smaller number of students, with little lower division units. Members were asked whether they wanted to move forward with convening the different Ethnic Studies faculty to determine whether an area of emphasis would work for their program. The body made a motion to move forward with convening Ethnic Studies. Adams proposed a discipline input group (DIG) meeting for Ethnic Studies; members deliberated then agreed to hold a DIG.

Action:

- A DIG will be convened for Ethnic Studies faculty.

VII. Reports

A. Senate Updates

There was no report from either senate at this meeting.

B. IOC Report

The next IOC meeting is on March 17 in Sacramento. Spano will work on having the C-ID Faculty Coordinator report included on the upcoming agenda.

Action:

- Spano will work to get Pilati on the IOC agenda on March 17.

C. CCC CO (*Skinner*)

Skinner provided a document on approved AD-T and noted that 1,078 were approved, with 595 in progress since January 22, 2014. During a review of the data, Chancellor Harris offered to contact the 30 campuses with the lowest "% Target Achieved" and received commitments from the campus president to meet the 100% goal. He noted that the University of California and some independent colleges have begun to discuss transfer initiatives with CCC. Harris encouraged Janet Napolitano (UC President) to review AD-Ts to see if they can build in the TMC to their system. Napolitano agreed to share with UC faculty members the TMC process to see if and how this could work for their segment. Skinner mentioned that a similar conversation happened with the AICCU (independent colleges) representative Kristen Soares. Skinner informed the group that

staffing at the Chancellor's Office is sparse, as Russell and Lenz have left to take on new roles.

A question on the Elementary Teacher Education AD-T was posed, regarding the low number of degrees submitted for this discipline. Skinner offered to research this question and inform the group of his findings. Skinner clarified that AD-Ts must be offered if a college offers or plans to offer an AA/S degree in that discipline.

Action:

- Skinner will research why Elementary Teacher Education has lower number of degrees submitted and present to the group at an upcoming meeting.

D. CSUCO (*Swerkes*)

Swerkes distributed a document to the group that showed the CSU-TMC alignment for CSU campuses. Members noted that they are not receiving this by email from the CSU Chancellor's Office. This report is a summary of a longer document that shows specific information for each campus.

VIII. Prepare for Future IOC Meeting

Adams pulled together a document that outlined the C-ID budget, from initial funding to current levels, which could be modified and used to present the information to IOC to request more funds if ICW decides to move in that direction. Members agreed that the document was well outlined and informative. There were minor questions and suggested information to be included in the document such as the \$1 million dollar grant received from Complete College America (CCA), as well as the use of SB 70 dollars to fund CTE degrees. Adams gave a brief summary of the C-ID activities to date, including the recent round of stipend payments to course reviewers, primary reviewers, and FDRG Leads, which totaled roughly \$110,000. They discussed the potential role of CSU in funding, as CCC currently pays for most of C-ID's expenses. There was a question about the difference between one-time versus on-going expenses and members asked Adams to clarify this on the document. Adams noted that maintenance for a discipline costs roughly \$7,000, with new disciplines costing roughly \$4,200. As C-ID is being considered for use with other programs such as online initiatives or education planning software, ICW was encouraged to look at those initiatives to see how C-ID can get a carve-out from the budget.

Adams will make the proposed alterations and inclusions to the document and bring back to the next ICW meeting.

Action:

- Adams will refine the document to include information on CCA, SB70, and breakdown of cost for descriptor development and maintenance, and bring back to the upcoming meeting.

Swerkes brought forth an MOU draft document that was not originally intended for budget purposes, but formed into a document outlining what both segments (CCC and CSU) agreed to

do for the implementation of SB 1440. There was some feedback provided by members about the different steps outlined for the development of TMCs including:

- removal of #14 (there is currently no interim policy);
- language early on about descriptors (suggest to include in #2);
- information on #4 regarding CSU faculty contacted via listserv for online vetting.

The group indicated that this document is something they would like to pursue, specifically in light of possibly asking for funding of the project from CSU. Swerkes will accept feedback on the document and will include on the draft to be presented at the next meeting for approval.

Action:

- Swerkes will incorporate suggestions and present the document for approval at the next meeting.

IX. Local TMC Development and Conversation

Postma presented an alternative TMC process for those degrees that have two or less CSU campuses that offer the program. He asked ICW to consider a local TMC process that would have CCCs articulate locally with CSU campuses that offer that degree. Some members disagreed with the creation of this new process, as colleges already have the ability to have local articulation, and did not see a benefit for the creation of a localized TMC. Members asked Postma to bring a list of programs that could fit into this new local TMC development, and bring it back to ICW when it is ready to be discussed.

Action:

- Postma will research the programs that would fit into this criteria and alert ICW when it is ready for discussion in a future meeting.

X. Future Agenda Items and Next Meeting Date/Place

Members discussed the need for more CSU reviewers to participate in C-ID and course reviewing, and talked about ways in which CSU faculty involvement could be encouraged. CSU members agreed that their segment will have to identify ways to support more faculty involvement. The following are items that will be brought back to the upcoming agenda:

- Ethnic Studies
- Areas of emphasis
- Social Work research
- Guarantees for high unit degrees
- TMC for other language (research by Pilati/Postma)

The next meeting will take place on Monday, February 24, 2014- 10:00 AM – 4:00PM.

XI. Adjournment

Respectfully submitted by
Krystinne Mica
Administrative Assistant

Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup Minutes (Draft)

February 24, 2014

Academic Senate Office—9th Floor Conference Room

555 Capitol Mall, Suite 525, Sacramento

In Attendance:

Deanna Abma, Articulation Officer, City College of San Francisco
Kevin Baaske, Faculty Affairs, CSU Academic Senate/CSU Los Angeles
Julie Bruno, ICW Meeting Facilitator, Secretary, ASCCC/Sierra College
Sheila Lau, Articulation Officer, College of Alameda
Erin Larsen, Specialist- Academic Affairs, CCCCCO
Ken O'Donnell, Senior Director, Student Engagement and Academic Initiatives and Partnerships, CSU Office of the Chancellor
Michelle Pilati, C-ID Faculty Coordinator, ASCCC/Rio Hondo College
Jim Postma, Immediate Past Chair, CSU Academic Senate
Bob Quinn, C-ID Project Monitor, Transfer and Articulation Coordinator, CCCCCO
Erik Shearer, Professor of Art, Napa Valley College
Erik Skinner, Deputy Chancellor, CCCCCO
Barbara Swerkes, Consultant, CSU System Office
Mary K. Turner, Vice President of Instruction, Sacramento City College
Mark Van Selst, Professor of Psychology, San Jose State University

Staff:

Krystinne Mica, Administrative Assistant, ASCCC

I. Announcements and Approval of the Agenda

Introductions were conducted, as there were new members in the group. The agenda was approved as presented. (Baaske, Shearer) MSC

II. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes were approved with a typographic change on page 3. (Shearer, Baaske) MSC.

III. TMC Policies and Processes

A. TMC progress report

Postma presented a report that tracked the progress of TMCs, MCs, and projected future Areas of Emphasis (AOE). His goal was to display how much ICW has accomplished with the creation of existing TMCs and the disciplines those TMCs serve, as well as show potential future achievement through the creation of model curriculum (ISMC), and AOE. Members thanked Postma for pulling together the data.

As he reviewed the document, a central theme emerged on the necessity for ICW to delineate when TMC creation is finished, and what criteria is being used to determine which disciplines are convened for TMC development. In reviewing transfer numbers, it became apparent that there are some disciplines that should be reviewed for potential TMC development based on their popularity. A list of disciplines needing examination or re-examination was compiled and members were assigned the task of researching them

(see Action items below). The CSU Chancellor's Office was asked whether determining when TMC development was "done" would be useful. O'Donnell commented that he has found that faculty in some disciplines are reluctant to say yes to *similar* because they feel there still might be a chance of having a TMC created in their discipline. Pilati proposed that the criteria might be: 200+ students and three campuses. She suggested outlining for the public why some disciplines that do not meet this requirement were convened to develop TMCs. There was concern regarding releasing criteria without having thorough research conducted on existing TMCs and future TMC/MCs that are in progress. The need to clarify what the nursing and engineering MCs would prepare students for was discussed. ICW decided to task the following research to members:

- Postma – Nursing
- Pilati – Engineering, Hotel/Hospitality, Family and Consumer Science
- Swerkes – Recreation Administration
- Lau – Public Administration and Political Science

Action:

- Baaske will research Communicative Disorders and bring the information back to the next meeting
- Members will research the following disciplines:
 - Postma – Nursing
 - Pilati – Engineering, Hotel/Hospitality, Family and Consumer Science
 - Swerkes – Recreation Administration
 - Lau – Public Administration and Political Science
- Bring back the conversation on TMC criteria to the next meeting

B. TMCs for other language research

Postma proposed a modification to the creation of TMCs for other languages. He suggested the following steps:

1. Recruit CCC and CSU lead faculty in each language discipline
2. Use the above faculty (or a subset of it) as the Foreign Language FDRG
3. Hold a Language DIG with the above members and other interested faculty
4. At the DIG, describe the Spanish TMC and let the Spanish faculty lead describe their processes and outcomes
5. Ask the other languages to design their TMCs
6. Have the faculty work on course descriptors, recognizing the currently-articulated language courses in ASSIST
7. Vet the TMCs and course descriptors with the respective language faculty

Members were unsure whether or not to move forward with the development of a new process for the creation of foreign language TMCs. ICW did not come to a decision at this meeting on the movement of this proposal.

C. Potential 1440 benefits for high-unit degrees

Pilati presented a document to outline potential benefits for high-unit degrees. She reviewed the benefits and asked the group to discuss the document as presented. Postma stated that although the document is a good start, he is hesitant to begin conversations on this as the CSU has not yet determined what benefits may be given to model curriculum

by the accepting CSU institution. Other members felt strongly that they needed to solidify the benefits for the model curriculum, particularly for Nursing and Engineering. The group conversed about the challenges facing the two disciplines and the need to clarify with the FDRG about the intended usage of the model curriculum. It was suggested that the FDRG Leads be invited to the upcoming ICW meeting so members can have the conversation with the Leads. Members agreed and discussed extending the invitation to the FDRG Lead for Information Systems after the ICT model curriculum finishes vetting. Pilati indicated she will research this discipline prior to inviting the Lead.

Action:

- The Leads for Nursing and Engineering will be invited to the next meeting.
- Pilati will research the ICT discipline to determine if the Lead should be invited for the discussion on model curriculum benefits.

D. TMC criteria proposal

This item was discussed in the section “TMC progress report.”

E. Revision of non-substantive change to finalized TMC

There is a non-substantive change proposed to the Chemistry TMC- the inclusion of the MATH 900s descriptor. Pilati informed the group that the non-substantive change policy approved by ICW calls for the discipline Lead to request ICW to review the proposed change and give approval or notify if they do not approve. While using the process, she noticed that it was missing a call for comment period so that statewide faculty could provide input prior to making the proposed change(s). She requested ICW’s approval to include this addition. A motion to approve the inclusion was made and approved by ICW. Turner, Shearer (MSC).

Action:

- Pilati will provide C-ID staff with the new policy document to be posted on the C-ID website.

IV. Consideration of change to Chemistry TMC

ICW reviewed the proposed non-substantive inclusion of the MATH 900s descriptor to the Chemistry TMC. Members were in favor of the change and approved the inclusion. (Swerkes, Postma) MSC.

Action:

- The Chemistry TMC with the Math 900s descriptor included will be distributed to the public.

V. C-ID Advisory Committee updates

Pilati provided a brief update on the C-ID advisory meeting. The Advisory group discussed the following topics:

1. *Descriptor to “other” content ratio:* While it is stated that a COR need only reflect the descriptor to obtain a C-ID number, issues have arisen when there is so much “other” content that reviewers are concerned as to whether or not the descriptor content and

objectives are being covered with the desired depth and rigor. C-ID policy documents will be modified to make it clear that a COR might not be approved due to concerns about the coverage of the descriptor delineated material.

2. *Appeals process*: The Advisory stated that the current appeals process was more generous than it needed to be and asked for it to be scaled back. Since ICW's concern was the primary reviewer's ability to overturn a CSU decision, members determined that the document needed to be clear and include checks and balances into the process.
3. *Discipline designation*: The Advisory determined that it is not up to C-ID to determine which discipline houses the course and will therefore not amend the policy, as this is currently the understanding.

ICW discussed the issue on recruiting faculty to be course reviewers. CSU members noted that there were complaints from other CSU faculty members who are reviewers and are not receiving course assignments. They discussed possible solutions and noted that a more focused recruitment could help with the process, along with a review of the backlog of courses to note which descriptors need more CSU participation. As the data in C-ID are not static, Pilati noted that the information on course data provided to the CSU previously may not be accurate. A majority of the disciplines that were behind have caught up. There was no resolution to this topic at the meeting.

VI. Areas of Emphasis

A. Social Science

There was some confusion between members about the disciplines that should have been included in the Social Science area of emphasis research. Van Selst conducted research to include Ethnic Studies; however, ICW previously discussed that the Ethnic Studies area of emphasis was separate from the Social Science area of emphasis. Postma believed that what the public wanted to see is a Social Science area of emphasis that would work for all social science transfers (i.e., Psychology or Sociology). Skinner concurred with this interpretation and urged ICW to think of area of emphasis as a way to broaden the pathway for students ("one to many" approach) and exhaust this avenue to illustrate that they are doing all they can to address the legislation.

ICW circled back to their earlier conversation of identifying and establishing criteria for when TMC development is done. Pilati recommended bringing together the faculty from those disciplines that have a small number of transfer students and task them to determine if they can create an area of emphasis that will work. If the faculty convened agrees that they cannot, ICW could lay to rest the possibility of creating transfer degrees for those disciplines. A suggestion was also made to look at current TMCs and figure out a way to distribute information to the public that demonstrates the many paths available to students with the current TMCs.

ICW decided not to move forward with an area of emphasis for Social Science. They will continue with the creation of an Ethnic Studies area of emphasis, and the Health Science/Allied Health area of emphasis.

B. Global Studies/International Relations

Dave DeGroot, a member of the AO Subgroup, pulled together research on Global Studies and proposed the creation of an area of emphasis. ICW was asked to consider whether this discipline is an ideal candidate for an area of emphasis. They discussed the pros and cons of convening this discipline, mentioning the number of students that have transferred (87) does not meet the 200 + student criteria, but that this area of emphasis has the potential to serve many disciplines. There was enough interest in the group to move forward with convening a discipline input group (DIG) for Global Studies/International Relations, and a motion unanimously passed by the group.

Action:

- A DIG will be convened for Global Studies/International Relations to look at the creation of an area of emphasis.

VII. Budget Reports

A. Memorandum from Adams

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

ACTION:

- ICW will review the proposed memorandum at the next meeting.

B. MOU from Swerkes

Swerkes brought back the MOU from the last meeting, with the proposed inclusion sent by members. They discussed the proposed changes to the document, paying particular attention to the last section on philosophical statements. Members proposed the addition of an ongoing funding source into the *Key Principles* section, as well as the composition of ICW into the document- a CCC member will draft this statement. The group advocated for the maintenance of a listserv by the CSU Chancellor's Office, as this was a helpful tool for disseminating information. There was also a suggestion to include *Senates* in the title, to note that this MOU is coming from the Academic Senates of CCC and CSU and not the Chancellor's Office of either system; members agreed to the inclusion. Members requested that Baaske draft a statement on the evaluation process. There was also a request to postpone releasing the number of TMCs and model curriculum. Members will send any additional items to Swerkes via email and Swerkes will bring back the document to the next meeting.

Action:

- Swerkes will send out the amended document via email and include the changes. She will bring the document back to the next meeting.
- Baaske will draft a statement on the evaluation process.
- A CCC member will draft the statement on ICW composition.
- Clarification will be sought from B. Smith on the question of "working on a consensus model when we vote to approve a TMC."

VIII. Reports

A. Senate Updates

There were no official senate updates from B. Smith or Guerin. Van Selst shared on behalf of GEAC regarding IGETC for STEM and CSU GE Breadth. Bruno shared the latest report from SAC regarding conjoint programs for ADTs.

B. IOC Report

The next IOC meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 17, 2014.

C. CCC CO (*Skinner*)

Skinner reported that the CCCCCO is in the process of filling vacancies in their Academic Affairs department and noted the continued support going to City College of San Francisco. He reported on key legislation moving forward, including bills on dual enrollment, funding stability for CCSF, CCC awarding BA degrees, and legislation on accreditation. Larsen reported the number of ADTs as of January is 1078, but they expect that number to be over 1100 by the posting of the February numbers. She conducted research on Elementary Teacher Education and noted that there were no discrepancies in the system and that 35% of colleges have done an ADT.

D. CSU CO (*Swerkes*)

O'Donnell reported back on his research on the use of IGETC for STEM in the Computer Science ADT. Of the 14 campuses that initially indicated they were using the Computer Science ADT, seven responded to his question and stated they could no longer make it work with the change, two said yes, and five did not respond. Members were also interested to hear about matching degrees in CSU; O'Donnell said most campuses are waiting for ICW to announce when TMC creation is finished before campuses look at doing similar degrees for those with lower number of student enrollment.

IX. Prepare for Future IOC Meeting

Members discussed the items they would like presented to IOC, including the budget memorandum from Adams, as well as the research conducted by Postma on the progress report of TMCs. Members were divided on whether or not they wanted information pulled together by Postma presented to IOC; some felt that it was premature to show them the data, as they felt that information was speculative- a counterargument of showing only hard numbers was presented. Others disagreed with the counterargument and noted that the document as it is, is a great tool to show IOC the amount of disciplines currently covered by TMCs and future TMC/MC creation. Chancellor's Office representatives indicated that either document would be beneficial to present to IOC. Upon this recommendation, members tasked Pilati and Postma to merge both concepts and come up with a document to present to IOC. Swerkes recommended including the data from the C-ID Newsletter into the proposal and members concurred. Members also agreed to share with IOC the working definitions of area of emphasis and degrees they are exploring in the future.

Action:

- Pilati and Postma will review the progress report document and modify to show hard numbers on TMCs. This will also include numbers from the C-ID Newsletter.
- ICW will share the working definition of area of emphasis to IOC.

X. Future Agenda Items and Next Meeting Date/Place

Future agenda items include:

- Inviting ENGR and NURS Leads to the next meeting
- Draft of evaluation process from Baaske
- IGETC and catalog language
- Budget memorandum from Adams
- Area of emphasis homework from individuals:
 - Postma – Nursing
 - Pilati – Engineering, Hotel/Hospitality, Family and Consumer Science
 - Swerkes – Recreation Administration
 - Lau – Public Administration and Political Science
- **Tentative:** ICFW to meet prior to the next meeting if FDRGs are able to finalize TMCs to present for consideration.

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 4, 2014. Location to be determined.

XI. Adjournment

Respectfully submitted by
Krystinne Mica
Administrative Assistant



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Local Senate Visits		Month: April 2014	
		Item No: VII.J	
		Attachment:	
CATEGORY:	Information and Written Reports	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Dolores Davison	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	Julie Adams	Action	
		Information	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will review the local senate reports for recent visits to West Valley College and San Jose City College.

BACKGROUND: Both colleges requested visits from the Executive Committee for observation of their senates and information about statewide activities and priorities.

¹ Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

Local Senate Report

Senate: San Jose City College

Executive Committee Member: Dolores Davison

Date: 18 March 2014

Senate President: Fabio Gonzales

At the request of Senate President Gonzales, I attended the San Jose Academic Senate meeting on Tuesday, 18 March 2014. Fabio had let me know that there were some questions that the senators would be interested in talking about, specifically about the role of the senate in issues of equivalency. I met with Fabio briefly before the meeting to talk about issues facing the college and to discuss particular concerns regarding the day's agenda, particularly the appointment of faculty to senate committees.

The meeting was attended by about 20 members of the senate along with the college president, VPI, and VPSS. The major topics raised, and concerns expressed, included issues around equivalency, accreditation, the Student Success and Support Plans, the appointment of faculty to hiring and other committees, the reassigned time currently provided to the Senate (only .5 for the college), and the participation of the senate president and his designees on campus and district committees. Due to many of the concerns raised during the previous years, in which SJCC was not actively participating in statewide meetings, a technical visit from the ASCCC president and the CIO of the CCLC had been conducted in January, and it was clear that the new senate administration is making major strides in improving the campus relations between the administration and the senate, and within the senate itself. I am happy to continue to reach out to the SJCC leadership in the coming months should they have any concerns or questions.

Local Senate Visit: West Valley College

Senate President: Eric Pape

Date of Visit: Tuesday, 11 February 2014, 2:30-4:30

Phil Smith and I visited West Valley College's Senate on Tuesday, 11 February, 2014. The meeting was conducted by Eric Pape, the president, with the assistance of his administrative assistant Jennifer French. There were approximately 12 Senators in attendance and several members of the campus community, including the college president, VPI and ALO, and a member of Mission College's Academic Senate

The meeting included a wide range of topics, including the self-evaluation report for the college's upcoming accreditation visit. Eric had invited us to give a briefing on what the ASCCC did, the services we provided, and the kinds of activities that occurred at the statewide level. Eric had also requested that Phil and I discuss a combination of local and statewide issues, including accreditation issues, legislation, the budget, and the like. The meeting also included approval of the creation of a district wide academic senate budget committee to discuss issues, the concern regarding the number of meetings held each semester, and the participation of both senates in their joint meetings.

West Valley's Senate is clearly engaged and interested in the issues both on its campus and statewide; the members were well informed and engaged in lively discussion about all of the items on the agenda. One concern is that they appear to have been somewhat under-informed previously, and in some cases seemed to be hesitant about taking the lead on issues that are clearly within their purview; strong presidential leadership should help that issue as the Senate moves forward. The senate is active and engaged and is working to become more involved in shared governance and decision making at the local campus as well as the district level. Phil and I both stated that we were happy to continue to reach out to the West Valley leadership in the coming months should they have any concerns or questions.

