

#### **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

#### Wednesday, November 1, 2017

Irvine Marriott

18000 Von Karman Avenue, Irvine, CA 92612 Meeting Room: Salons A & B1

11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Executive Committee Meeting 12:00 p.m. to 12:30 p.m. Lunch 12:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Executive Committee Meeting

The meeting is accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification in order to participate in the meeting may make a request by emailing the Senate at agendaitem@asccc.org or contacting Ashley Fisher at (916) 445-4753 x103 no less than five working days prior to the meeting. Providing your request at least five business days before the meeting will help ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

Public Comments: A written request to address the Executive Committee shall be made on the form provided at the meeting. Public testimony will be invited at the beginning of the Executive Committee discussion on each agenda item. Persons wishing to make a presentation to the Executive Committee on a subject not on the agenda shall address the Executive Committee during the time listed for public comment. Public comments are limited to 3 minutes per individual and 30 minutes per agenda item. Materials for this meeting are found on the Senate website at: <a href="http://www.asccc.org/executive\_committee/meetings">http://www.asccc.org/executive\_committee/meetings</a>.

#### I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

- A. Roll Call
- B. Approval of the Agenda
- C. Public Comment

This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Executive Committee on any matter <u>not</u> on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

- D. Calendar
- E. Action Tracking
- F. Local Senate Visits
- G. One Minute Accomplishment

#### II. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. September 29-30, 2017 Meeting Minutes, Davison
- B. Guided Pathways Resource Team, Roberson
- C. TASSC Regional Meetings, Beach
- D. Accreditation Institute Draft, May/Freitas

#### III. REPORTS

- A. President's/Executive Director's Report 20 mins., Bruno/Adams
- B. Foundation President's Report 10 mins., Rutan
- C. Liaison Oral Reports (please keep report to 5 mins., each)
  Liaisons from the following organizations are invited to provide the Executive
  Committee with updates related to their organization: AAUP, CCA, CCCI, CFT,
  CIO, FACCC, and the Student Senate.

#### IV. ACTION ITEMS

#### A. Legislation and Government Update – 20 mins., Stanskas

The Executive Committee will be updated on recent legislative activities and consider for approval any action as necessary.

# B. Revision of 2000 ASCCC Paper: Re-Examination of Faculty Hiring: Processes and Procedures – 20 mins., Davison

The Executive Committee will review and consider for approval the suggested revisions to the Hiring Processes Paper.

#### C. ASCCC Audit – 10 mins., Freitas

The Executive Committee will discuss the ASCCC audit for 2016 – 17 fiscal year.

#### V. DISCUSSION

- **A.** Chancellor's Office Liaison Report 45 mins. (*Time certain 1:30 p.m.*) A liaison from the Chancellor's Office will provide Executive Committee members with an update of system-wide issues and projects.
- B. Board of Governors/Consultation Council 20 mins., Bruno/Stanskas
  The Executive Committee will receive an update on the recent Board of
  Governors and Consultation meetings.

#### C. Guided Pathways – 45 mins., Bruno

The Executive Committee will be updated on the implementation of the CCC Guided Pathways Award Program.

#### D. Update on Quantitative Reasoning – 30 mins., Stanskas/May

The Executive Committee will be updated on the CSU systems requirements for transfer students and review two additional documents that have been realeased to the public.

#### E. Fall Plenary Session Final Planning – 30 min., Bruno

The Executive Committee will discuss the final planning for Fall Plenary Session.

#### F. IEPI P3 Workgroup Update – 20 mins., Eikev

The Executive Committee will be updated on the change in focus for P3 and which policies or system-wide practices may be re-examined for possible statutory changes.

# G. CTE C-ID and Model Curriculum Workgroup – 20 mins., Slattery-Farrell The Executive Committee will be updated on and discuss the changes to the C-ID Model Curriculum Workgroup in terms of CTE.

#### H. Meeting Debrief – 30 min., Bruno

The Executive Committee will debrief the meeting to assess what is working well and where improvements may be implemented.

# **VI. REPORTS** (*If time permits, additional Executive Committee announcements and reports may be provided*)

#### **A. Standing Committee Minutes**

- i. Accreditation Committee, May
- ii. Basic Skills Committee, Davison
- iii. Curriculum Committee, Rutan
- iv. Educational Policies Committee, Beach
- v. Equity and Diversity Action Committee, Davison
- vi. Legislative and Advocacy Committee, Stanskas
- vii. Part Time Committee, Adams
- viii. Relations to Local Senates Committee, Eikey
- ix. Resolutions Committee, May

#### **B.** Liaison Reports

- i. AEBG Math Crosswalk Committee, Legner
- ii. California Community Colleges Curriculum Committee (5C), Rutan
- iii. CIO Executive Board, Rutan
- iv. Common Assessment Initiative Advisory Committee, Rutan
- v. General Education Advisory Committee, May

#### **C.** Senate and Grant Reports

#### VII. ADJOURNMENT

SUBJECT: Calendar		Month: November	Year: 2017		
•Upcoming 2017-2018	Events	Item No: I. D.			
•Reminders/Due Dates	3	Attachment: YES			
•2017-2018 Executive	Committee Meeting Calendar				
DESIRED OUTCOME:	Inform the Executive Committee of upcoming	Urgent: NO			
	events and deadlines.	Time Requested: 5 minutes			
CATEGORY:	Order of Business	TYPE OF BOARD CON	NSIDERATION:		
REQUESTED BY:	Ashley Fisher	Consent/Routine			
		First Reading			
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action			
		Information	X		

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

#### **Upcoming Events and Meetings**

• Executive Committee Meeting – Sacramento – December 1 – 2, 2017

Please see the 2017-2018 Executive Committee Meeting Calendar on the next page for August 2017 – June 2018 ASCCC executive committee meetings and institutes.

#### **Reminders/Due Dates**

#### November 14, 2017:

- Agenda items for December 1-2 meeting
- Reports
- Action Tracking updates

#### December 31, 2017:

• Rostrums due to Julie Adams

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

#### **REGIONAL MEETINGS DATES**

#### **DATES**

September 15/16 – OER Regional
\*September 22/23 – CTE Regional
October 20/21
\*October 27/28 – Civil Discourse
\*November 17/18 – Curriculum
February 9/10 – OER
February 16/17
\*March 9/10 – CTE Regionals
March 30/31
April 6/7
April 27/28

<sup>\*</sup>Approved

#### **Academic Senate**

#### 2017 - 2018

#### **Executive Committee Meeting Agenda Deadlines**

#### **Reminder Timeline:**

- Agenda Reminder 2 weeks prior to agenda items due date
- Agenda Items Due 7 days prior to agenda packets being due to executive members
- Agenda Packet Due 10 days prior to executive meeting

Meeting Dates	Agenda Items Due	Agenda Posted and Mailed
August 11 – 12, 2017	July 25, 2017	August 1, 2017
September 7 – 9, 2017	August 21, 2017	August 28, 2017
September 29 – 30, 2017	September 12, 2017	September 19, 2017
November 1, 2017	October 13, 2017	October 20, 2017
December 1 – 2, 2017	November 14, 2017	November 21, 2017
January 12 – 13, 2018	December 26, 2017	January 2, 2018
February 2 – 3, 2018	January 16, 2018	January 23, 2018
March 2 – 3, 2018	February 13, 2018	February 20, 2018
April 11, 2018	March 23, 2018	March 30, 2018
June 1 – 3, 2018	May 15, 2018	May 22, 2018

A	Month	Year Assigne	Orig. Agenda	A !	D D		Month	V	
Action Item	Assigned	d	Item #	Assigned To	Due Date	complete	Complete	Year Complete	Status/Notes
SB 967 Student Safety: Sexual Assault	4. November	2014	V. E.	Davison	December	In Progress			The committee has identified a contact in the CCCCO's Legal Affairs office t work on this item. The current EDAC chair will pass this information on to the next EDAC chair.
TASSC Survey on Services for Disenfranchised Students	8. August	2015	V. M.	Beach	December	In Progress			The committee established a task group to review the survey in greater deta and to discuss what actions, if any, could be taken to accomplish part or all the resolution. The task group met and determined a temporary course of ac The work group will recommend to the full committee to write an extended Rostrum article regarding the issue of creating a local college plan for addressing the needs of disenfranchised students that meets the culture of college. The work group recommends that an attempt to create a long-term system plan with the BOG and the CCCC, as called for in the resolution, is feasible. TASSC will discuss at its October 13 meeting.
Outline for Revision of the 2009 Noncredit Instruction Paper	May	2016	IV. E.	Aschenbach	February & March	In progress			Once modifications have been made to the outline a resolution for adoption the paper is expected to be presented at the 2016 Spring Plenary. Paper v return to a future meeting for first reading. Paper is postponed until Fall. A breakout will be held in spring to report on the delay and to get feedback.
Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative	March	2017	IV. P.	Bruno	Spring/Summer	In progress			The Operational Committee will agendize this policy.
A2Mend	June	2017	II. D.	Davison	October	Assigned			EDAC will bring back a recommendation about how to partner with A2Mend the future.
Periodic Review Report Recommendations	June	2017	II. F.	Adams	January/February	In progress			Adams will either implement or facilitate the actions as noted by the PRC
Spring Session Resolutions	June	2017	II. H.	Chairs	September	Assigned			The Accreditation and Curriculum Committee chairs will solicit members to serve on a task force to address Resolution 9.01 S17.
Resolution Handbook	June	2017	II. I.	Stanskas	November/April	Assigned			When asking the body to adopt the procedures and rules, the vice presider announce that it is important for those who write resolutions to attend the breakout session.
Leadership Survey	June	2017	IV. F.	Adams	June/September	In progress			The survey was passed out at the Faculty Leadership Institute. The RwLS Committee will review the survey summary and determine if another survey should be sent to the SP listserv.
ASCCC Professional Development	June	2017	IV. L	Aschenbach	September	In progress			The RwLS requested that the survey be sent to the senate presidents.  1) The FDC will discuss at its first meeting topics for the PDC, review the Professional Development Plan, and make recommendations for future professional development activities.
Executive Committee Participation at Events	June	2017	IV.M	Adams/Bruno	September	In progress			A policy will be brought back to a future meeting for consideration for approach the policy is on the September 8 - 9 agenda for consideration.  The policy will go to the Operational Committee for revision based on recommendations at the September 8th Executive Committee meeting.
Publications Guidelines	August	2017	II. F.	Adams	November	Assigned			Adams will bring the "Other Official Documents" to the Operational Commit to address members comments. The revised guidelines will return to anoth meeting for approval.
Committee Priorities	August	2017	IV. D.	Committee Chairs	November	Assigned			Committee chairs will provide Adams and Bruno with an update of the committee priorities after the first meeting of the standing committee.
Policy for Executive Committee Members Attending Events	September 7-9	2017	II. C.	Adams	November	Assigned			The policy for Executive Committee members attending events will return t Operations Committee for clarification and return to a future meeting for approval.
Foundation Bylaws	September 7-9	2017	II. D.	Adams	November	Assigned			The Foundation Bylaws as amended have been posted on the Foundation website. Adams will contact the ASCCC attorney to explore actions to addit possible conflict of interest of directors who serve on both the ASCCC and ASFCCC.
Fall Plenary Planning	September 7-9	2017	IV. B.	Adams	October	Completed			The preliminary program posted on the website and circulated to the field.
Collaborative Institute	September 7-9	2017	IV. C.	Adams	January/February	Assigned			Staff will begin seeking locations for the event with Riverside Convention C as the first option.  A subgroup of the CTE Leadership and the Noncredit Committees will be formed with the addition of representatives from 3CSN, the Chancellor's Of and ACCE to plan the event.
									Event marketing will begin once the event location is identified and registra is open.

TASSC Regional Meetings	September 29-30	2017	II. C.	Beach	November	Assigned	Information about and registration for the events will posted on the website as soon as locations are determined.
Standards and Practices Committee Charge	September 29-30	2017	II. D.	Freitas/Adams	November	Assigned	The revised charge will be sent to the executive director for posting on the ASCCC website.
Accounting Policies	September 29-30	2017	II. E.			Assigned	The changes will be accepted and updated to the Executive Committee livebinder.
Update on Quantitative Reasoning	September 29-30	2017	IV. F.	Stanskas/May/Adam s	November	Assigned	A message will be sent to the executive director for posting to the Listserv.

### LOCAL SENATE CAMPUS VISITS

### *2016 – 2018*

(LS= member of Local Senates; IN = report submitted; strikeout = planned but not done)

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	NOTES
AREA A					
American River	Executive Committee Meeting	9/30/16			
Bakersfield					
Butte	Goold/Davison/ Aschenbach/ Freitas	10/13/16	Davison	05/12/17	Butte Chico Center/ Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
Cerro Coso					
Clovis	Davison	8/29/16	Davison	05/3/17	IEPI PRT Member/Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
Columbia					
Cosumnes River					
Feather River					
Folsom Lake	May/Goold/ Aschenbach Goold	10/14/16			Area A meeting  Discipline Conversation
Fresno					
Lake Tahoe					
Lassen					
Merced	Aschenbach	4/27/2017			PDC Visit for Julie Clark
Modesto					
Porterville					
Redwoods, College of the					
Reedley					
Sacramento City	Beach, A. Foster, Smith	2/19/17			Diversity in Hiring Regional Meeting

San Joaquin Delta	Smith	11/18/16		Formerly Incarcerated Regional Mtg.
Sequoias, College of the				
Shasta				
Sierra				
Siskiyous, College of the				
Taft				
West Hills Coalinga				
West Hills Lemoore				
Woodland College	Freitas/Rutan/Foster/ Adams	10/28/16		MQ North Regional
Yuba				
AREA B				
Alameda, College of	Bruno	11/21/16		Collegiality in Action
Berkeley City				
Cabrillo	Davison	4/28/17		Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
Cañada				
Chabot	Smith	3/21/17	Bruno/Davison	Area B Meeting
Chabot – Las Positas District	Davison	5/23/17		Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
Contra Costa				
DeAnza				
Diablo Valley				
Evergreen Valley				
Foothill	Executive Committee Meeting	3/3/17		
Gavilan				
Hartnell				
Laney	May	3/6/17	Corrina Evett	District (PCCD) Enrollment Mgmt.
Las Positas	May	9/16/16		SLO vs. Objectives
Los Medanos				
Marin, College of	Davison	3/17/17		Curriculum Streamlining

Mendocino					
Merritt	Davison	3/17/17			Curriculum
					Streamlining
Mission	Davison/Freitas	12/08/16			Local Visit
Monterey Peninsula	Freitas/Bruno	11/10/16			Local Visit
Napa Valley	Beach	11/14/16			IEPI RPT Team
					Member
Ohlone					
San Francisco, City College	Davison	3/8/17			Technical Curriculum
of					
San José City	Davison	5/24/17			Curriculum
					Streamlining Workshop
San Mateo, College of					
Santa Rosa Junior	Beach	12/21/16			EDAC Strategic Plan
					Meeting
	Lorraine Slattery-	3/10/17			
	Farrell and Sam				MQ
	Foster				
Skyline	Davison/Beach/LSF/	10/21/16	John Stanskas	1/25/17	Curriculum Regional
	McKay/Crump		BDP Articulation		Meeting
Solano	Stanskas/McKay/Smi	10/14/16	Rutan	2/16/17	Area B Meeting
	th/Davison		BDP Accreditation		
West Valley	Davison	11/8/16			Local Senate Visit
	Aschenbach	12/07/16			Noncredit Asst. (Zoom
					w/WVC Noncredit
					Task Force

AREA C				
Allan Hancock				
Antelope Valley				
Canyons, College of the	Freitas/Stanskas	10/21/16		MQ & Equivalencies
				Presentations
Cerritos				
Citrus				
Cuesta				
East LA	Freitas/Foster/Bruno	3/25/17		Area C

El Camino	Executive Committee	2/3/17			
	Meeting				
Compton College	May/Roberson	8/25/17			Guided Pathways
Glendale	Rutan/Foster	9/24/16	Freitas/Slattery-Farrell	6/9/17	Accreditation
	Aschenbach	12/08/16			Committee
					Noncredit Committee
					Mtg.
LA District	Davison	3/10/17			Curriculum Workshop
LA City	Rutan	9/22/17			LACCD District
					Academic Senate
					Summit
LA Harbor	Rutan	5/5/17			TOP Code Alignment
LA Mission					
LA Pierce					
LA Southwest					
LA Trade-Technical	Smith	10/21/16			Formerly Incarcerated
					Regional Meeting
LA Valley					
Moorpark					
Mt. San Antonio	Davison/LSF/	10/22/16	Davison/Rutan/Beach	2/25/17	Curriculum Regionals
	Aschenbach/Beach/		Curriculum		
	Rutan		Committee Meeting		Dual Enrollment
	Davison	2/23/17			Toolkit
			Aschenbach		
					Curriculum Assistance
Oxnard					
Pasadena City	Foster/Freitas	11/15/16			Area C Meeting
Rio Hondo					
Santa Barbara City					
Santa Monica					
Ventura	Freitas	4/2/2016			Area C Meeting
West LA					

AREA D					
Barstow	Rutan/Stanskas/ S. Foster/Beach/ Slattery-Farrell	3/25/17	Slattery- Farrell/Stanskas	8/29/17	Area D Meeting Technical Visit
Chaffey	Slattery- Farrell/Freitas/S. Foster	3/10/17			MQ Regional
Coastline					
Copper Mountain					
Crafton Hills					
Cuyamaca					
Cypress	Freitas/Stanskas	1/20/17			
Desert, College of the					
Fullerton	Beach	9/20- 21/16			SLO Presentation
Golden West					
Grossmont					
Imperial Valley	Beach	4/7/17			Governance Presentation
Irvine Valley	Davison/Rutan	5/15/17			Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
Long Beach City	Davison/Rutan	4/26/17			Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
MiraCosta	Foster/Freitas	8/10/17	May/Beach	9/28/16	Ed. Pol.
Moreno Valley	McKay/Stanskas	1/27/17	Online Ed Committee		
Mt. San Jacinto					
Norco					
North Orange - Noncredit					
Orange Coast					
Palo Verde	Rutan	8/31/17			Top Code Alignment
Palomar	Aschenbach/McKay	12/03/16			Noncredit South Regional Meeting
Riverside City	Freitas/Stanskas/ Slattery-Farrell	10/29/16	Davison/Rutan	5/30/17	MQ South Regional Meeting
					Curriculum Streamlining Workshop

Saddleback	Davison	3/15/17			Curriculum Tech Visit
San Bernardino Valley	Executive Committee Meeting	9/9/16			
San Diego City					
San Diego Cont. Ed.	Rutan/Slattery-Farrell Smith	10/15/16 11/19/16	Stanskas/A. Foster	5/2/17	Area D Meeting Top Code Alignment
G D: M	D	5 /00 /17			Tech. Visit
San Diego Mesa	Davison/Rutan	5/22/17			Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
San Diego Miramar					
Santa Ana	Beach	8/23/17			Presentation on Role of Local ASCCC Senates Governance
Santiago Canyon					
Southwestern	Rutan	12/12/16	Beach/A.Foster/Smith Diversity in Faculty Hiring Regional Mtg.	2/10/17	TOP Code Alignment
Victor Valley					

SUBJECT:		Month: November Year: 2017
Guided Pathways Reso	urce Team request for support at local colleges	Item No: II. B.
		Attachment: YES
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will approve Guided	Urgent: NO
	Pathways Resource Teams as a new service for	Time Requested: 10 minutes
	local senates.	
CATEGORY:	Action	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:
REQUESTED BY:	Carrie Roberson	Consent/Routine X
		First Reading
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action
		Discussion

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

As a new service to local academic senates, the ASCCC Guided Pathways Resource Teams are designed to provide support for faculty and local academic senate leaders concerning faculty involvement, shared governance processes, and other issues involving academic and professional matters (10+1) within the context of the design and implementation of guided pathways frameworks. In order to provide sufficient guidance, the resource teams will consider the needs and particular challenges identified by the local senate to help faculty identify and implement options which are aligned with ASCCC positions and papers and that are appropriate for their college's culture and student populations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

As a new service to local academic senates, the ASCCC Guided Pathways Resource Teams may be requested to provide support for faculty and local academic senate leaders concerning faculty involvement, shared governance processes, and other issues involving academic and professional matters (10+1) in the context of the design and implementation of a guided pathways framework. In order to provide sufficient guidance, the resource teams will consider the needs and particular challenges identified by the local senate to help faculty identify and implement options which are aligned with ASCCC positions and papers and that are appropriate for their college's culture and student populations.

#### WHO

Team members are faculty members from California community colleges who are former or current Executive Committee members, current ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force members, recognized guided pathways framework experts, content experts, and/or faculty currently participating in local guided pathways efforts.

#### **TOPICS OF INTEREST**

Some topics of interest might include the following:

- Overview of the principles inherent in a guided pathways framework
- Faculty participation in designing and implementing a guided pathway framework
- Collegial Consultation and other aspects related to academic and professional matters
   (10+1) as well as strategies for local senates to work with administrators, classified staff
   and students as they move forward with designing and implementing a guided pathways
   framework.
- Integrated approaches for broad faculty dialog and collaborations around guided pathway efforts.

#### TYPES OF SERVICES PROVIDED

- Informative presentations
- Resource materials
- Interactive, facilitation sessions
- Other methods to assist local colleges in a successful development and implementation of a guided pathways framework

#### **COST**

Costs associated with the ASCCC Guided Pathways Resource Team will vary and depend on the resources needed to accomplish the goal(s) of the college. Costs primarily cover the expense of travel for the Guided Pathways Resource Team.

#### WHAT IS NEXT?

Use the link below to complete the form to request services.

SUBJECT: TASSC Regional Meetings		Month: November	Year: 2017
		Item No: II. C.	
		Attachment: Yes	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will consider for	Urgent: No	
	approval two regional meetings to be organized	Time Requested: 10 minutes	
	by TASSC on March 8 and 9, 2018		
CATEGORY:	Consent	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Randy Beach	Consent/Routine	Х
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action	
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Committee would like to hold two regional meetings (one in the north and one in the south) in spring to provide guidance in a variety of areas including general topics related to transfer/student services (ADTs, General Education concerns, The Educational Planning Initiative, Guided Pathways, etc.). The committee has proposed the meetings on Thursday, March 8 and Friday March 9. Alternate dates are Thursday, February 22 and Friday, February 23. All dates and presenters on the draft agenda are unconfirmed and tentative.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

### ASCCC REGIONAL MEETING

# for Student Services and Faculty

#### Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services

Golden West (South) ARC or Consumnes (North) March 8 (North) March 9 (South) 2/22 and 2/23 Plan B

8:30 am - 9:00 am Registration and Sign-in, location TBD

9:00 am - 10:15 am Welcome and Introductions. location TBD Randy Beach, ASCCC Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Chair

#### The Role of Student Services Faculty in the Guided Pathways Framework

Facilitator: Randy Beach (North and South)

Presenters:

VP student services Mt. San Antonio (South); VPSS Bakersfield/Sierra/Skyline (North)

ASCCC GP Task Force Randy Beach and/or Rebecca Eikey (South); Carrie Roberson and/or Ginni May (North)

Stephanie Dumont, Golden West College (South); Jackie Mathis (Cosumnes River College) or Brianna Holland, American River College, (North)

10:15 am - 10:30 am Break

10:30 am -11:30 pm **Advising Students about General Education Requirements** 

Presenters:

TASSC Committee members presentation

11:30 pm - 12:20 pm Lunch

12:30 pm - 1:30 pm **First Breakout Session** 

#### **Breakout #1 Course Substitution and Associate Degrees for Transfer**

Location Description

Facilitator, LaTonya Parker (South)

Facilitator, Maurice Geddis (North)

Presenters:

Dave DeGroot, Allan Hancock College (North and South) AO CID Group (North and South)

#### Breakout #2 The CCC/UC Transfer Pathways for Chemistry and Physics

Location
Description

Facilitator, Julie Land (South) Facilitator, TBD (North)

Presenters:

John Stanskas or Craig Rutan, ASCCC Exec (South) TBD (North)

#### 1:40 pm - 2:40 pm Second Breakout Session

#### Breakout #3 EPI

Location
Description

Facilitator, Maurice Geddis, TASSC (North) Facilitator, Jackie Stahlke TASSC (South)

#### Presenters:

Stephanie Dumont, Golden West College TBD, Fresno, Bakersfield, Santa Rosa (North) TBD, Mt. San Jacinto (South)

# Breakout #4 Credit for Prior Learning (Dual Enrollment, Credit for Military Service, External Examination (AP, IB, CLEP))

Location Description

Facilitator, Clarisa Veras, TASSC (North Facilitator, Jule Land, TASSC (South)

#### Presenters:

Dolores Davison (North) Donna Green (South)

Presenter, College/Organization

Meeting concludes at the end of the second breakouts. Thank you for attending!

SUBJECT: Accreditation Institute Draft for 1st Reading		Month: November Ye	ear: 2017
		Item No: II. D.	
		Attachment: Yes (1)	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will consider the	Urgent: No	
	Accreditation Institute Program draft for	Time Requested: 15 minutes	
	approval.		
CATEGORY:	Consent	TYPE OF BOARD CONSI	DERATION:
REQUESTED BY:	Ginni May (chair)	Consent/Routine	X
	John Freitas (2 <sup>nd</sup> )	First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action	
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The Accreditation Institute is taking place February 23-24, 2018 with a pre-session sponsored by the ACCJC on February 22. The Executive Committee considered the general program overview at the September 29-30 Executive Committee meeting and provided input for the Program Draft.

The Accreditation Institute Program draft is attached for a first reading.

#### **DESIRED OUTCOME:**

Approval of the Accreditation Institute Program draft.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

#### **2018 Accreditation Institute**

February 23-24, Pre-session: February 22 Wyndam Anaheim – Garden Grove 12021 Harbor Blvd., Garden Grove, CA, 92840

Post-secondary education is undergoing many changes such as student placement and assessment processes, increased student services, and even consideration of a guided pathways framework. Likewise, accreditation requirements and practices are undergoing significant change. Accreditation is no longer an event that occurs once every six years to prove compliance; it is a process that requires annual consideration and broad participation to ensure that the education and services provided to our students are of high quality and value to the community and public at large. Whether your college is gathering evidence, in the process of writing an Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER), or preparing for a comprehensive site visit, the Academic Senate for California Community College's Accreditation Institute will provide guidance and support. Accreditation is an opportunity to share everything that our colleges do well and to identify areas where improvement can be made. This year's institute, while embracing change, is focused on understanding accreditation so that participants are empowered and energized to take ownership of accreditation. New this year, is a pre-session sponsored by the ACCJC. There will be two trainings: one, a New Evaluator Training for Faculty and the other, New Accreditation Liaison Officer Training.

Theme: Change

#### Goals:

- 1. Provide basic information on accreditation.
- 2. Provide information on effective practices in accreditation.
- 3. Empower and energize participants to take ownership of accreditation to
  - a. continuously improve their colleges, and
  - b. identify existing infrastructure that supports and sustains ongoing evaluation.

#### Strands:

- 1. The ACCJC Accreditation Standards
- 2. ACCJC Accreditation and More...
- 3. Effective Accreditation Practices
- 4. Accreditation in Practice

#### Thursday, February 22 – Pre-session

10:00-4:00 New Evaluator Training for Faculty 1:00-4:00 New Accreditation Liaison Officer Training

#### Friday, February 23

9:45-10:15 General Session 1 – Welcome

#### 10:30-11:45 Breakout 1

- 1. Overview of ACCJC Standard I
- 2. California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Accreditation Workgroups 1 and 2: History, Update, and Future
- 3. The Quality Focus Essay faculty role, relationship to planning, sustaining the momentum
- 4. Writing the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER)

#### 12:00-2:00 Lunch/General Session 2 –

- eLumen presentation
- A History of Accreditation in the United States

#### 2:15-3:30 Breakout 2

- 1. Overview of ACCJC Standard II
- 2. Follow-up to a History of Accreditation in the United States with Q&A
- 3. Programmatic Accreditation for Career Education and Accreditation of Noncredit Programs Western Association of Schools and Colleges-Accrediting Commission for Schools (WASC ACS)
- 4. Gearing up for and getting through "the visit"—Understanding your visiting team

#### 3:45-5:00 Breakout 3 (there are 5 sessions here!)

- 1. Overview of ACCJC Standard III
- 2. Guidance on Standard I.B.6 and disaggregation of student learning outcome assessment data
- 3. Faculty Leadership in Accreditation Processes fleshing out the 10+1
- 4. eLumen Sponsor's Breakout
- 5. Accreditation in Multi-College Districts

#### Saturday, February 24

9:00-10:00 General Session 3 – The Compton College Story

#### 10:15-11:30 Breakout 4

- 1. Overview of ACCJC Standard IV
- 2. Distance Education and United States Department of Education Requirements
- 3. Other requirements besides the four ACCJC Standards, such as the Eligibility Requirements and ACCJC Policies
- 4. Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Partnership Resource Teams (PRTs) and Accreditation

#### Additional Breakout Titles/topics:

- 1. Follow-up Visits, Midterm Reports, Substantive Change, and more (add to B1,3 or B4,3)
- 2. Being an Accreditation Chair/Co-chair/Tri-Chair (add to B3,3)

\*eLumen will sponsor the Accreditation Institute at \$5000 for the following:

- Event table with marketing materials
- One full page ad in the program and honorable mention during general session
- Four tickets to the general session
- 5-minute demonstration in front of general session
- Breakout session for exclusive opportunity to present products/services



#### **Management Report**

By Julie Adams, Executive Director October 2017

#### **ASCCC Operations**

#### Association Management Software (AMS)

The ASCCC currently uses EventBrite to manage our events, which has limited functionality. Last year, the Senate paid roughly \$18,300 in fees, based on how much we charge for event registration. The ASCCC Office explored other platforms for managing registration for events, particularly an Association Management Software (AMS). AMS Software is designed for the purpose of organizing and increasing efficiency for an association through a variety of tools. An RFP process was conducted and the ASCCC office reviewed three vendors via a system requirements matrix, as well as a review of demos to determine the best fit for the organization. Requirements for the system were included but not limited to event management, financial reporting, technical assistance, and training. The vendor selected was MemberClicks. This vendor provides the needed functionality and more including dues collection, event registration, member engagement, and a database that stores information on members and attendees and vendors at events, as well as donors of the ASFoundation. This system also includes some level of accounting/bookkeeping functionality. MemberClicks will streamline all operations and replace the current event management site EventBrite and the current email marketing site, Campaign Monitor, saving the organization approximately \$10,000 annually. The Senate is currently in the implementation phase, where the database will be migrated to the AMS.

After the implementation phase, an onboarding process will occur where each staff member will be trained as an administrator to the AMS. In addition, there will also be video tutorials for members on how to navigate their personal profiles, check invoices, and register for events. There will be multiple communications to the field as well during this process. Ultimately, members will have a profile page where they will be prompted to login as a mechanism to store their information such as events they attended and certificates they received, but also to increase their interaction with the Senate's programs and communications. The ASCCC website will remain as the main resource for members, and MemberClicks will act as an open-door system prompting only one sign in or a Single Sign On (SSO) for members which will allow them (members) to seamlessly go from the member site to the ASCCC site with ease and without notice.

#### **Events**

Collaborative event: The Mission Inn was not available for the Collaborative Event so the ASCCC Office secured the Westin in South Coast Plaza. The event registration is now available.

A location was identified for the SLO Symposium on February 9, 2018—Orange Coast College.

The event registrations are noted below:

- CTE Regionals (October 20 21): North 46, South 42
- Civil Discourse and Equity Regional Meeting (October 27 28): North 13, South
  - 9. The Executive Committee might consider cancelling these two meetings.
- Fall Plenary: 241
- Curriculum Regionals (November 17 18): North 32, South 47

#### **ASCCC Appointments**

The ASCCC Office confirmed more than 70 appointments to Chancellor's Office advisory, task forces, and committees. Requests for faculty appointments continue to come in on a regular basis. The ASCCC Office has inserted a "Help Wanted" button on the front of the website and is currently developing a way to advertise open volunteer opportunities via website as well as the ASCCC Weekly Bulletin.

#### New Staff

April Lateer was hired as a C-ID Specialist for the C-ID project.

#### **Accounting**

In preparation for FY 16-17 audit, all requested checklist responses, reconciliations, and substantiating documentation were organized and compiled. Staff members from John Waddell & Co CPAS were in ASCCC office for one week reviewing accounting and payroll records, financial statements, reconciliations, procedures, policies, and systems. This year included a testing of the internal controls for cash disbursements. Waddell staff is currently finalizing their findings and expected to have the audit completed within the next week.

Internal policies and procedures were reviewed and updated by staff members to reflect current processes and provided for final approval of the Executive Committee.

Billings for on-going grants were issued and collected for first two months of FY 17-18 for LACCD and C-ID grants, and annual Governor's Grant. Billing for IEPI grant for first quarter was issued. Guided Pathways and Code Alignment Project tracking procedures were developed and workshops are underway with reimbursement process in place.

#### **Annual Office Processes and Communications**

The ASCCC sent out the following annual communications to the field:

- Call for Disciplines List proposals
- Board of Governors Nominations
- Awards Nominations

In addition, two surveys were drafted and distributed to the field for the Open Educational Resources Committee and Noncredit Committee. A third survey was also drafted for Relations with Local Senates that will be distributed in late-October. Communications related to the surveys, along with tracking of the survey responses, are tracked and collected by the ASCCC Office.

Weekly bulletins were also drafted and disseminated to the appropriate listservs, along with other stand-alone communications to the field.

The ASCCC also provided and/or scheduled four technical assistance requests to colleges this semester, and currently has two scheduled for spring.

#### **C-ID System**

#### **Disciplines**

C-ID's work in disciplines continues to expand, now encompassing over 70 disciplines, ranging from Administration of Justice, to Social Work and Human Services. The ASCCC Office provides support on the coordination of each disciplines' meetings, whether in-person or by teleconference. The ASCCC Office is also responsible for communications to the field, including messaging regarding vetting of materials, such as descriptors and/or model curriculum, to updating the field on new policies, to the C-ID monthly newsletter distributed to colleges. The ASCCC also provides initial contact to the field as it relates to C-ID questions.

#### Marketing

The ASCCC Office is working with <u>Runyon Saltzman Einhorn</u> (RSE), a professional marketing company, on the development of digital collateral materials for the C-ID project. Using RSE, C-ID envisions the creation of several digital collateral pieces that can be disseminated to the field, particularly to faculty and to the legislature. Several conversations and an in-person meeting were held with the RSE team to discuss the vision of C-ID, as well as provide information on the work of the C-ID project. The ASCCC is working closely with RSE on the development of the digital collateral pieces, which include a fact sheet and brochure. ASCCC staff is working directly with RSE staff on the content of each piece and providing guidance on the look and feel of the collateral materials developed. In addition, the ASCCC Office will be working with RSE to develop collateral for the ASCCC not related to C-ID.

#### **Meetings**

In order to advance the finalization of the existing C-ID disciplines, the ASCCC and C-ID shifted its focus on the process for CTE disciplines, such that it now calls for the development of a

framework, which consists of a core group of courses, be identified first by the discipline faculty, prior to work commencing on descriptors.

While this process is very similar to what was already done in C-ID, it was decided that a pilot discipline test out the new process to see how it will work. Using the new process, C-ID collaborated with the Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC), The Health Workforce Initiative (HWI), Sector Navigators, Regional Consortia Chairs, and the ASCCC to hold a Discipline Input Group (DIG) meeting for Medical Assisting faculty on October 13, 2017. The ASCCC coordinated the meeting, including identifying the hotel, working with faculty on travel arrangements, setting the agenda for the attendees, pulling together the materials and presentation for the day, and sending invitations for the faculty to attend. Twenty-seven faculty from the 50 programs on CCC then attended the meeting and identified a core list of courses that could be used across the following three areas of Medical Assisting:

Administrative, Clinical, and Comprehensive. Additionally, the groups drafted potential stackable certificates for each of the areas. C-ID will form and convene a Medical Assisting Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) to continue work on the materials drafted at the meeting.

In addition, C-ID is actively working to determine whether associate degrees can be created that will feed into the existing baccalaureate programs at the California community colleges. On October 6, 2017, a DIG meeting was held in Northern CA, for faculty in Automotive Technology, Respiratory Care, and Biomanufacturing—21 faculty attended. The ASCCC coordinated the meetings, including identifying the hotels, working with faculty on travel arrangements, setting the agenda for the attendees, pulling together the materials and presentation for the day, and sending invitations for the faculty to attend. Statewide faculty are registered to attend the meeting closest to them.

As a result of the October 6 meeting, Automotive Technology faculty drafted four stackable certificates, and a 27-unit associate degree. Both Biomanufacturing and Respiratory Care faculty were also able to begin the development of an associate degree for their discipline. The southern California faculty for the three disciplines are scheduled to meet on October 20, 2017 to continue the work on the draft documents from the northern California meeting. After the meeting, each discipline's existing FDRG will continue the work on the draft documents until the documents are vetted and finalized. The ASCCC works with FDRGs to coordinate meetings, including setting up Doodle polls, and arranging the teleconference line and/or travel to the meeting.

#### Technology

C-ID continues its work with the CCC Technology Center (CCCTC) on the development of the C-ID website. The ASCCC Office provides guidance and input to the CCCTC weekly on the website, including tracking a list of on-going issues from the field, reviewing the work done by the software developers, and writing up detailed user stories on new issues. ASCCC also tracks

separately any new problems from the field using the ZenDesk ticketing system and provides solutions, when possible, and escalation to the CCCTC when necessary.



SUBJECT: Legislation and Government Update		Month: November Year: 2017		
		Item No: IV. A.		
		Attachment: Yes (2)		
DESIRED OUTCOME:	Discussion and Action	Urgent: Yes		
		Time Requested: 20 minutes		
CATEGORY:	Action	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Stanskas	Consent/Routine		
		First Reading		
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action X		
		Information		

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

For this year, all bills with fiscal impact have been sent to the governor by the time this meeting occurs. The governor had until October 15 to sign or veto.

The Executive Committee approved the Legislative Priorities for this year and requested further information regarding one of them.

#### **Approved Legislative Agenda for 2017-2018**

Full-Time Faculty and Faculty Diversification

Audit Fee

Permanent and Sustainable Funding for C-ID

Dedicated Professional Development Money for ASCCC to convene faculty discipline meetings to improve student success and completion\*

Wrap-Around Student Support (Mental Health, Increased Direct Aid for Food and Housing Insecurity)

\*Statewide Discussions about curriculum, serving various student groups, alignment, and better conversations and collaborations at the discipline level. This may be accomplished through an expansion of the C-ID mission to facilitate discipline dialog at the state level. This also may include improving money for colleges specifically for professional development that indicates support of discipline dialog as an explicit component of funding.

#### **DESIRED OUTCOME:**

The attached reports may generate discussion and action by the Executive Committee.

The board may also choose to modify or reject the ASCCC legislative priorities as recommended by the Legislative and Advocacy Committee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

## ASCCC Legislative Report October 16, 2017

# Legislation with implications for academic and professional matters Assembly Bills

#### \*AB19 (Santiago) Enrollment Fee Waiver - California Affordability Promise

Existing law provides for the waiver of the \$46 per unit fee under certain circumstances, including, among others, that the student either (1) at the time of enrollment is a recipient under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment Program, or a general assistance program, (2) demonstrates eligibility according to income standards established by regulation of the board of governors, or (3) demonstrates financial need in accordance with methodology set forth in federal law or regulation for determining the expected family contribution of students seeking aid. Currently, 60% of community college students qualify for a fee waiver. In addition, a student may receive a BoG fee waiver if they enroll in 12 units at a district and submit a FAFSA or California Dream Act application. There are specific requirements required of the district to qualify for this program including partnerships with CSU or UC, partnerships with school districts, outreach to the community regarding ADTs and using evidence-based assessment for placement. The language regarding assessment is, "Utilizing evidence-based placement and student assessment indicators at the community college district that include multiple measures of student performance, which may include, among others, grades in high school courses, overall grade point averages, results from common assessments, and input from counselors." Amended to make provisions contingent upon appropriations 9/1/17.

Status: Signed by the Governor.

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: The ASCCC has long held that access to education should not be limited by financial constraints as evidenced by many resolutions including SP11 6.01, FA03 6.01, and SP03 20.01. The language in this bill regarding assessment is much more in line with ASCCC positions than AB705.

#### \*AB21 (Kalra) Access to Higher Education for Every Student - Urgent

This bill would direct or request, as allowed by law, that California's post-secondary educational institutions take certain actions in response to the possibility of immigration law enforcement activity on their campuses. In essence, the bill would (1) prevent disclosure of citizenship or immigration status information unless required by federal law; (2) seek to ensure that campus leadership has verified the legal authority behind any immigration enforcement activity on campus before it takes place; (3) make immigration legal assistance referral information available to students upon request; and (4) guarantee that students impacted by federal immigration enforcement do not lose eligibility for enrollment, financial aid, or other benefits as a result.

Additionally, colleges will develop and post advisement on their website and update faculty, students, and staff quarterly via email of the college policy.

Amended to delay implementation to July 1, 2019.

Status: Signed by the Governor.

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: The ASCCC has long held that access to education should not be limited as evidenced by many resolutions including SP11 6.01, FA03 6.01, and SP03 20.01.

#### AB214 (Weber) Student Food Security

AB 214 seeks to assist students facing food insecurity by making the CalFresh application processes easier. The Student Aid Commission would be required to notify CalGrant recipients of their eligibility for CalFresh benefits.

**Status:** Signed by the Governor and Chaptered, 7/24/17

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: The ASCCC has a history of supporting our neediest students with access to programs and services necessary to facilitate curricular success.

#### \*AB504 (Medina) Student Success and Support Program Funding

This bill would require that Student Success and Support Program funding be used to support the implementation of student equity plan goals and the coordination of services for the targeted student population through evidence-based practices. The bill provides the minimum standards for inclusion in data collection of various segments of the student population to inform student equity plans.

**Status:** Signed by the Governor.

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: These categories are the same that most colleges use currently.

#### \*AB637 (Medina) Cross-Enrollment in Online Education

This bill would permit students enrolled at one community college to enroll in a completely online course from another community college on the OEI Consortium. This bill also requires the Chancellor's Office to allow eligible students of opportunities to access online courses. 6/14/17

**Status:** Signed by the Governor.

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: The ASCCC participates in the OEI framework. This bill seems to ease some regulatory concerns about cross-enrollment and student processes.

\*AB705 (Irwin) Seymour-Campbell Student Success Act of 2012: Matriculation: Assessment

This bill would, permit the Board of Governors to establish regulations governing the use of measures, instruments and placement models including the use of high school transcript data in the assessment and subsequent assignment of students to English and mathematics coursework in order to maximize the probability that the student will complete transferlevel coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe. The bill would prohibit a community college district or college from requiring students to enroll in remedial coursework that lengthens their time to complete a degree unless research shows that those students are highly unlikely to succeed in transfer-level coursework. The bill would authorize a community college district or college to require students to enroll in additional concurrent support during the same semester that they take the college-level English or mathematics course, but only if it is determined that the support will be essential to the student's success in the college-level English or mathematics course. To the extent the bill would impose additional duties on community college districts and colleges. the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill encourages the State Dept. of Education and the Chancellor's Office to work collaboratively to ensure timely access to data regarding high school performance. The bill was slightly amended to allow for students who wish to earn an associate's degree but not transfer to complete associate's level English and math in one-year, and for ESL students to have a three-year time frame. Amended 5/3/17 Amended 5/30/17 Amended 7/19/17

**Status:** Signed by the Governor.

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: The ASCCC has long held that assessment for placement is a local decision of alignment with appropriate curriculum. We have significant concerns with this bill's current language. We would support a bill that improved the availability of high school transcript data to community colleges with the funding to support that data structure. The ASCCC adopted resolution SP17 6.04 opposing the limitation of multiple measures included in this bill. A letter of opposition was submitted.

\*AB 1018 (Reyes) Community Colleges, Student Equity Plans, Homeless Students
AB 1018 would amend the list of student categories tracked by SSSP to include, but not limit to, current and former foster youth, students with disabilities, low-income students, veterans, students in the racial and ethnic categories defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students and homeless students. This bill also permits the Chancellor's Office to include more required categories. Slight amendments by Senate Appropriations 9/1/17

**Status:** Signed by the Governor.

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: The ASCCC is supportive of efforts to ensure access to all student groups and would also advocate for inclusion of LGBTQI+ students in the list. And done!

#### \*AB 1567 (Holden) Foster Youth.

AB 1567 requires the State Department of Social Services and county welfare departments,

in coordination with the California State University and the California Community Colleges to share relevant data on foster youth enrollment and ensure that foster youth are offered access to programs offered, like EOPS. Amended by Senate to reduce data requirements. 9/1/17

Status: Signed by the Governor.

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: We should support any efforts to support former foster youth.

#### \*ACR 32 (Medina) Community College Faculty

This Concurrent Resolution would urge the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to set goals toward making progress on the goals of 75% of credit classroom instruction covered by full-time faculty, improved access to part-time health care and office hours, and improved compensation toward parity for part-time faculty and noncredit faculty.

Status: Enrolled 9/13/17.

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: We are very supportive of the goals set forth in this ACR within the confines of our purview regarding the academic and professional matters.

#### Senate Bills

#### SB12 (Beall) Foster Youth and Financial Assistance

This bill would require the Student Aid Commission to work cooperatively with the State Department of Social Services to develop an automated system to verify a student's status as a foster youth to aid in the processing of applications for state and federal financial aid. In addition, existing law, the Cooperating Agencies Foster Youth Educational Support Program, authorizes the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to enter into agreements with up to 10 community college districts to provide additional funds for services in support of postsecondary education for foster youth. Existing law provides that these services include, when appropriate, but are not necessarily limited to, outreach and recruitment, service coordination, counseling, book and supply grants, tutoring, independent living and financial literacy skills support, frequent in-person contact, career guidance, transfer counseling, child care and transportation assistance, and referrals to health services, mental health services, housing assistance, and other related services. This bill would expand that authorization from up to 10 community college districts to up to 20 community college districts, and would make conforming changes to other provisions of the program. Slight technical amendments from Senate, 9/1/17

**Status:** Signed by the Governor.

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: The ASCCC does not have a specific resolution regarding the CAFYES program, but has numerous resolutions in support of access.

#### SB68 (Lara) Exemption from Nonresident Tuition

Current law exempts students from nonresident tuition if they have attended a California public high school for at least 3 years. This bill would instead exempt a student, other than a nonimmigrant alien, from nonresident tuition at the California State University and the California Community Colleges if the student has a total of 3 or more years of attendance at, California secondary schools, campuses of the California Community Colleges, or a combination of those schools, as specified, and the student graduates from a California high school or attains the equivalent, attains an associate degree from a campus of the California Community Colleges, or fulfills minimum transfer requirements established for the University of California or the California State University for students transferring from campuses of the California Community Colleges. Non-substantive amendments 3/29/17.

**Status:** Signed by the Governor.

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: The ASCCC has historically supported access to higher education to all students with zero fees.

#### SB 164 (McGuire) Tribal TANF

SB 164 extends priority enrollment at a community college to recipients of Tribal TANF. CalWorks recipients already have priority enrollment and Tribal TANF is essentially the same program with authority provided to federally recognized Tribes to administer their program. The affected population is estimated at 11,000 statewide.

**Status:** Signed by the Governor 7/21/17

**ASCCC Position/Resolutions**: The ASCCC has historically supported access to higher education to all students with zero fees.

#### Bills of Interest

#### AB17 (Holden) Transit Pass Pilot Program

Creates a transit pass program that provides free or reduced cost transit passes to Title 1 middle school and high school students and community college students eligible for Pell Grants, Cal Grants or BoG fee waivers. Appropriates \$20 million to pilot.

**Status:** Referred to Appropriations, ordered 3<sup>rd</sup> reading 9/5/17. Passed Senate 9/7/17. Passed Assembly 9/12/17. Enrolled 9/13/17.

\*Indicates bills to be highlighted during the Executive Committee meeting legislation discussion.

^Indicates bill will be removed from next iteration of report since the bill is not germane to the work of the ASCCC or has been replaced by a new bill.

 $\begin{array}{ll} ACR = Assembly \ Concurrent \ Resolution & ACA = Assembly \ Constitutional \ Amendment \\ AB = Assembly \ Bill & SB = Senate \ Bill \end{array}$ 



Subject: Revision of 2000 ASCCC Paper Re-Examination of Faculty		Month: November Y	'ear: 2017
Hiring: Processes and Procedures		Item No: IV. B.	
		Attachment: NO	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	DESIRED OUTCOME: The Executive Committee will approve the		
outline for the revision of the Hiring Processes		Time Requested: 20 minutes	
	Paper		
CATEGORY:	Action	TYPE OF BOARD CONS	SIDERATION:
REQUESTED BY:	Davison	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action	Х
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The Executive Committee will consider the outline, below, for the revision of the 2000 ASCCC Paper *Re-Examination of Faculty Hiring: Processes and Procedures* 

#### Paper Prompts (approved September 2013)

The purpose of this paper: Revision of the 2000 ASCCC Paper Re-Examination of Faculty Hiring: Processes and Procedures

Proposed completion date: Spring 2018

1. Is this a new paper, a revision of, or an update to an existing senate paper? This is a revision/update of the 2000 paper

2. Does the resolution ask for a paper? Resolution 3.01 (S17): Revise the Paper A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures

Whereas, The most recent Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) paper on faculty hiring, *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures*[1], was adopted in Fall 2000, and it is good practice to regularly review and reevaluate professional standards regarding the hiring processes and procedures for all faculty;

Whereas, Awareness of the importance of developing faculty hiring processes to increase the diversity of candidates applying and being interviewed for full-time faculty positions has become more significant throughout the system, including the drafting and recent release by the Chancellor's Office of the *Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Diversity Best Practices Handbook*, [2] which provides an explanation of the recently-adopted, multiple methods

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

allocation model for EEO funding and model practices for addressing the nine multiple methods described in the allocation model; and

Whereas, The report from the Board of Governors' Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy included recommendations to expand the pool of potential career and technical education (CTE) faculty with industry experience, and subsequent efforts by the ASCCC and the Chancellor's Office CTE Minimum Qualifications Task Force have been made to assist colleges to be more flexible when hiring CTE faculty while maintaining high academic and professional standards;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update the paper *A Reexamination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures* and bring it to the Spring 2018 Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

- 3. Are there other resolutions or senate publications relevant to this effort? Are there other resources that should be taken into consideration when developing the paper? Yes, multiple Rostrum articles and work by EDAC over the past year (2016-17).
- 4. If the paper is requested by resolution, do you believe that the paper as requested by the resolution is feasible? Yes
- 5. If the paper is not requested by resolution, what is the justification for writing the paper? Where and how did the idea for the paper originate? N/A
- 6. List the main points, topics, or section headers of the paper or a narrative describing the approach to the paper. Please describe any relevant data to be included in the content of the paper or data that is necessary to complete the paper. You may include this information in outline form if appropriate.
  - a. Introduction
  - b. The Current Status Demographics, Changes Since the Publication of the Previous Paper
  - c. Review and Revision of Hiring Policies and Procedures
  - d. Considerations with the Construction of the Hiring Committee
    - 1. The Role of Administration
    - 2. The Role of Faculty
    - 3. The Job Description
    - 4. Advertising and Recruiting Expanding the Traditional Parameters
  - e. Paper Screening
    - 1. Diversifying Pools
  - f. The Interview Process/Questions
  - g. Selecting the Finalists
  - h. Finalist Interviews
  - i. Other Considerations
    - 1. Part-time Faculty Hiring and Diversity in PT Ranks
    - Beyond Hiring Welcoming, Mentoring, and Retaining Newly Hired Faculty
  - j. Recommendations
  - k. Conclusions

- 7. Do you plan to include appendices in the paper? If so, what type? Provide an example, if appropriate. Documentation from the CCCCO showing the impact of full time hiring on diversity within the full time ranks; local handbooks regarding hiring processes
- 8. Do you need to gather information from the field (i.e., in the form of a survey or other) to inform the content of the paper? Unknown at this time
- 9. Do you have other information, comments, questions, or concerns?



SUBJECT: Academic Senate Audit		Month: November   Year: 2017
		Item No: IV. C.
		Attachment: YES
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will receive an	Urgent: NO
	update on the results of the recent Senate	Time Requested: 10 mins.
	audit.	
CATEGORY:	Action	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:
REQUESTED BY:	John Freitas	Consent/Routine
		First Reading
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action X
		Information

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

Each year the Academic Senate undergoes an audit of its finances. This year is no different. The purpose of the audit as noted in their engagement letter is "to express an opinion about whether the consolidated financial statements prepared by management with your [the board's] oversight are fairly presented, in all material respects, in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles." In September, the auditors conducted an audit of the Senate financials. At the time of the agenda preparation, the audit report was not available and will be forthcoming prior to the November 1<sup>st</sup> meeting date.

The Treasurer will present the audit for adoption by the delegates on Saturday. The Executive Committee will review and discuss the audit so that Executive Committee members are familiar with the audit and the Senate's finances.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

SUBJECT: Chancellor's Office Liaison Discussion		Month: November	Year: 2017
		Item No: V. A.	
		Attachment: NO	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	A liaison from the Chancellor's Office will	Urgent: NO	
provide the Executive Committee with an		Time Requested: 45	mins.
	update of system-wide issues and projects.		
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD COM	ISIDERATION:
REQUESTED BY:	Julie Bruno	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> : Ashley Fisher		Action	
		Information	Х

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

A Chancellor's Office representative will bring items of interest regarding Chancellor's Office activities to the Executive Committee for information, updates, and discussion. No action will be taken by the Executive Committee on any of these items.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

SUBJECT: Board of Governors/Consultation Council		Month: November	Year: 2017
		Item No: V. B.	
		Attachment: NO	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will receive an	Urgent: NO	
	update on the recent Board of Governors and	Time Requested: 20 r	minutes
	Consultation Council Meetings.		
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CON	SIDERATION:
REQUESTED BY:	Julie Bruno/John Stanskas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action	
		Information	Х

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

President Bruno and Vice President Stanskas will highlight the Board of Governors and Consultation meetings in October. Members are requested 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.



SUBJECT: CCC Guided Pathways Award Program		Month: November	Year: 2017
		Item No: V. C.	
		Attachment: NO	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will be updated on	Urgent: YES	
	the implementation of the CCC Guided	Time Requested: 45	minutes
	Pathways Award Program and discuss future		
	direction.		
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CON	SIDERATION:
REQUESTED BY:	J. Bruno	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action	
		Discussion	Х

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

With \$150 one-time allocation in the 2017-2018 budget, the Governor and Legislature created the CCC Guided Pathways Award Program designed to support colleges in implementing the principles and elements of an integrated approach to serving students in a way that significantly improves outcomes. The program falls within the Chancellor's Office Institutional Effectiveness division and is connected to the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative. More information on the program including statue language defining the program, information on the guided pathways framework and resources for colleges may be found at http://iepi.cccco.edu/Guided-Pathways

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in partnership with the Chancellor's Office, Career Ladders Project and the Research and Planning Group, is leading the effort to provide guided pathways workshops, capacity building at colleges, and an Applied Solutions Kit.

The Executive Committee will be updated on the implementation of the CCC Guided Pathways Award Program and discuss future direction.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

SUBJECT: Update on Quantitative Reasoning		Month: November	Year: 2017
		Item No: V. D.	
		Attachment: Yes (3)	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	Discussion	Urgent: Yes	
		Time Requested: 30	minutes
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CON	NSIDERATION:
REQUESTED BY:	John Stanskas	Consent/Routine	
	Ginni May	First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action	
		Information	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The field has been grappling with the requirements for transfer-level quantitative reasoning for the last year. As an update on the CSU systems requirements for transfer students, two additional documents have been released to the public and are attached.

#### **DESIRED OUTCOME:**

This report may generate discussion by the Executive Committee regarding direction to the field or direction to the ASCCC's representatives on GEAC, C-ID Advisory, and ICW committees.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.



Academic and Student Affairs 401 Golden Shore, 6th Floor Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

www.calstate.edu

October 9, 2017

Loren J. Blanchard, Ph.D. Executive Vice Chancellor

Telephone: 562-951-4710 Email: lblanchard@calstate.edu

Dr. Christine Miller Chair, Academic Senate, California State University California State University, Office of the Chancellor 401 Golden Shore Long Beach, California 90802

Dear Dr. Miller:

In this letter, I wish to provide a response to questions that continue to be raised regarding the degree to which Executive Order (EO) 1100 General Education Breadth Requirements-Revised integrates recommended definitions from the ASCSU Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) Report. The scope of the EO revision was limited to three aims: (1) providing greater clarity, (2) promoting equitable treatment of students and equitable opportunities for academic achievement, and (3) facilitating degree completion. It is left to the ASCSU General Education Task Force to decide larger issues about changing the purpose, size, and required GE distribution areas.

# Removing the Singular Universal Intermediate Algebra Prerequisite for All GE Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Courses

The recommendation to remove the Intermediate Algebra prerequisite as a requirement for all Subarea B4 courses was supported for five reasons. First, Intermediate Algebra is a high school-level course, and the CSU will no longer offer pre-baccalaureate courses. Second, the prerequisite is redundant with CSU admission requirements because first-time freshmen are required to meet A-G admission requirements, including Algebra II; and admission requirements for California Community College (CCC) students include completion of CSU GE Breadth Subarea B4 course with a C- grade or higher. Third, because the prerequisite was not required consistently in the CSU, the universal requirement for CCC courses represented inequitable standards for students. Fourth, while College Algebra and higher courses will still be required as a prerequisite for Calculus and other courses required in STEM majors, that preparation is not always directly applicable to other majors. Finally, no other GE Area or discipline in systemwide GE policy requires a prerequisite.

The ASCSU Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) Recommendation II is for the CSU to "Ensure equitable access and opportunity to all CSU students." EO 1100 responds to inequities caused by the required intermediate algebra prerequisite for GE Subrea B4 (mathematics/quantitative reasoning) courses, a problem highlighted in the report. The prerequisite is not equitably applied in practice; California Community College (CCC) students are held to meeting that prerequisite, while CSU first-time freshman were not always required to do so. In fact, after EO 1033 in 2008 added the "explicit Intermediate Algebra prerequisite" as a requirement for all Subarea B4 courses, CSU campuses did not

CSU Campuses Bakersfield Channel Islands Chico Dominguez Hills East Bay Fresno
Fullerton
Humboldt
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay Northridge Pomona Sacramento San Bernardino San Diego San Francisco San José San Luis Obispo San Marcos Sonoma Stanislaus Dr. Christine Miller October 9, 2017 Page 2

comply with that added requirement. The QRTF report identified that CCC campuses more strictly adhere to the intermediate algebra GE prerequisite than do CSUs. The task force pointed out that nearly half of CSU Subarea B4 courses do not expect students to use intermediate algebra. Additionally, 42 percent of CSU first-time freshmen satisfy their GE Subarea B4 mathematics/quantitative reasoning requirement with a course that is not algebra intensive. Meanwhile, many CCC students must successfully pass a GE Subrea B4 course with an explicit intermediate algebra prerequisite in order to be admissible to the CSU. For many students, that currently requires first taking a series of remedial mathematics courses. As explained in the task force report:

It is well documented that such course sequences—which may span as many as 3-4 courses —result in very few students ever completing a college-level math class. In fact, students who place into the lowest level of developmental math have only a 1-in-10 chance of ever [complete a college-level math course] (p. 5).

#### **Definition of GE Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning**

As specified in my March 7, 2017 letter to you (attached), the definition for subarea B4 reflects concepts in the recommended definition appearing on page 9 of the QRTF Report. Key outcomes included "applying concepts," "reasoning quantitatively," "communicating," "solving problems," for example. The EO definition reads:

Through courses in Subarea B4 students shall demonstrate the abilities to reason quantitatively, practice computational skills, and explain and apply mathematical or quantitative reasoning concepts to solve problems. Courses in this Subarea shall include a prerequisite reflective only of skills and knowledge required in the course. In addition to traditional mathematics, courses in Subarea B4 may include computer science, personal finance, statistics or discipline-based mathematics or quantitative reasoning courses, for example.

Per EO 1110 Assessment of Academic Preparation and Placement in First-Year General Education Written Communication and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Courses, all CSU courses will be at the baccalaureate level; and per EO 167 Transfer of Credit, baccalaureate courses transferred from regionally accredited institutions shall count toward a CSU baccalaureate degree. CCC and CSU courses already approved for Subarea B4 may retain that certification. Each CSU campus curriculum process will review and approve its own courses for Subarea B4 credit, and each CSU campus will decide the prerequisite appropriate for Subarea B4 courses.

#### Foundational and Baccalaureate Proficiencies

The recommended "foundational" and "baccalaureate" quantitative reasoning definitions were not adopted because they are not appropriate for GE policy. As specified in the executive summary of the QRTF report, the purpose of the task force was to "review the CSU's expectations for student proficiency in quantitative reasoning upon high school and college graduation, and to recommend changes to existing policies and practices." Student proficiencies upon high school graduation are addressed in CSU admission policy, not in GE policy. Similarly, GE policy does not address college graduation-level proficiencies.

Also in keeping with the plans laid out in that March 2017 letter, EO 1100 specifies that "satisfaction of CSU General Education (GE) Subarea B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning will fulfill the CSU

Dr. Christine Miller October 9, 2017 Page 3

graduation requirements for quantitative reasoning, and students satisfactorily completing Area B4 will be deemed proficient in quantitative reasoning at the GE baccalaureate level." However, through regular campus curricular procedures, a campus may mandate that a mathematics/quantitative reasoning course be taken to satisfy the upper-division Area B requirement. Additional mathematics or quantitative reasoning courses may be pursued in fulfillment of major or minor requirements or may be taken as electives. While the WASC Senior College and University Commission requires institutions to ensure development of five core competencies (written communication, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, and information literacy), each CSU campus is responsible for providing appropriate educational opportunities across the baccalaureate degree and for carrying out assessment of student learning. Writing or quantitative reasoning across the curriculum strategies may be adopted at the campus level, according to local curricular processes. CSU GE Breadth policy does not include foundational or baccalaureate proficiency requirements related to any discipline, including the five WASC core competencies.

#### Foundational Proficiency for Community College Transfer Students

We do not impose A-G admission requirements on community college students, who may be admitted to CCC campuses without having completed a high school education. We have a commitment to treating those students equitably, and the CCC has the responsibility of educating those students at a baccalaureate level prior to transfer. The CSU accepts baccalaureate-level transfer courses toward CSU degrees, as addressed in EO 167. For CCC students, the CSU proxy for A-G proficiency is satisfactory completion of the Golden Four basic skills courses in oral communication, written communication, quantitative reasoning and critical thinking GE Subareas. Satisfying these courses demonstrates that students have learned beyond the high school equivalent of A-G. No other discipline requires CCC transfer students to complete high-school level courses as a prerequisite to enrolling in GE courses.

I hope this clarifies the actions taken, as outlined in my March 2017 letter and as carried out in the drafting of EO 1100 Revised.

Sincerely,

Loren J. Blanchard, Ph.D. Executive Vice Chancellor

c: Rebecca D. Eisen, Chair, CSU Board of Trustees Lillian Kimbell, Chair, Educational Policy Committee Timothy P. White, Chancellor



# Guiding Notes for General Education Course Reviewers

These Guiding Notes have been developed based on recommendations from the faculty and staff who review course outlines proposed for lower-division general education credit in the University of California and the California State University. They elaborate on state and systemwide policies, adding suggestions and insights from past reviewers.

The Guiding Notes are in three parts:

Part One	Background	2
Part Two	Review criteria by area	7
	English and critical thinking	11
	Quantitative reasoning	13
	Arts and humanities	17
	Social sciences	22
	Physical and biological sciences	24
	Lifelong learning	27
	Language other than English	29
	American Institutions	30
Part Three	Electronic bibliography	32

We make these Notes available to the public so our colleagues can see what the CSU and UC look for in proposals for general education courses. For community colleges, this may make for quicker and more successful course submissions.

This document is continuously shaped by the faculty and staff in California's public colleges and universities who serve as GE course reviewers. California's Title 5, the IGETC Standards, and CSU Executive Orders remain the official policy documents for the general education transfer curriculum. Links to those policies and to these annually updated *Notes* are available in Part Three.

Alison Wrynn
CSU Office of the Chancellor
<a href="mailto:awrynn@calstate.edu">awrynn@calstate.edu</a>

Nancy Purcille UC Office of the President nancy.purcille@ucop.edu

#### PART ONE: BACKGROUND

#### The Purpose of General Education

General education represents the universal curriculum of the degree, the learning expected of all baccalaureate-level students regardless of background or major. It develops the intellectual capacities and versatility that employers say they most value:

- Effective oral and written communication
- Critical thinking
- Familiarity with styles of inquiry from a range of disciplines
- Ability to work in groups
- Skills to solve complex problems
- Tolerance for ambiguity
- An understanding of a variety of cultures, including one's own

The universities of the UC system and California State system have each created a distinct general education curriculum that meets these goals. Students who know which university they will attend may be best served by the local GE curriculum, but should check with the receiving campus to see whether IGETC or CSU GE Breadth is preferred.

For transfer students planning to attend a public California university but unsure of which one, the GE transfer curriculum establishes universally accepted minimum requirements in different academic areas, so students know which courses will take them closer to the degree, while maintaining consistent breadth in the baccalaureate degree.

Students who transfer into the UC or CSU from California Community Colleges (CCC) may be "certified" as having completed the lower-division units of their general education.

Administration of the two statewide general education patterns is set by Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, and governed day-to-day by these policies:

	For students bound for	<b>Governing Policy</b>	Guides
<b>CSU GE Breadth</b>	Any CSU	EO 1100 Revised	These Guiding Notes
<b>Intersegmental GE</b>	Any UC or CSU	EO 1100 Revised	IGETC Standards v 1.8
Transfer			and these Guiding Notes
Curriculum			
(IGETC)			

Each curriculum is defined by the set of courses approved for its subject areas, as published at <u>assist.org</u> and updated annually. The reviewers who use these Guiding Notes are participating in the annual updates by evaluating CCC course outlines proposed for GE credit in California's public universities.

#### General Education before Transfer

Both CSU GE Breadth and IGETC will apply to any CSU, and IGETC will apply to any UC or CSU—regardless of a student's choice of campus or major. However, IGETC may not be acceptable or recommended for students in high-unit majors such as science or engineering.

For these majors, longer chains of prerequisites may make it more advantageous to take lower-division coursework in the discipline, and then complete general education and major requirements as matriculated students at the university. Community college counselors can help students choose the most efficient way to complete their general education. For more

Students and their advisors should remember that any kind of GE certification before transfer is separate from – and doesn't guarantee – admission: certification recognizes completed coursework, not eligibility to enroll.

details on this process, see CSU GE Breadth for STEM Majors within ADTs below.

#### CSU GE Breadth vs. IGETC

Both the CSU GE Breadth and IGETC patterns are designed to educate students to think, write, and speak clearly and logically; to reason quantitatively; to know about the human body and mind, the development and functioning of human society, the physical and biological world, and human cultures and civilizations; and to develop an understanding of the principles, methods, and values of human inquiry.

They do so by grouping disciplines and modes of inquiry into areas such as science and social science. Most areas and subareas in CSU GE-Breadth match those in IGETC, and so course outlines are routinely submitted for both. See the chart on the next page for a detailed comparison of areas.

#### **Certification via Completion of an Approved Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT)**

Students are considered fully lower-division general education certified if they successfully completed CSU GE Breadth or IGETC (CSU) and are awarded a CCC ADT.

#### **CSU GE Breadth for STEM Majors within ADTs**

Students pursuing Chemistry or Biology ADTs may complete CSU GE Breadth for STEM or IGETC for STEM, deferring one lower-division course in Area C or Area 3 and one lower-division course in Area D or Area 4 until after transfer. CSU GE Breadth for STEM and IGETC for STEM is applicable only to majors for which the Transfer Model Curriculum specifies. A current list of ADT's that allow for use of IGETC for STEM can be found at <a href="https://www.c-id.net">www.c-id.net</a>.

A CCC preparing a CSU GE Breadth for STEM certification as part of an ADT shall ensure that the student has completed:

a. All courses in Areas A, B, and E of the traditional GE curriculum; and

- b. One course in Area C1 Arts and one course in Area C2 Humanities; and
- c. Two courses in Area D from two different disciplines.

IGETC for STEM certification – Complete the following courses before transfer:

- a. All courses in Area 1, 2 and 5 of the traditional IGETC: and
- b. One course in Area 3A; one course in Area 3B; and two courses in Area 4 from two different disciplines.

GE Breadth (CSU only)		Discipline	IGETC (CSU and U	JC systems)
	A1	Oral Communication	1C [not required for UC]	
	A2	Written Communication	1A	
	A3	Critical Thinking	1B	
	B1	Physical Sciences	5A	
	B2	Biological Sciences	5B	
	B3	Laboratory Activity	5C	
	B4	Mathematics	2	
	C1	Arts	3A	
	C2	Humanities	3B	
AREA D	D	Social Sciences	D	AREA 4
AREA E	Е	Lifelong Learning		[no area]
[no area]		Language Other than English	6A [not required for CSU]	AREA 6A

Detailed review criteria for each Area and Subarea, as well as sample reviewer's responses for each, comprise the next section of these Guiding Notes. Reviewers consider similar questions for the two patterns.

However, within their similarities are some important differences:

GE Bre	GE Breadth pattern (CSU only)		IGETC pattern (CSU plus UC)	
$\Rightarrow$	requires oral communication	$\Rightarrow$	doesn't require oral communication of students transferring to the UC	
$\Rightarrow$	doesn't require Language Other Than English	$\Rightarrow$	requires Language Other Than English for students transferring to the UC	
$\Rightarrow$	any passing grade will count for courses other than the golden four which require a C- or better: written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning	$\Rightarrow$	only grades of C or better will count for any courses	
$\Rightarrow$	a single course may carry any number of units. Typically, CSU GE courses (other than physical activity courses) are at least 3 semester units.	$\Rightarrow$	each course must carry at least three semester- or four quarter-units	

- ⇒ includes an area in Lifelong Understanding and Self-Development
- Courses in Subarea B4 will only have a prerequisite reflective of the skills and knowledge needed to succeed in the course.
- ⇒ no area in Lifelong Understanding and Self-Development
- ⇒ Requires intermediate algebra or higher math as prerequisite for courses in Area 2A, Mathematics. Until 2019, math courses with prerequisites of intermediate algebra OR courses that satisfy the UC TCA Guidelines for Statics and are approved by CSU per the memo of October 2015 are acceptable to fulfill the quantitative reasoning requirement.

In practice, the IGETC pattern is more restrictive. Courses that are approved for IGETC are automatically approved for the corresponding Area(s) or Subarea(s) in CSU GE Breadth if the CCC also requests that CSU GE Area. However, not all courses approved for CSU GE Breadth are approved for IGETC. The exception to this rule is CSU GE Subarea A1 (IGETC 1C). Approval for courses in this Subarea is based solely on the CSU decision.

#### **CSU Executive Order 1061: American Institutions**

CSU Executive Order 1061 establishes for all CSU students a separate graduation requirement in United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals (informally abbreviated "American Institutions" or "AI"). As with lower-division general education, transfer students may fulfill American Institutions requirements before or after matriculating to the CSU. Typically, students take courses that count for both AI and GE.

#### **Process Overview: Faculty and Staff Review**

CCCs submit new or revised course outlines to the CSU and UC system offices electronically via ASSIST Next Gen. Intersegmental faculty and staff then evaluate the outlines for consistency with the respective policy documents. Approved outlines from previous years are automatically carried forward, unless a CCC reports that a course has changed substantially since its last review. (For a description of what counts as a "substantial" change, see Submission, below.)

#### **Course Design**

Courses are created by faculty at CCC. The CSU and UC systems don't suggest particular subjects. Before they can be offered (or submitted to a system office for GE transfer credit), courses go through the normal channels of curriculum approval, and only baccalaureate-level courses are eligible for GE transfer credit. CCC courses must be UC-transferable (approved for the UC TCA) to be approved for IGETC. Subsequent determinations made by the fouryear schools relate only to the suitability of a course to an area of a GE pattern, and even high-quality courses may be denied.

A word of caution to the CCC faculty who design courses for general education transfer credit in the UC or CSU: some published approvals are better models than others. Until 1993, courses were accepted without review by the four-year institutions. When the public segments created the current review process, those courses were "grandfathered in" without review. Second, as knowledge and the needs of our graduates evolve, so do our review criteria for general education. Creators of courses are encouraged to choose examples whose approval is recent, and in no case earlier than 1993.

In the fall, CCC articulation officers submit courses by entering their new or substantially revised course outlines into ASSIST Next Gen. (These course submission screens aren't visible to public users.)

Substantial changes include changes in content, student learning objectives, modes of delivery (only if student learning objectives or content are affected), prerequisites, contact hours and/or decrease in units, or methods/criteria of assessment. Technical changes (not requiring review) include prefix, number, or title changes and/or updates of sample texts.

After the course outline data has been submitted, it is then available to the CSU Office of the Chancellor (CSUCO) and the UC Office of the President (UCOP).

Every submitted course undergoes a 1st-level review conducted by at least two readers. Courses are reviewed comprehensively; that is, if a course with current approval in biology is resubmitted for additional approval in social science, then reviewers will evaluate its fit for both areas of general education, and the pre-existing approval in biology may be withdrawn. Each 1st-level review ends with a preliminary recommendation.

For a minority of submitted courses, first-level reviewers are unable to agree on whether to recommend approval. These courses are referred to 2nd level review by additional staff or by faculty in the disciplines. 2nd-level reviewers may also contact liaisons to the authors of the course outlines to get clarification or additional details.

Reviewer recommendations for courses in CSU GE Breadth and American Institutions are reconciled in the CSUCO. Determinations of IGETC congruence are made in discussions between the CSUCO and UCOP.

By early April, articulation officers at participating institutions throughout California are able to view decisions within ASSIST Next Gen. Soon afterward the review decisions are communicated to ASSIST, so the public can see which CCC courses bear GE transfer credit and/or satisfy IGETC at four-year institutions.

**Submission** 

1st Level Review

2nd Level Review

Reconciliation

Notification

#### Respecting Precedent vs. Responding to Change

Submitting CCCs sometimes point to comparable courses already approved at other CCC, and ask whether reviewers feel bound by precedent. For the most part the answer is no: if a recently denied submission looks like longstanding approved courses elsewhere, then we're likelier to reconsider and remove the originally approved course than to extend similar approvals for the sake of consistency. The needs of the state, guidance from disciplinary faculty, and our understanding of the world and how best to learn about it are all evolving, and good articulation has to accommodate that, even if progress doesn't happen everywhere at the same rate.

However, we also recognize that frequent changes in the statewide transferability of a single course can disrupt enrollment, advising, and planning, and so very recent approvals may be allowed to stand even over the valid objections of subsequent reviewers.

#### PART TWO: REVIEW CRITERIA BY AREA

## **Criteria Applying to All Areas**

#### From the IGETC Standards 1.8:

Courses in the IGETC shall be culturally broad in their conception. They should help students understand the nature and richness of human culture and social structures through a comparative approach and have a pronounced historical perspective. They should recognize the contributions to knowledge, civilization, and society that have been made by men, women and members of various ethnic or cultural groups.

IGETC courses shall address the modes of inquiry that characterize the different areas of human thought: the nature of the questions that can be addressed, the way questions are formulated, the way analysis is conducted, and the validity and implications of the answers obtained.

When they submit courses for GE acceptability, CCCs will indicate the pattern, area and subarea to which they want the course applied. Reviewers use area-specific criteria as well as the following, which apply to all submitted courses:

⇒ Any course submitted for GE must be baccalaureate level. Because CCCs serve multiple constituencies, not everything they teach is comparable in depth and rigor to courses at four-year universities; for example, some coursework is instead meant to train students for specific jobs, or to prepare them for college.

The UC faculty have asked to review every community college course proposed for transferability, whether or not for general education. Prior to the IGETC update cycle each year, community colleges use ASSIST Next Gen to propose courses for the Transfer Credit Agreement (TCA).

CSU faculty chose instead to let CCCs decide which courses should transfer. In 1973, the CSU adopted Executive Order 167 to define transferability. Later the CSU's faculty senate elaborated on the definition in a document called "Determining a Baccalaureate Level Course." (Both the Executive Order and subsequent elaboration are available at the Academic Programs and Policy web site, http://calstate.edu/app/policies/). Generally, indications that a course is baccalaureate level include (1) a clear emphasis on cultural, historic, aesthetic, or other intellectual facets of the subject taught – particularly in classes that otherwise would amount to skills development; (2) stated requirements in reading and writing; (3) high demands of students, substantial student-faculty interaction, and clearly distinguished entry- and exit-level expectations; and (4) the existence of comparable courses at four-year institutions.

⇒ Courses should carry an appropriate number of units. In the IGETC pattern, any course must carry at least 3 semester-units or 4 quarter-units of credit. In the CSU GE Breadth pattern, any unit level is acceptable as a matter of policy, but in practice courses below three semester units rarely meet the criteria for breadth, depth, and rigor expected of general education courses.

Both patterns make exception for science laboratories, when offered separately from the accompanying lecture. CSU GE Breadth also makes exceptions for physical activity courses in Area E.

- ⇒ Course content should reflect a balance between breadth and depth appropriate for lower-division work. While it is important for course outlines to reflect the depth of university-level work, proposed courses may be denied if their focus is too narrow. For example, an otherwise acceptable course in literature (IGETC Area 3B) that focuses on a single book, or in self-development (CSU GE-Breadth Area E) that focuses only on the first years of childhood, would not provide the breadth expected of GE.
- ⇒ Variable-topics courses are excluded. As a rule, no variable-topics courses (or directed-studies courses) are acceptable for IGETC or CSU GE-Breadth regardless of area, because they change too much from one term (and instructor) to the next. However, not all the topics in a course have to be specified in detail. For example, a course on Victorian-era English literature doesn't have to name every novel assigned. A course in "Contemporary Controversies in Science" that examined a different controversy every term would be denied.
- ⇒ Courses may be approved in more than one area. One course may meet the criteria for more than one GE area. However, ordinarily students will be able to count it toward only one area.
- ⇒ **Proposed courses shall include at least one textbook.** Reviewers use the representative text as a way to confirm their understanding of course content. It's understood that the instructor in a given section may choose a different text, but the proposed one is still given close attention. It's expected that the structure of

the text will be consistent with the course outline. Including additional reading is a good way to demonstrate that multiple points of view will be evaluated, as a means of developing critical thinking.

Texts do not need to be published in hard copy. The UC and CSU welcome the use of online texts and other Open Educational Resources (OER), so long as the resource is a stable, bona fide textbook, and not just a collection of links to lecture notes or other web pages.

- ⇒ All CSU and UC campus departments consider the content of textbooks when reviewing articulation proposals from the CCCs. The use of online texts is reviewed by campuses on a case-by-case basis for articulation with CCCs.
- → Multiple CCC courses already use online texts that are approved for CSU- and UC-transferability, and for articulation with CSU and UC campuses.
- ⇒ Some CSU and UC campus departments use online texts themselves.
- ⇒ Texts, both online and traditional, must be dated within seven years for most course submissions. If they are not, there should be a note of explanation included, e.g., if the text is considered a classic.
- ⇒ Courses and recommended textbooks should be current. Course outlines should reflect contemporary thinking in the discipline, for example by showing a relatively recent date of approval from the department or campus curriculum committee.

Normally at least one text (and for some disciplines, *all* the texts) should have been published within seven years of the submission date (e.g., published in 2010 for course outlines submitted fall, 2017). Older books should be included if they're considered classics in the field and *clearly identified as classics in the outline*. Reviewers may make exceptions if the course authors provide a strong rationale.

- Any course outline should contain enough detail to make a decision possible. Reviewers are asked not to make assumptions based on their own disciplinary background or knowledge of the community college, course topic, or instructor. Among the areas of information submitted, course descriptions are considered least reliable because they're used to market the course to students. Course objectives, methods of instruction, and methods of evaluation are more informative. Listed prerequisites are also good indicators of course content, rigor, and disciplinary grounding.
- ⇒ Course outlines should make sense to the reviewer. Occasionally courses are rejected because the course outline is in a language other than English, doesn't match the "cross-listed course" in ASSIST NG, or has gaps or contradictions in the submitted information.

- ⇒ Course outlines should be in English—even when the course is not.
- ⇒ **IGETC** and **CSU GE Breadth decisions should be consistent.** Because transfer students count on courses that meet IGETC standards to work in the CSU Breadth pattern, reviewers will approve courses in CSU GE Breadth for the sake of consistency.

## Typical reviewer comments across all Areas

- "This outline contains insufficient detail in the content section for reviewers to determine how the course meets the area requirements."
- "Outlines submitted for CSU GE or IGETC course approval must be in English."
- "This is primarily a skills course."
- "No variable-topics courses (or directed-studies courses) are acceptable for IGETC or GE-Breadth."
- "This outline is different from the one submitted for the counterpart cross-listed course."
- "Courses proposed for IGETC must have a minimum unit value of 3-semester or 4-quarter units."
- "Textbook information should include the date of publication."
- "The perspective is predominantly humanistic, not social scientific. The course is retained solely in Area C2 of GE Breadth and Area 3B of IGETC."
- "The texts appear to be outdated. At least one textbook must have been published within the past 7 years. Outlines with texts more than 7 years old may be rejected if more recently published texts are appropriate and readily available."

#### CSU GE-Breadth Area A and IGETC Area 1

#### Communication in the English Language & Critical Thinking

Areas A and 1 emphasize development of students' communication and reasoning skills. These require coursework in "communication in the English language, to include both oral communication and written communication," making them the only areas in the GE patterns that must be taught in English.

#### **1A Written Communication**

(CSU GE Breadth Subarea A2)

Written Communication courses must lead to achievement of the same "freshman composition" objectives as found at most universities. Courses should explore rhetorical principles independent of the application of writing to a specific profession: an advertising department's course in Copy Writing or a journalism department's course in News Writing would probably not be suitable for Written Communication.

#### From the IGETC Standards 1.8:

A first-semester course in English reading and written composition must include substantial instruction and practice in expository essay writing at the college level with a minimum of 6,000 words. Courses should also require a substantial amount of reading of significant literature.

**Difference in CSU GE Breadth:** Subarea A2 of the CSU GE Breadth pattern has no minimum number of words; however, *some number of words should be specified in the course outline*.

Reviewers look for evidence of assigned and graded student writing, both in class and as assigned homework.

The course must carry an appropriate prerequisite course, or an SAT score or placement score, distinguishing it from a basic skills class.

# Typical reviewer comments in Subarea A2/1A

"Courses in this area must be conducted in English."

"A revised outline should specify the approximate total number of words (counting only final drafts) that students are expected to write, and should specify writing assignments required in class and outside the classroom."

"Courses in news writing and reporting are excluded from Area A2."

"This course focuses on the development of students' creative writing skills and techniques rather than the development of expository writing, which emphasizes form, content, context, and effectiveness of communication."

"Courses designed exclusively for the satisfaction of remedial composition cannot be counted toward fulfillment of the English composition requirement, whether they are in the CCC or in the CSU."

#### 1B Critical Thinking and Composition

#### (CSU GE Breadth Subarea A3)

The second semester of English composition adds a requirement of critical thinking.

#### From the IGETC Standards 1.8:

Written work shall be evaluated for both composition and critical thinking. Texts chosen in this area should reflect an awareness of cultural diversity. A minimum of 6000 words of writing is required.

Instruction in critical thinking is to be designed to achieve an understanding of the relationship of language to logic, which should lead to the ability to analyze, criticize, and advocate ideas, to reason inductively and deductively, and to identify the assumptions upon which particular conclusions depend. The minimal competence to be expected at the successful conclusion of instruction in critical thinking should be the ability to distinguish fact from judgment, and belief from knowledge; to use elementary inductive and deductive processes; and to recognize common logical errors or fallacies of language and thought.

Courses approved for IGETC Area 1B must have a stated prerequisite of a college-level course in English composition.

**Difference in CSU GE Breadth:** Subarea A3 in CSU GE Breadth is a course in critical thinking but not writing. There is no minimum word count, and departments of philosophy typically offer the course.

Critical thinking courses include explicit instruction and practice in inductive and deductive reasoning and identification of formal and informal fallacies of language and thought. Literary criticism courses are typically not accepted in this area.

# Typical reviewer comments in Subarea A3/1B

"The content section of the outline does not provide enough detail to determine whether all elements of critical thinking required by CSU EO 1100 Revised for Subarea A3 are present (*e.g.*, whether students will be able to advocate ideas effectively and to reason inductively and deductively)."

"This course does not appear to include sufficient explicit instruction and practice in inductive and deductive reasoning or identifying formal and informal fallacies of language and thought."

"Area 1B courses must include evaluation of information."

Reviewers look for courses that develop students' ability to think systematically and identify faulty reasoning, such as:

- ⇒ hasty generalization
- ⇒ non sequitur
- ⇒ false analogies
- ⇒ post hoc arguments
- ⇒ attacks ad hominem
- ⇒ bandwagon appeal
- ⇒ tautology/circular reasoning

⇒ either-or fallacies

#### 1C Oral Communication

#### (CSU GE Breadth Subarea A1)

Most courses must include faculty-supervised, faculty-evaluated practice in communicating orally in the physical presence of other listeners. The CSU asks that course outlines submitted for IGETC Area 1C or CSU GE Breadth Subarea A1 be very specific regarding how instruction and evaluation are conducted, so that it may be determined that student presentations, no matter what modality the course is offered in, will be made either in front of faculty and other listeners.

Rhetorical principles must be covered (study of effective communication in formal speeches or social interaction is appropriate, for example).

To qualify in CSU GE Breadth Subarea A1, students must speak their own words, not recite words written by others.

Interpersonal communications and debate courses are not a natural fit in Subarea A1, but a few have been made to work by incorporating significant faculty-supervised, faculty-evaluated practice in speaking with others and at least a small component of traditional rhetoric.

## Typical reviewer comments in Subarea A1/1C

"Course must include faculty-supervised, faculty-evaluated practice in oral communication presented in front of other listeners."

"Rhetorical principles must be covered (study of effective communication in formal speeches or social interaction is appropriate, for example)."

"This course is accepted with reservations about the extent of faculty-supervised, faculty-evaluated practice in oral communication or appropriate online substitutions. Reviewers suggest revising the outline."

#### CSU GE Breadth Subarea B4 and IGETC Area 2

#### **Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning**

#### From Executive Order 1100 Revised:

Through courses in Subarea B4 students shall demonstrate the abilities to reason quantitatively, practice computational skills, and explain and apply mathematical or quantitative reasoning concepts to solve problems. Courses in this Subarea shall include a prerequisite reflective only of skills and knowledge required in the course. In addition to traditional mathematics, courses in Subarea B4 may include computer science, personal finance, statistics or discipline-based mathematics or quantitative reasoning courses, for example.

#### From the IGETC Standards 1.8:

The Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of a one-term course in mathematics or statistics above the

level of intermediate algebra, with a stated course prerequisite of intermediate algebra. Courses outside the discipline of math using the application of statistics may be used to fulfill this requirement, as long as the course has intermediate algebra as a prerequisite and knowledge of intermediate algebra is necessary to be successful. Until 2019, math courses with prerequisites of intermediate algebra OR courses that satisfy the UCTCA Guidelines for Statistics and are approved by CSU per the Statistics Pathway memo of October 2015 are acceptable to fulfill the quantitative reasoning requirement. An appropriate course in statistics must emphasize the mathematical basis of statistics, probability theory and estimation, application and interpretation, uses and misuses, and the analysis and criticism of statistical arguments in public discourse.

Knowledge relevant to public and private decision making is expressed frequently in quantitative terms; we are routinely confronted with information requiring quantitative analysis, calculation, and the ability to use and criticize quantitative arguments. In addition, many disciplines require a sound foundation in mathematical concepts. The requirement in Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning is designed to help prepare students to respond effectively to these challenges. Courses approved to fulfill this requirement must focus on quantitative analysis and the ability to use and criticize quantitative arguments.

Symbolic Logic, Computer Programming, and survey courses such as Math in Society, were deemed unacceptable to fulfill the Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning requirement.

Courses submitted for CSU GE Breadth Subarea B4 approval require students to demonstrate the abilities to reason quantitatively, practice computational skills, and explain and apply mathematical or quantitative reasoning concepts to solve problems.

Across all CCC courses that are approved for CSU GE Breadth (including Subarea B4), the course content and outcomes must be baccalaureate level, needing as prerequisite the skills and knowledge that should have been developed in high school. With the issuance of CSU EO 1110 Revised, CSU students will no longer be required to complete remedial coursework. Thus, we leave it to the individual CCC to determine how students who have not completed the prerequisites to Subarea B4 courses will be supported to succeed (e.g., via traditional remedial courses, stretch or pathways models or co-requisite courses.)

Category of course	Example course	Minimum Prerequisite
Mathematics	College Algebra	Algebra 2
Mathematics	Calculus	College Algebra
Statistics	Statistics	Algebra 1
Quantitative Reasoning	Personal Finance,	Algebra 1
	Mathematical	
	Thinking, Math	
	for Teachers,	
	Liberal Arts	
	Math, etc.	

Certain courses are excluded from Area 2 or Subarea B4:

- ⇒ courses in the history of mathematics, or Mathematics for Elementary Teachers (excluded from 2A)
- ⇒ NOTE: until fall 2019, approved statistics pathways courses are acceptable to fulfill the quantitative reasoning requirement."

In asking whether a proposed course could satisfy the GE criteria for math/quantitative reasoning, reviewers ask whether a student will learn broadly transferable quantitative literacy – will attain the "numeracy" expected of an educated adult. If the answer is yes – even for advanced courses like differential calculus – then the course may be approved for GE.

Note: different data systems may rely on two-character values for this field, and call the IGETC area "2A." There isn't a policy or curriculum difference between Areas 2 and 2A in IGETC.

**Difference from CSU GE Breadth:** Math courses developed specifically for students preparing to teach elementary school are excluded from IGETC but acceptable in CSU GE Breadth. CSU math faculty have asked reviewers to check for inclusion of specific elements of math instruction before granting approval.

Certain quantitative reasoning courses (beginning with the fall 2018 semester) that may be approved for CSU GE Breadth may not be considered for IGETC.

# Typical reviewer comments in Subarea B4/Area 2

"This course is remedial work in quantitative reasoning or the first part of "stretch," co-requisite, or pathway portion of a quantitative reasoning course and is not acceptable for CSU GE Breadth or IGETC."

"This statistics course lacks conceptual or computational skills in basic inferential statistical methods, probability as it relates to statistical inference, or attention to statistical literacy."

"Remedial work in mathematics, defined as work in topics from arithmetic, beginning and intermediate algebra, high school geometry, or trigonometry if taught as a separate course are not acceptable for CSU GE Breadth or IGETC."

# Approving Math Courses for Elementary School Teachers (CSU GE Breadth pattern only)

Math courses designed as part of a teacher preparation or liberal studies curriculum must meet specific criteria to qualify for Subarea B4 of CSU GE Breadth. Faculty have asked that such courses include *all* of these elements listed in the March 2013 posting of the C-ID Math 120, "Mathematical Concepts for Elementary School Teachers - Number Systems."

Course Topics: In conformity with ESM standards, topics must include, but are not limited to:

- 1. Numeration systems: history, Hindu-Arabic numeration system, and place value systems;
- 2. Integers: structure and basic properties, computational algorithms;
- 3. Basic number theory: divisibility, prime and composite numbers, prime factorization, fundamental theorem of arithmetic, least common multiple and greatest common divisor;
- 4. Rational numbers: structure and properties, ratio and proportion;
- 5. Real numbers: structure and basic properties, arithmetic operations, rational and irrational numbers, decimal representation, number line representation;
- 6. Patterns, problem solving, communication, connections, modeling, reasoning, and representation; and
- National and state curriculum standards for elementary school math including Common Core State Standards.

**Student Learning Outcomes**: In conformity with ESM standards, course outcomes must include, but are not limited to:

- 1. Perform calculations with place value systems;
- 2. Evaluate the equivalence of numeric algorithms and explain the advantages and disadvantages of equivalent algorithms in different circumstances;
- 3. Apply algorithms from number theory to determine divisibility in a variety of settings;
- 4. Analyze least common multiples and greatest common divisors and their role in standard algorithms;
- 5. Explain the concept of rational numbers, using both ratio and decimal representations; analyze the arithmetic algorithms for these two representations; and justify their equivalence;
- 6. Analyze the structure and properties of whole, rational, and real number systems; define the concept of rational and irrational numbers, including their decimal representation; and illustrate the use of a number line representation;
- 7. Develop and reinforce conceptual understanding of mathematical topics through the use of patterns, problem solving, communication, connections, modeling, reasoning, and representation; and
- 8. Develop activities implementing curriculum standards.

## Arts and Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences

Between them, these two areas cover Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences – the broad middle ground of what most educated people consider liberal learning. Taken together, these two areas have accounted for more than half of all course outlines submitted for GE credit in California.

To ensure the breadth of learning expected of a baccalaureate degree, it is important that courses in these two areas be distinguished from each other:

	Study in Arts and Humanities		Study in the Social Sciences
$\Rightarrow$	focuses on the human condition: its limits, potential, and creative expressions	$\Rightarrow$	uses hard-science techniques of experimentation and empirical evidence to explore human experience
$\Rightarrow$	relies on critical analysis of specific texts or works to support its claims	$\Rightarrow$	includes explicit use of research and the scientific method
$\Rightarrow$	is "hermeneutic," <i>i.e.</i> , interpretive, especially of speech or writing	$\Rightarrow$	employs quantitative and qualitative analysis
		$\Rightarrow$	is likelier to examine groups of people and patterns of behavior than particular artifacts, individuals or idiosyncrasies

Although the areas are distinct, some disciplines such as Ethnic Studies may comprise significant coursework in both kinds of inquiry, and so count in both areas of general education.

History is among the hardest disciplines to categorize, by historians' own admission:

Since the 1980s, the discipline of history, which has always straddled the humanities and social sciences, has become more identified with the humanities. Indeed, the American Historical Association has recently urged the National Research Council (NRC) to classify history with the humanities in its periodic ranking of departments. For the institutional purposes that motivate the NRC rankings (and the methodologies used for them), the formal shift in category makes sense. But this change of institutional location in the national organization of research should not be understood as an intellectual abandonment of the discipline's historical association with the social sciences. History should value and maintain its Janus-faced position in the world of scholarship—looking to both the humanities and the social sciences.

-- The Education of Historians for the Twenty-First Century American Historical Association, 2004

The CSU and UC systems take their cues from the discipline, and may categorize history in the humanities. However, if participating institutions submit a history course for

approval in Area D/Area 4 Social Sciences and the outline supports the designation, then that is where the course is approved.

## CSU GE-Breadth Area C and IGETC Area 3

## Arts, Literature, Philosophy, and Foreign Languages

#### From the IGETC Standards 1.8:

The Arts and Humanities historically constitute the heart of a liberal arts general education because of the fundamental humanizing perspective that they provide for the development of the whole person. Our understanding of the world is fundamentally advanced through the study of Western and non-Western philosophy, language, literature, and the fine arts.

## From Executive Order 1100 Revised:

Across the disciplines in Area C coursework, students will cultivate intellect, imagination, sensibility and sensitivity. Students will respond subjectively as well as objectively to aesthetic experiences and will develop an understanding of the integrity of both emotional and intellectual responses. Students will cultivate and refine their affective, cognitive, and physical faculties through studying works of the human imagination. Activities may include participation in individual aesthetic, creative experiences; however, Area C excludes courses that exclusively emphasize skills development.

In their intellectual and subjective considerations, students will develop a better understanding of the interrelationship between the self and the creative arts and of the humanities in a variety of cultures.

Students may take courses in languages other than English in partial fulfillment of this requirement if the courses do not focus solely on skills acquisition but also contain a substantial cultural component. This may include literature, among other content.

## 3A Arts (Art, Dance, Music, Theater)

(CSU GE Breadth Subarea C1)

### Arts include:

- $\Rightarrow$  visual arts
- ⇒ architecture
- ⇒ design
- ⇒ music
- ⇒ dance
- ⇒ theater
- ⇒ film

Studio and performance classes that develop technique or skills alone do not meet the standards established for this area. Skills development is permitted, but only when it contributes to a broader contextual understanding of the arts, such as helping students make connections between the arts and cultural and social issues, and serving as an introduction to the arts as an aesthetic and creative endeavor.

Approved courses do not ordinarily carry prerequisites or advisories suggesting the student should have prior experience in the same art. *Audition-based courses will not be approved for GE*.

A note to faculty who create courses in this area: beware of emulating arts courses with existing approvals on ASSIST. Approval for arts courses in particular is often "grandfathered in" from years before 1993, when the current review process was put in place. These skills-heavy courses would be unlikely candidates for GE under the current procedure and criteria.

In 2011, CSU faculty addressed the problem of these grandfathered courses in Subarea C1 by removing those offered at or below two units. In the other areas of GE Breadth, courses of any unit value may still appear grandfathered in.

To determine the degree of emphasis on skills acquisition in new submissions, reviewers look at the time spent in lecture vs. activity (1.5 vs. 4.5 hours per week more than tips the scale to activity-based). For example, community college courses in design and color often carry a heavy lab component to prepare students for immediate employment; this is sound professional preparation but tips the course away from the goals of GE.

On the other hand, a noteworthy course in ceramics did qualify. The outline took a historic approach to the study of ceramics, much as an art appreciation course would. The students created ceramic works only as a reinforcement of the historic/cultural style (*e.g.*, the students produced a ceramic piece in the Japanese raku style after studying the historic and cultural influence of raku).

## Special cases:

**Music Theory**: Music Theory courses are primarily skills-development courses (notation and ear training) and are ordinarily excluded, even if they include some classical compositions. In the review conducted in Academic Year 2014-15, readers identified a handful of courses that seemed to satisfy the criteria both for the major and for GE.

**Film Studies:** Film studies courses (as opposed to film production) may qualify for either Arts or Humanities, depending on the focus of the course. Sometimes film is used as a means to study a particular time or culture, making a humanities (Subarea C2 or 3B course) designation appropriate. When the focus is instead on film as a medium of artistic expression, the more appropriate placement is Arts (Subarea C1 or 3A).

The same distinction applies to courses in still photography rather than motion pictures: if the medium is merely the means to examine the human condition, the approval will be in the Humanities area; if the medium itself is the main subject of study, then the approval will be in Arts.

**Art for Teachers:** Frequently these courses are denied for GE, because they emphasize pre-professional training for educators rather than great works of the human imagination.

## Typical reviewer comments in Area C1 and 3A

"Performance and studio classes may be credited toward satisfaction of this subject area only if they include substantial integration of history, theory, and criticism."

"This course's strong focus on technical and performance skills precludes its acceptance in Subarea C1."

"This course appears to be for Art majors, not general education students and is thus denied for general education."

#### **3B Humanities**

#### CSU GE Breadth Subarea C2

## From the IGETC Standards 1.8:

Acceptable Humanities courses are those that encourage students to analyze and appreciate works of philosophical, historical, literary, aesthetic and cultural importance. The faculty of the two segments determined that courses such as English composition, Logic, Speech, Creative Writing, Oral Interpretation, Readers Theater, and all elementary foreign language courses were skills or performance courses that do not meet the specifications for IGETC. Advanced foreign language courses may be approved if they include literature or cultural aspects. Theater and film courses may be approved if taught with emphasis on historical, literary, or cultural aspects. Logic courses may be accepted if the focus is not solely on technique but includes the role of logic in humanities disciplines.

In determining which of these submissions should qualify under either pattern, reviewers ask:

- ⇒ will students learn to analyze and appreciate works of philosophical and cultural importance?
- ⇒ does the course use canonical or seminal works as pathways to a broader understanding of the human condition?
- ⇒ how will the course help students confidently understand and articulate their own subjective intellectual experiences?

These criteria are key to determining the suitability of courses in a range of disciplines:

⇒ **Language courses** should do more than impart vocabulary and rules of grammar; they should use the second language to evoke a sympathetic response to the acquired culture, to help students understand the "other" in the first person.

For most language courses in IGETC, the course should be equivalent to at least the third year of high school to meet the criteria for Area 3B. Another useful indicator of whether the course exceeds that threshold is in its prerequisite: courses approved for Area 6A under the IGETC pattern are intended to achieve that minimum proficiency level, and so if they're listed as prerequisite to a course submitted for Subarea C2 in CSU GE-Breadth or Area 3B in IGETC, then the more advanced course probably has a strong enough cultural component to qualify. The course outline should include this cultural component content.

The prerequisite may be stated as:

- ⇒ a community college course that satisfies Area 6A of IGETC
- ⇒ two years of high school study of the language
- ⇒ some other measure of proficiency

In recent years, CSU faculty in languages, linguistics, and other humanities disciplines have signaled greater willingness to count elementary language courses for humanities credit. As a result, more of these courses are approved for the CSU GE Breadth pattern than for IGETC.

- ⇒ Creative writing courses are acceptable for CSU GE Breadth Subarea C2 only if they include reading and analysis of works of literature. Students should be learning to "read as writers" (focusing on how creative writing is developed, not just how readers interpret what is written), which is a different process than literary criticism.
- ⇒ Courses in geography, history, and art may satisfy Area 3B Humanities if the outline indicates a strong cultural content and an exploration of subjective human experience.
- ⇒ **Literature courses** may be disallowed because they are too narrow. A course in a single novel or literary movement (*e.g.*, postmodern American fiction) is probably more suitable for upper-division work, since it may not incorporate literary analysis from a variety of critical perspectives.
- ⇒ Courses in mass communication or mass media are seldom accepted in Area 3B or Subarea C2. (However, courses that study the interaction of mass communication and society are often appropriate for social science.)
- ⇒ Courses in English as a Second Language may despite their focus on proficiency and the acquisition of skills be advanced enough to meet the objectives of the Humanities Subareas C2 and Area 3B.

- ⇒ **Logic courses** are categorically excluded from Subarea C2. Such courses are designed primarily to develop students' reasoning skills, not their appreciation of "great works of the human imagination."
- ⇒ Depending on their dominant mode of inquiry, **history courses** may be categorized in Subarea C2 or Area 3B Humanities, Area D or Area 4 Social Sciences, or both.
- ⇒ Courses in **linguistics** may also be a close call between humanities and social science. In addition to reviewing the content of the course outline, such cases reviewers may refer to the department prefix (typically Anthropology or English) to suggest which mode of inquiry is dominant.
- ⇒ **Art history courses** are typically reviewed in Humanities, not as Art or any of the social sciences in Areas D or 4.

## Typical reviewer comments in Subareas C2 and 3B

- "Courses for native (heritage) speakers must emphasize culture and cultural readings in the language rather than a focus on grammar and written language skills exclusively."
- "This children's literature course appears to focus too heavily on how to select books for children and how to read them to children, rather than on learning and applying the techniques of literary analysis and criticism to literature written for children."
- "This course focuses on the development of students' creative writing skills and techniques rather than the critical analysis of literary genres."
- "Mass communication/mass media courses are not accepted in IGETC Area 3B."
- "The strong focus on skills and techniques precludes it from being accepted for Subarea C2."

#### CSU GE-Breadth Area D and IGETC Area 4

## Social, Political, and Economic Institutions & Behavior; History

## From the IGETC Standards 1.8

The pattern of coursework completed shall ensure opportunities for students to develop understanding of the perspectives and research methods of the social and behavioral sciences. Problems and issues in these areas should be examined in their contemporary, historical, and geographical settings. Students who have completed this requirement shall have been exposed to a pattern of coursework designed to help them gain an understanding and appreciation of the contributions and perspectives of men, women and of ethnic and other minorities and a comparative perspective on both Western and non-Western societies. The material should be presented from a theoretical point of view and focus on core concepts and methods of the discipline rather than on personal, practical, or applied aspects.

#### From CSU Executive Order 1100 Revised:

Students learn from courses in multiple Area D disciplines that human social, political and economic institutions and behavior are inextricably interwoven. Through fulfillment of the Area D requirement, students will develop an understanding of problems and issues from the respective disciplinary perspectives and will examine issues in their contemporary as well as historical settings and in a variety of cultural contexts. Students will explore the principles, methodologies, value systems and ethics employed in social scientific inquiry. Courses that emphasize skills development and professional preparation are excluded from Area D.

For this area, reviewers look in particular for evidence that:

- ⇒ students will learn how to practice social science, and not just understand what social scientists have concluded.
- ⇒ the course leads to a broad understanding of social science, and not just the discipline within it.
- ⇒ students are learning more than pre-professional skills. At the extreme, courses proposed for GE social science can look too much like training for careers in criminal justice or social work, with learning objectives different from those of GE.

## Special case:

**Research Methods**: A growing number of CCC propose courses like "Research Methods in Psychology" or "Research Methods in Sociology" to satisfy both GE transfer requirements in social science, and major requirements for AD-Ts. Reviewers have found that for such courses to meet GE criteria, the challenge is often to "rise above technique," to develop the student's analytical capacity and understanding of social science in ways that would be useful to any educated citizen and transferable to many walks of life in addition to those of professional social scientists. Such courses often cover disciplinary fundamentals in addition to statistical techniques, but unless the course outline says so explicitly, it's unlikely to be approved for Area 4 or D.

## Typical reviewer comments in Areas D and 4

"This course emphasizes the application of social scientific findings in an occupationally oriented context, rather than principles, theories, and methods of social science."

"Most of the course appears to be devoted to career-oriented preparation, rather than social scientific concepts, theories, and methods."

"This course appears to concentrate on the development of students' communication skills rather than on social scientific principles, theories, and research methods."

"The course outline does not make clear how sociological concepts, theories, and methodology underlie the examination of marriage and the family as social institutions."

## CSU GE Breadth Subareas B1-B3 and IGETC Area 5

## **Physical and Biological Sciences**

These areas of IGETC and CSU GE Breadth call for three kinds of coursework: physical science lecture, life science lecture, and a lab associated with a lecture.

#### From the IGETC Standards 1.8:

Courses [in physical and biological sciences] must emphasize experimental methodology, the testing of hypotheses, and the power of systematic questioning, rather than only the recall of facts. Courses that emphasize the interdependency of the sciences are especially appropriate for non-science majors.

The contemporary world is influenced by science and its applications, and many of the most difficult choices facing individuals and institutions concern the relationship of scientific and technological capability with human values and social goals. To function effectively in such a complex world, students must develop a comprehension of the basic concepts of physical and biological sciences, and a sophisticated understanding of science as a human endeavor, including the limitations as well as the power of scientific inquiry.

## From CSU Executive Order 1100 Revised:

In Subareas B1-B3, students develop knowledge of scientific theories, concepts, and data about both living and non-living systems. Students will achieve an understanding and appreciation of scientific principles and the scientific method, as well as the potential limits of scientific endeavors and the value systems and ethics associated with human inquiry. The nature and extent of laboratory experience is to be determined by each campus through its established curricular procedures.

Courses in these subareas of Areas B and 5 emphasize the perspectives, concepts, principles, theories, and methodologies of the scientific disciplines. Those that have built-in laboratory activity may also qualify for Area B3, so long as the course outline clearly distinguishes the laboratory activity from the lecture.

Some but not all course outlines submitted for these areas will refer to "the scientific method." Implicit inclusion of the scientific method is acceptable, especially for courses designed for students majoring in science. Area B/5 courses should enhance students' appreciation of how scientists do science, not just what scientists have concluded.

This distinction of learning not just the conclusions of scientists but also *how science is practiced* is the key to making review decisions in a few special cases:

⇒ Multi-disciplinary and interdisciplinary science courses. Some community colleges have designed courses to meet California's credentialing standards for

prospective elementary school teachers, who will need to know something about geology, astronomy, physics and chemistry. These "do-it-all" courses are usually acceptable, so long as they address science as a way of intellectual inquiry.

Organic chemistry courses may also strike reviewers as interdisciplinary, but are ordinarily categorized in B1/5A Physical Science, where the subject is frequently housed and taught.

- ⇒ **Physical anthropology courses.** Depending on the emphasis, a course in physical anthropology may belong with other biological sciences in Area B2.
- → Physical geography courses. These are almost always accepted in Subarea B1. (Other kinds of geography course are closer to the social sciences and are instead approved in Area D.)
- ⇒ **Lower-division major preparation courses.** These may work unless they are too narrow; the question is whether students will achieve the "science literacy" expected of educated citizens in any profession.
- ⇒ **Lab manuals.** Lab manuals are required, and must be explicitly listed on the COR, for all courses in IGETC Area 5C and CSU GE Breadth Subarea B3.

In defining "science literacy" for an educated populace, science faculty from across the CSU agreed to this definition and course-scoring rubric, which reviewers of community college courses may find helpful:

A student who achieves science literacy through a course that satisfies a general education science requirement must master literacy in understanding both:

- (a) science as the system of reasoning—the acquisition of testable knowledge of the physical world, including explanations of the phenomena and
- (b) the minimal foundational concepts and content of the science discipline(s) addressed by the course.

This rubric addresses "a":

Unacceptable	Minimally acceptable	Very Acceptable	Ideal
Item 13 only or item 13 plus omission of any items 1-7	Items 1-7, plus Item 13	Items 1-10 plus Item 13	Items 1-13

# Learning Outcomes for Science Literacy in Science as a Framework of Reasoning in an Introductory Course

- 1. Student can articulate in her/his own words a reasonable definition for what constitutes science.
- 2. Student can describe, using at least two specific examples, how science literacy is important in everyday life to an educated person.
- 3. Student can explain why the attribute of doubt has value in science.
- 4. Student can explain how scientists select which among several competing working hypotheses best explains a physical phenomenon.
- 5. Student can explain how "theory" as used and understood in science differs from "theory "as commonly used and understood by the general public.
- 6. Student can explain why peer review generally improves our quality of knowing within science.
- 7. Student can explain how science uses the method of reproducible experiments to understand and explain the physical world.
- 8. Student can name one assumption that underlies all science.
- 9. Student can provide two examples of science and two of technology and use these to explain a central concept by which one can distinguish between science and technology.
- 10. Student can cite a single major theory from one of the science disciplines and explain its historical development.
- 11. Student can explain and provide an example of modeling as used in science.
- 12. Student can explain why awareness of ethics becomes increasingly important to a society becoming increasingly advanced in science.
- 13.Student can meet the minimal learning outcomes specified by the discipline that address the major ideas, concepts and content of the science discipline. The arbiter of "specified by discipline" might range from locally at the scale of a department to internationally as specified by the larger profession.

## Typical reviewer comments in Subareas B1 and 5A and Subareas B2 and 5B

"This course emphasizes professional applications of chemistry rather than science as an investigative tool; it does not address sufficiently the principles, theories, and methodology of chemistry."

"Because the course emphasizes technical skills rather than the scientific principles and theories of physical or cultural geography, it is appropriate for neither Area 5A nor Area 4."

"Science courses should cover basic scientific principles and not just include memorization of facts or skills practice."

"The college is urged to revise the outline to distinguish clearly the laboratory activities from the content of the lectures."

## **Laboratory Activity (IGETC 5C and CSU GE Breadth Subarea B3)**

Courses meeting the requirements of this subarea must be associated with a lecture component, either built into the laboratory section itself or connected as a co-requisite or prerequisite. It is especially important for colleges to clearly delineate laboratory activity from the lecture: a list of topics to be covered in the lab sections is seldom enough to tell reviewers whether the activity warrants the additional lab approval. Reviewers rely in

particular on the choice of textbook, checking that it is appropriate for a course with lab activities.

⇒ **Lab manuals.** Lab manuals are required, and must be explicitly listed on the COR, for all courses in IGETC Area 5C and CSU GE Subarea B3. "Homegrown" lab manuals, created by CCC faculty, are also acceptable.

Stand-alone lab courses are designated B3 or 5C only, and *only* when associated with a lecture course as either a pre- or co-requisite.

## Typical reviewer comments in Subareas B3 and 5C

- "Lecture-and-Lab science outlines should distinguish lecture content from lab activity."
- "A lab manual is required for courses in this area and none is listed on the COR."
- "This laboratory course is acceptable in Area B3 only if the corresponding lecture is adopted as its pre- or co-requisite."

## **GE Breadth Area E (CSU only)**

## **Lifelong Learning and Self-Development**

Courses that meet the learning objectives of Area E draw on findings from the biological, behavioral, and social sciences to study humans from psychological, sociological, and physiological perspectives.

## From Executive Order 1100 Revised:

This requirement is designed to equip learners for lifelong understanding and development of themselves as integrated physiological, social, and psychological beings. Physical activity may be included, if it is an integral part of the study elements described herein.

Content may include topics such as student success strategies, human behavior, sexuality, nutrition, physical and mental health, stress management, information literacy, social relationships and relationships with the environment, as well as implications of death and dying or avenues for lifelong learning. Courses in this area shall focus on the development of skills, abilities and dispositions.

With the exception of courses in physical activity (detailed below), reviewers expect courses in Area E to include three kinds of inquiry:

- ⇒ **Sociological:** in this context, the relationships between an individual and broader society.
- ⇒ **Physiological:** the human body as an integrated organism with systemic functions such as movement, nutrition, growth, reproduction, and aging.

⇒ **Psychological:** the study of the mental processes that create consciousness, behavior, emotions, and intelligence.

Any single course should address all three – though not necessarily with equal emphasis. Submissions in this area fail when they focus on a single learning skill (e.g. library use, computer literacy, or first aid).

Second, any course submission should address all three areas for *more than a few years* of a human lifespan. The consideration doesn't need to extend from cradle to grave, but study should include more than early childhood or the octogenarian experience, in order to provide the breadth expected of general education.

Note: Courses in personal finance are no longer considered for CSU Area E. Personal finance courses that are currently approved for Area E will have their CSU Breadth GE status removed effective fall 2018. CCC may submit revised personal finance courses for Subarea B4 consideration during the 2017-2018 CSU GE Breadth/IGETC review period.

## **Physical Activity**

Physical activity courses (except for special-topics or directed studies courses) are acceptable in Area E.

However, students may not complete Area E using only physical activity courses. Participating institutions are asked to limit the number of physical-activity units they count when certifying a student for Area E.

(Note the wording: a CCC may offer a three-semester-unit class in badminton and qualify it for Area E; it just can't apply all three units to a student's Area E certification.)

## **Military Service**

CSU Executive Order 1036 encourages campuses to use evidence of military training to satisfy Area E for their students who enroll without a prior certification in GE. Typically, the evidence is the completion of basic training as listed on the veteran's discharge papers, Form DD-214. All CSU campuses have elected to honor CSU GE Breadth transfer certifications that clear Area E Lifelong Learning and Self-Development with a DD-214.

## There is no IGETC Counterpart to Area E.

Students using the IGETC pattern to meet their lower-division GE before transfer to the CSU are exempted from this systemwide requirement.

## Typical reviewer comments in Area E

- "Attention to the integration of physiological, psychological, and social considerations does not appear to be sufficient; most of the course appears to be devoted to library use."
- "Courses that teach specific job skills are not considered appropriate for Area E."
- "This course does not appear to integrate physiological, psychological, and sociological study to a sufficient extent to qualify for Area E."
- "Child development courses qualify for Area E only if they cover birth through adolescence."
- "Although there is some mention of "behavior" in the outline, the extent to which the course integrates psychological and socio-cultural considerations with its physiological content is not clear."
- "Although this course has some topics that draw clearly on findings and principles of psychology and sociology, it hardly touches on physiological (e.g., health) considerations and appears to be devoted to too great an extent to college-specific material and educational planning."

## **IGETC Standards Area 6A (UC only)**

## **Language Other Than English**

Courses approved for this area are deemed "proficiency," *i.e.*, equivalent to two years' high school foreign language. This means that language courses above this level could in theory have a strong enough cultural component to qualify under Subarea C2 in GE Breadth (or Area 3B in IGETC).

Some UC campuses and departments may require more than two years of language proficiency; students should check with the receiving campus to determine whether a course satisfying IGETC Area 6A will clear the entire requirement in a Language Other Than English.

## From the IGETC Standards 1.8:

Students transferring to the University of California are required to demonstrate competence (proficiency) in a language other than English equal to two years of high school study. Those students who have satisfied the UC freshman entrance requirement in a language other than English will have fulfilled this requirement. This requirement may also be satisfied by demonstration of equivalent proficiency prior to transfer.

Language courses should provide instruction in the written and oral language as well as history and cultural traditions of the country associated with the language studied. Languages other than English for Native Speakers are appropriate for transfer. Courses primarily conversational must have as a prerequisite a course equivalent to the third year of high school study or one year of college level in the language. Also, the content of conversation courses should not be primarily business or travel-oriented.

## **CSU "American Institutions" (CSU only)**

## **U.S History, Constitution, and American Ideals**

The CSU's graduation requirements in American Institutions are established in Executive Order 1061, separately from the areas of CSU GE Breadth. EO 1061 implements Title 5 Section 40404 of California's Code of Regulations, which calls for study in three areas:

- 1. The historical development of American institutions and ideals (Area US-1),
- 2. The Constitution of the United States and the operation of representative democratic government under that Constitution (Area US-2), and
- 3. The process of California state and local government (Area US-3).

While EO 1036 does not set a unit or course minimum for these areas, it's unusual for a single course to adequately address all three. Instead, participating CCC submit a sequence of courses – typically including courses from their history and/or political science departments – that together meet the graduation requirement in American Institutions.

Following the Executive Order, reviewers use these criteria for each of the three areas:

## **Area US-1: American History**

Students are expected to learn significant events from U.S. history, as follows:

- ⇒ covering a minimum time span of approximately one hundred years
- ⇒ occurring in the entire area now included in the United States of America
- ⇒ including the relationships of regions within that area and with external regions and powers
- ⇒ the role of major ethnic and social groups
- ⇒ the "continuity of the American experience" (i.e., not a string of isolated events) and its derivation from others cultures, including study of politics, economics, social movements, and/or geography (at least three of the four)

## **Area US-2: The U.S. Constitution**

Course outlines should reflect content that teaches:

- ⇒ the political philosophies of the framers of the Constitution
- ⇒ the operation of United States political process and institutions under the U.S. Constitution
- ⇒ the rights and obligations of individual citizens in the political system established under the Constitution

## **Area US-3: California State and Local Government**

Courses in this area will address:

- ⇒ the Constitution of the State of California
- ⇒ the nature and processes of California state and local government

⇒ the relationships between the U.S government and California's state and local governments

Notice that these criteria are extremely detailed. Good courses are often turned down, as reviewers have to consider not only their quality but also how closely they meet these exact criteria, as set by administrative law and CSU policy.

## Typical reviewer comments in American Institutions

- "The outlines will have to be revised to include considerably more information about the courses' coverage of the U.S. and California state constitutions and the nature and processes of the federal, state, and local governments."
- "The course content section of the outline does not address the political philosophies of the framers of the U.S. Constitution or the Constitution of the State of California"
- "The course content appears to focus largely on the American Southwest, not the entire area now comprising the U.S."
- "This course covers a time span of 62 years, which is considerably less than the 100-year time span that is expected of courses meeting the historical elements of the requirement."
- "This course in the history of Armenian Americans is too narrowly focused on a single population to qualify for US-1."

## **ELECTRONIC BIBLIOGRAPHY**

These notes are available online at <u>calstate.edu</u>.

The documents cited in these Guiding Notes are those in effect as of October 2017. Readers are encouraged to refer to online sources, as these references are often revised or superseded.

## CSU General Education Breadth, IGETC, and American Institutions

- ⇒ IGETC Standards 1.8
- ⇒ CSU Executive Order 1100 Revised (August 23, 2017): CSU General Education Breadth
- ⇒ CSU Executive Order 1061: American Institutions

## **Courses and Articulation in California**

- ⇒ ASSIST
- ⇒ Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID)
- ⇒ Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs)
- ⇒ College Catalogs
- ⇒ California Community Colleges and Districts

## Transferability of Baccalaureate-Level Coursework

- ⇒ CSU Executive Order 167: Transfer of Credit
- ⇒ Working Definition of Baccalaureate Credit (Faculty Senate Resolution of 1987)

## Quantitative Reasoning Task Force

The Quantitative Reasoning Task Force's [QRTF] September 2016 Report was approved in toto by the Academic Senate of the CSU, was strongly supported by our colleagues in the California Community Colleges and was accepted enthusiastically by a variety of stakeholders in California and nationally. Over the last few months however, specifically since the issuance of EO 1100 [revised] and EO 1110, the Report has been repeatedly mentioned as the source of and legitimation for a number of mandated changes to General Education in the CSU and to developmental instruction in quantitative reasoning. As co-chairs of the QRTF and drafting members of its written Report, we seek to provide some context for the recommendations in the Report and to correct some disturbing misapplications of those recommendations. In some cases, these misapplications attempt to separate the problem statement of the Report from the solutions recommended, and in others they isolate one recommendation from another. However, the recommendations of the QRTF are interdependent and as a group they are entwined with the problem they attempt to solve. Separating and isolating elements of the Report, as the recent executive orders and their justifications do, creates a quantitative reasoning regime that is weakly defined within a complex, intersegmental environment that cries for guiding principles. Over time, we risk limiting access within the CSU by tracking students away from many majors and creating transfer confusion between ourselves and our sister segments. By being careful now, we we would protect the value of the CSU degree and the opportunities it affords its graduates. By balancing access and opportunity, we achieve educational equity.

To give the Report its context and to point out the risk, we provide here a brief summary of its findings. and then reflect on how they relate to EO1100 (revised) and 1110.

#### **QRTF Report Recommendations:**

The QRTF was called into existence to address inequities surrounding the existing CSU practice of requiring Intermediate Algebra as a prerequisite for any general education (transferrable) quantitative reasoning/math course. These inequities were particularly pronounced for students who transferred into the CSU from the California Community Colleges where students were languishing in long sequences of remedial math classes. The issue was a topic of active and heated discussion in the CSU and in the press starting around 2009 when The Carnegie Foundation's solution to the problem, Statway, first started taking hold in California. It was the subject of a 2015 report to GEAC by the CSU Math Council, it was addressed in Berkeley's 2015 Conference on Developmental Math, and it was summarized in Pamela Burdman's 2015 series of reports "Degrees of Freedom". Therefore, any claim that the CSU was unaware of this issue until after the QRTF Report is ill-informed.

The QRTF's identification of the inequities caused by the universal Intermediate Algebra threshold informed the Task Force's first recommendation – A definition of Quantitative Reasoning (QR) that was based on students' quantitative needs in their majors, careers and interests. Creating such a definition is a necessary prerequisite to any intelligent conversation about QR, most especially conversations across organizational boundaries (e.g., talking with our K-12 colleagues about QR instruction, talking with our CCC colleagues about appropriate courses, or talking with employers about desired skillsets).

The second recommendation is at the heart of the debate about access and equity in the CSU, and proposes revision of QR requirements in the CSU. The QRTF took the position that QR is more than just a single required course. The Task Force recommended ending the use of prerequisite coursework as a metric for determining QR

## Quantitative Reasoning Task Force

competency. Rather, the Task Force chose to define separate requirements for foundational (aka entry level) QR and baccalaureate level (aka exit level) QR. The Task Force concluded that those definitions should be framed in the language of the California Common Core State Standards in pursuit of ensuring that requirements are communicated effectively to our colleagues in K-12 and higher education as well as the public. Put succinctly, the new foundational threshold would ask students to master the K-9 math skills, by practicing them in the full K-12 standards, and to demonstrate proficiency with Common Core's nine basic mathematical practices. Upon exit, the baccalaureate threshold would ask students to build upon foundational skills to be lifelong learners who are proficient in the QR skills and practices needed in their majors, interests, and careers. This new perspective on GE QR asks for more than one course taken at the start of their studies, and it challenges the CSU to see QR as an integrated part of the GE curriculum taught across disciplines and over the course of a 4 year degree. In that case QR is one building block of GE and thus necessitates that foundational QR be more than just a narrow preparation for one B4 course.

The third recommendation addresses the issues of access and opportunity in the CSU. An important part of this recommendation is that CSU review and revise policies to ensure that those policies provide transfer and developmental math students with increased access to QR courses that can open opportunities in students' majors, interests, careers and civic lives. In pursuit of maximizing students' abilities to engage in and make use of QR, the Task Force recommended that CSU require four years of QR coursework in high school. Another part of this recommendation is that students engage in QR coursework in a timely fashion rather than leaving it to the last semester and delaying graduation. Finally, in this section the Task Force recommends that CSU remove the universal Intermediate Algebra prerequisite.

The fourth and final recommendation was that the CSU should create a campus-based Center for the Advancement of Instruction in Quantitative Reasoning to support high quality instruction in high schools, community colleges, and public universities. The Task Force explicitly noted that this Center needs to be a locus of intersegmental conversation among faculty, holding true to the principle that those actually doing the instruction must be involved in the conversations, which is much more effective and results in better outcomes than providing yet another venue for administrators to pontificate on what techniques teachers should be using. This principle led to the Task Force's assumption that faculty would be integrally involved in the leadership of the Center, but such is not currently the case.

## The interface of the QRTF Report on EOs 1100 (revised) and 1110.

Again, we want to emphasize that the QRTF recommendations address complex and interrelated aspects of QR education that impact every student in the CSU and may well have an impact on every student in California. The CSU Chancellor's Office attempt to implement only selected aspects of the recommendations will not provide the access or equity we seek.

For example, eliminating the use of prerequisite coursework as a mechanism for ensuring appropriate QR preparation was indeed one of the QRTF recommendations. However, doing so without defining what QR competencies CSU does require (at both the foundational and baccalaureate levels) leaves CSU faculty, our colleagues in the other segments, and our students without guidance as to what is intended. For instance, there is no explicit definition or guiding principles for what B4 should or should not require for entry into or successful completion of a B4 course. The argument that other areas of B4 do not have such guiding principles is no excuse.

## Quantitative Reasoning Task Force

QR is peculiar in two respects: first, that the content taught in high school and college overlaps in important ways, and second that overlap (and the boundaries between) has for decades been a source of controversy. These circumstances create a disconnect which for students becomes a trap.

An example of the misapplications and attempts to separate the *problem statement* of the Report from the *solutions recommended*, can be found in EVC Blanchard's missive to ASCSU Chair Miller dated October 9, 2017. Blanchard notes that EO 1100 [revised] responds to inequities caused by the required Intermediate Algebra prerequisite for GE Subarea B4. Quoting the QRTF report, he notes that the prerequisite is not applied uniformly in practice [something the CSU CO was aware of well before the QRTF Report]. However, Blanchard casts the QRTF report recommendations that propose a thoughtful solution for that problem as beyond the scope of general education. In the case of Foundational QR, he calls it an admissions requirement, whereas the QRTF report defines it as a college readiness requirement, something that currently the CO is trying to measure using multiple methods without defining. He calls Baccalaureate QR a graduation requirement, whereas it is clearly described in the QRTF Report as part of lower division and upper division general education.

Further, Blanchard's 9 October letter demonstrates a misreading of the QRTF recommendations concerning foundational and baccalaureate QR proficiencies. He suggests that faculty governance precludes defining foundational and baccalaureate definitions or guiding principles. We agree that the campuses should have autonomy in creating standards that realize QR on their campuses, but that is not inconsistent with guiding principles vetted by the faculty as are the QRTF recommendations. In the absence of such principles consistency in GE [one of EO 1100 [revised]'s stated goals] will be very difficult. It is easy to see transfer problems arising when one campus takes a much more liberal view on QR than another.

A final troubling example from Blanchard's memo is his explanation that EO 167 prevents CSU from imposing Foundational QR on the CCCs. The CO has changed [revised] EO 1100; hence, it seems we could also work to change EO 167. It may well require consultation with the CCCs, but that is desirable, and in fact the QRTF proved that such consultation is possible at the faculty level.

Beyond the Blanchard memo there are other examples of the CO separating and isolating the QRTF findings. In particular, the CSU CO has established, in direct conflict with QRTF recommendations, a CO-located, administration-heavy Center for Improvement of Instruction in QR, which lives under the K-12 outreach arm of the CO's office. It appears the only portion of the QRTF recommendation that the CO followed was in naming the Center. Sadly, absent definition of QR requirements, absent that conversation among practitioners proposed by the QRTF, absent a strong connection between the Center and campuses, the Center as established by the CO will not be an effective means of engaging in the conversations with K-12 and CCC faculty that would enable a successful change in our approach to QR.

Speaking on behalf of the QRTF, we ask that CSU administration cease misrepresenting the intent and the content of the QRTF Report and its recommendations. In particular, we ask that the CO stop implying that they are implementing what the QRTF envisioned. The "we'll pick which recommendations to consider implementing" approach ignores the reality that the complexity of the challenges presented by implementing a quantitative reasoning regime in the CSU necessitate solutions that are themselves complex and interconnected. Selectively implementing some of the recommendations while ignoring others follows a path leading from viable solutions and toward further, and possibly more intractable, problems.

## Quantitative Reasoning Task Force

Access and equity are laudable goals, goals shared by the QRTF. However, the partial implementation of recommendations advanced by the CO does not acknowledge that the access provided under the CO proposals is illusory and risks preventing students from acquiring the skills and competencies needed for a variety of the professions and careers that act as entry points to the middle class.

Co-Chairs, CSU Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Steven Filling Katherine Stevenson

Members of the Report Drafting Subcommittee David Barsky Bill Eadie Denise Fleming Catherine Nelson Mark Van Selst Mark Wheeler

## **Executive Committee Agenda Item**

SUBJECT: Fall Plenary Session Final Planning		Month: November Year: 2017	
		Item No: V. E.	
		Attachment: <b>NO</b>	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will discuss the final	Urgent: NO	
	planning for fall plenary session.	Time Requested: 30 minutes	
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Julie Bruno	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action	
		Discussion X	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

## **BACKGROUND:**

The Executive Committee will discuss the final planning for the Fall Plenary Session beginning on Thursday and cover important notifications or pertinent information regarding the event. New members will be informed about the process and protocol regarding participating in plenary session.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.



## **Executive Committee Agenda Item**

SUBJECT: IEPI P3 Workgroup Update		Month: November	Year: 2017
		Item No: V. F.	
		Attachment: NO	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	To understand the change in focus of P3 and	Urgent: NO	
	which policies or system-wide practices may be	Time Requested: 20	min
	re-examined for possible statutory changes.		
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CON	ISIDERATION:
REQUESTED BY:	Rebecca Eikey	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action	
		Discussion	Х

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

In the past, the Policy, Procedures, and Practice (P3) Workgroup for IEPI had a broad agenda and the activities included (among other things) overseeing IEPI communication strategies and the development of the applied solutions kits (ASKs). However, going forward, P3 will focus on policy more specifically, and work to identify, review, and prioritize the revision of policies and system-wide practices that impact student success. Many of the other functions will be moved to the IEPI executive committee or to the other workgroups, as appropriate.

At the October 27<sup>th</sup> meeting of P3, the topic of "Delivery of Financial Aid to reflect Total Cost of Attendance" is to be discussed. This topic is identified as an area of interest because the "Board of Governors recently indicated this as a policy priority in line with Community College Student Success and the Strategic Vision."

An update on the change in focus for P3 as well as the topic above will be discussed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

## **Executive Committee Agenda Item**

SUBJECT: CTE C-ID and Model Curriculum Workgroup		Month: November	Year: 2017
		Item No: V. G.	
		Attachment: YES	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will be updated on	Urgent: NO	
	the changes to the C-ID Model Curriculum	Time Requested: 20	minutes
	Workgroup in terms of CTE		
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Lorraine Slattery-Farrell	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Ashley Fisher	Action	
		Discussion	Х

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The CTE C-ID process since its inception has attempted to replicate the non-CTE C-ID process by having faculty develop course descriptors that can be applied to common courses across the state. Due to a number of factors the process has been slow in providing the CTE field with a robust portfolio of courses and only a handful of certificates have been developed to date.

The Executive Committee will discuss.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Staff will review your item and provide additional resources to inform the Executive Committee discussion.

# Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID)



# Statewide C-ID CTE Framework Process Steps to Implementation

The Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) CTE Framework Process identifies key disciplines and programs that would benefit from a streamlined pathway for California community college students entering the workforce. The pathway provides a framework of core competencies and skills the student needs to be successful upon completion.

This integrated statewide effort is a collaboration between discipline faculty, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Regional Consortia Chairs, and Sector Navigators. The framework process outlines the key steps to implementation once a program or discipline is identified.





Once a discipline is identified to be part of the process, C-ID's discipline faculty will come together at a meeting to work on identifying core competencies and program learning outcomes (PLOs) for the discipline.

Input from industry partners are provided to faculty via the regional consortia and Sector Navigator

After the meeting, faculty are selected to serve on the statewide faculty review group that will complete the work on the certificate. Simultaneously, Sector Navigators will fold in industry partners to review the competencies and PLOs and provide feedback.





The review group will take the feedback and revise the certificate as needed. A statewide vetting of the certificate will take place. Once the vetting process is complete, the certificate will be reviewed and finalized.

Work on descriptors for the framework certificate may begin once the certificate is completed and finalized.





C-ID will work with colleges on implementing the framework at their institution. Colleges will complete a self-assessment of the comparability of their program against the framework model which will then be reviewed by C-ID Reviewers. Faculty are encouraged to complete the framework assessment in conjunction with their program review.

The C-ID website will reflect all colleges that have agreed to the framework certificate and will be the repository for courses that are approved for C-ID.

C-ID will work with the discipline faculty to determine the modification process for the framework.





LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

#### **Accreditation Committee**

August 17, 2017 8:15 am

(update phone call at 4:00 pm for those unable to make 8:15 call)

## **CCC Confer**

Dial your telephone conference line: 1-913-312-3202\*
Presenter Passcode: 6874826 (at 4:00 pm: 3624084)

Participant Passcode: 484885 (at 4:00 pm: 802556)

\*Toll free number available: 1-888-886-3951

## **MINUTES**

Members Present: Ginni May (chair), John Freitas, Misty Burruel, Christy Karau

Members Absent: Debbie Laffranchini, Deborah Wulff, Irat Gat

#### **Guests:**

- 1. Select note taker— John Freitas.
- 2. Approval of Agenda approved
- 3. Approval of minutes no minutes to approve
- 4. Overview of Accreditation Committee and expectations of committee work this year The Committee Charge is as follows:

The Accreditation Committee advises the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the faculty regarding accreditation and continuous quality improvement. The committee identifies and disseminates knowledge and information regarding faculty roles and effective practices in conducting comprehensive college-wide assessment, meeting and documenting accountability standards, self-evaluation methods and reports, attaining and maintaining accreditation status, and in supporting faculty as they reflect on outcomes and set goals for improvement. The committee receives input from, and collaborates with, pertinent outside groups including regional accreditors and federal agencies, their policies, and processes. Under the direction of the president, designated committee assist faculty and local academic senates with matters related to accreditation and institutional evaluation. The committee also plans the annual Accreditation Institute that offers professional development on accreditation issues, policies, and effective practices.

More information about the committee can be found at http://asccc.org/directory/accreditation-committee-0.

The committee charge was noted and members were encouraged to review it and the committee web page. Ginni stated that she planned to have at least one phone meeting per month, but no more than two meetings per month, leading up to the institute. Committee members will either be breakout presenters or breakout facilitators. Ginni also noted the resolutions assigned to the committee (see bottom of agenda) and asked that committee members review them before the September 16 meeting. Ideas for addressing the resolutions will be discussed at that meeting.

The Accreditation Committee will work with the Curriculum Committee on an SLO paper via a special task force. Committee members may volunteer for it.

Accreditation Institute:

February 23-24, 2018 (Pre-session February 22), Wyndam Anaheim, Garden Grove http://asccc.org/events/2018-02-23-160000-2018-02-24-230000/2018-accreditation-institute

The committee's responsibility for planning the Accreditation Institute was noted and the membership was informed that the cost of committee member attendance is covered by the ASCCC. It is expected that the AI program should be developed by the end of September.

The pre-session was briefly described. There will be a training for faculty on visiting teams, and training for ALOs. The limit for the faculty session is 60.

Ideas for institute strands/breakout sessions:

- Other types of accreditation (programmatic accreditors, WASC schools and noncredit, relationship of programmatic accreditation and senate engagement).
- The Four Standards
- Changes on the Horizon/What does the future hold?
- Multi-college districts
- Quality Focus Essay and faculty role, relation to institutional planning, sustaining the momentum of the QFE

If there are any other ideas, send them to Ginni.

5. Breakout Topics for Fall Plenary Session

Breakout topic ideas are due by August 21. Please send ideas for topics to Ginni before then.

6. Resolution Ideas for Fall Plenary Session

Pre-session resolutions are due by September 12. Please send ideas to Ginni before then.

7. Upcoming Events (http://asccc.org/calendar/list/events)

Area Meetings: October 13-14, 2017

Fall Plenary Session: November 2-4, 2017, Irvine Marriott

Upcoming events were announced. For additional information go to http://asccc.org/calendar/list/events.

8. Future Meetings

September 16, 2017 – Chaffey College, 11:30-3:45 (http://asccc.org/resources/forms)

Ginni noted the flight times to and from Sacramento. The meeting will include a working lunch. A lunch menu will be sent out and committee members to send in lunch selections to Misty by September 14 at 12:00.

9. Adjourn – adjourned at 9:07 am.

## **Status of Previous Action Items**

**A. In Progress** (include details about pending items such as resolutions, papers, *Rostrums*, etc.)

## **ASCCC Resolutions**

S15 2.01 Disaggregation of Learning Outcomes Data

Research has been completed and presented at the ACCJC Conference in April 2017 and Spring 2017 Plenary Session. An annotated bibliography was provided to the Academic Senate and the ASCCC Foundation as part of the SLO Disaggregation project funded by the Foundation. 2017 - 18: The Committee will discuss next steps for the use of the research information.

- S15 2.02 ACCJC Written Reports to Colleges on Sanction
  - 2017 18: The committee to consider how best to respond to this resolution.
- F16 2.01 Local Recruitment and Nomination Processes for Accreditation Teams

2017 - 18: The committee chair to discuss with the president how best to accomplish this resolution.

Update to the Existing SLO Terminology Glossary and Creation of a Paper on Student Learning Outcomes

2017 - 18: The Chairs of the Curriculum and the Accreditation Committees will identify committee members to sit on a task force to accomplish this resolution.

## Papers/Rostrums

- S17 9.01
- **B.** Completed (include a list of those items that have been completed as a way to build the end of year report).



LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

## **Accreditation Committee**

September 16, 2017 11:30 am – 3:45 pm

## **Chaffey College**

5885 Haven Avenue, Rancho Cucamonga

#### **AGENDA**

Members Present: John Freitas, Christy Karau, and Misty Burruel Members Present (teleconference): Ginni May, Deborah Wulff, Debbie Laffranchini, Stephanie Droker (ex-officio)

Members Absent: Irit Gat

#### **Guests:**

- 1. Note taker—Misty will send minutes to the committee for review.
- **2.** Approval of Agenda Approved by phone
- **3.** Approval of minutes Review minutes and send Ginni any corrections by Monday, September 18 at 4pm.
- 4. Accreditation Institute: February 23-24, 2018 (Pre-session February 22), Wyndam Anaheim, Garden Grove
  - a. Committee Role Members must attend the Accreditation Institute. Either Committee Members or Executive Committee Members will serve as leads at the breakouts. While Accreditation Committee members are not expected to serve during the pre-session, they are encouraged to attend. Ginni will send an email of what needs to be done and introduce presenters and leads; leads will work with presenters to ensure presenters are ready. The Accreditation Committee will meet the night of the pre-session to prepare for the Institute. Committee members are encouraged to think of presenters and should refer to the ASCCC office to seek candidates.
  - **b. Faculty New Evaluator Training** February 22 (10-4)
    - a. Not all 60 faculty will be guaranteed to serve on accreditation teams post training. Service on an accreditation team is pending CEO approval.
  - **c.** New Accreditation Liaison Officer Training February 22 (10-4) (Not all ALOs are faculty)
  - **d.** Theme The committee discussed the Accreditation Institute theme and that it should be related to the Fall Plenary Session theme, "change". Possible themes include:
    - a. "Keeping Up With the Pace of Change"
    - b. "Down the Rabbit Hole"

## e. Goals of the Accreditation Institute -

- a. Basic information on the accreditation process
- b. Practical information / applications that are used locally Share effective practices
- c. Empower and energize participants to take ownership of accreditation to continuously improve their colleges. Identify existing infrastructure that supports and sustains ongoing evaluation.

## f. General Sessions:

- a. Welcome by Ginni May, President/Vice President
- b. History of Accreditation in the United States (Richard Winn)
- c. Accreditation: Words from Compton College (The Compton College Story)

## g. Strands:

## a. The Standards (Basic information)

- i. Update on the standards
- ii. Involve ACCJC representatives, particularly since ACCJC is not holding their own conference

## b. Accreditation In Addition to ACCJC

- i. O&A with Richard Winn
- ii. **Updates on Workgroup 1 and 2**: perhaps a General Session with breakout follow-up. Other Regional Accreditors and Recognition by NACIQI, Workgroup 2 status updates. Looking at other accrediting bodies and the requirements on colleges. WASC Schools (ACS) / WASC Senior (ACSCU) and the ACCJC look at how they all interrelate; this breakout could also explore NACIQI with a Workgroup 1 and 2 status update. Taskforce explored moving away from ACCJC. One thought would be to tie this particular breakout with the efforts of the workgroup.
  - 1. Program accreditors Accreditation requirements on colleges besides ACCJC
  - 2. How is this reflected in our educational plans, aside from checking the box according to the standard?
  - 3. Deborah Wulff will bring it up with the CIOs to see who actually demonstrates a crosswalk of the accreditation standards to the college's educational goals.
- iii. **Programmatic Accreditation for Career Education** linkage/alignment to the broader college planning and accreditation processes. Engage CTE faculty and have them join the institute and learn how they work through their programmatic accreditation process; this could also include noncredit programs. The Accreditation Committee was asked to cover Career Education at the Accreditation Institute.
- iv. **Accrediting Noncredit Programs** The Accreditation Committee was asked to cover noncredit at the Accreditation Institute.

#### c. Effective Practices

- i. **The Quality Focus Essay** faculty role, relationship to planning, and sustaining momentum
- ii. **Reviewer Team Guidance on I.B.6** (ACCJC) rubrics, disaggregation of data, and equity
- iii. Multi-college districts
- iv. Distance Education and USDE Requirements (?)

## d. The Accreditation Process - Applied

- i. Writing the ISER
- ii. Gearing up for and getting through "the visit" Understanding your visiting team
- iii. Faculty Leadership in the Accreditation Process fleshing out the 10+1
- iv. Other Requirements besides the ISER

## e. Overlap and other Ideas

- i. In the Meantime...follow-up visits, midterm reports, reporting substantive changes in programs, etc.
- ii. What's New in Substantive Change!
- iii. eLumen Sponsor's Breakout
- iv. Being An Accreditation Co-chair
- v. Accreditation As An Ongoing Practice linkage to existing college
- h. Breakout Topics: Draft titles, descriptions
- i. Draft Program:
  - a. Pre-session Accreditation Institute Planning Draft
    - i. October 13 Second reading by Executive Team (committee will need a teleconference meeting prior to October 13)
    - ii. December Finalize program draft in time for the Executive Team meeting in December

## 5. Plan for Addressing Current Resolutions

- a. Disaggregation of Learning Outcomes Data Research was presented at the ACCJC 2017 Partners in Excellence Conference. Committee will hold off on I.B.6 until we here back from ACCJC in January 2018. There could be a Rostrum to give an update on Disaggregation of Learning Outcomes Training, 2.01.
- b. ACCJC Written Reports to Colleges on Sanction Workgroups 1 and 2 have been involved in recommending changes to these reports, resulting in many changes to date. It was recommended to have a breakout session at the Accreditation Institute that is an Update on Workgroups 1 and 2.
- c. Local Recruitment and Nomination Processes for Accreditation Teams This may be part of the pre-session at the Accreditation Institute and result in a Rostrum article.
- d. Update to the Existing SLO Terminology Glossary and Creation of a Paper on Student Learning Outcomes Christy Karau volunteered to serve on the Taskforce that will be charged with updating the SLO Terminology Glossary A Resource for Local Senates. There may be a second volunteer from Chaffey College who is the faculty lead for Outcomes and Assessment. Misty will provide Ginni the name and contact of this faculty member.

## 6. Resolutions for Fall Plenary Session

- a. Nothing to report
- 7. Breakout at Fall Plenary: Title, Description, presenters
  - a. Accreditation News, Accreditation Ginni will lead a breakout and Misty assist.
- **8.** Upcoming Events (http://asccc.org/calendar/list/events)
  - Area Meetings: October 13/14, 2017
  - Fall Plenary Session: November 2-4, 2017, Irvine Marriott

- o Ginni May and Misty Burruel will be at the Fall Plenary
- 9. Future Meetings
  - a. **Teleconference meetings:** 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesdays at 4pm. (Ginni will send invites)
  - b. Face-to-Face Meeting: November 18, LA City College
- **10. Other**: Look for invitation from Ginni for the teleconference meetings. The committee's next face-to-face-meeting will occur in November.
- **11. Adjourn** 2:48pm

#### **Status of Previous Action Items**

**A. In Progress** (include details about pending items such as resolutions, papers, *Rostrums*, etc.)

## **ASCCC Resolutions**

S15 2.01 Disaggregation of Learning Outcomes Data

Research has been completed and presented at the ACCJC Conference in April 2017 and Spring 2017 Plenary Session. An annotated bibliography was provided to the Academic Senate and the ASCCC Foundation as part of the SLO Disaggregation project funded by the Foundation. 2017 - 18: The Committee will discuss next steps for the use of the research information.

- S15 2.02 ACCJC Written Reports to Colleges on Sanction
  - 2017 18: The committee to consider how best to respond to this resolution.
- F16 2.01 Local Recruitment and Nomination Processes for Accreditation Teams

2017 - 18: The committee chair to discuss with the president how best to accomplish this resolution.

Update to the Existing SLO Terminology Glossary and Creation of a Paper on Student Learning Outcomes

2017 - 18: The Chairs of the Curriculum and the Accreditation Committees will identify committee members to sit on a task force to accomplish this resolution.

## Papers/Rostrums

- S17 9.01
- **B.** Completed (include a list of those items that have been completed as a way to build the end of year report).



LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

## **Accreditation Committee**

October 10, 2017 4:00 pm – 5:00 pm CCC Confer

Dial your telephone conference line: 1-913-312-3202\*

Presenter Passcode: 7086549 **Participant Passcode: 997590** 

\*Toll free number available: 1-888-886-3951

#### **AGENDA**

Members Present: Ginni May, John Freitas, Christy Karau-Magnani, Misty Burruel, Deborah Wulff

**Members Absent**: Deborah Laffranchini, Irit Gat, Steven Reynolds

#### **Guests:**

1. Select note taker— Misty Burruel

2. Approval of Agenda – approved by consensus

- 3. Approval of minutes done by email
- 4. Announcements:

#### a. ACCJC Webinar:

We invite you to participate in a 50-minute webinar including a brief report by Dr. Richard Winn, President of the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), on some of the recent changes in practice to meet the ACCJC's short-term goals in areas of educational programming and communications. He will also describe the shift toward an emerging and new long-term direction to achieve the ACCJC mission.

The webinar is hosted by Dr. Sonya Christian, Chair of the ACCJC Evaluation and Planning Committee. The session is intended as an opportunity for the ACCJC to listen to your initial thoughts that will help shape our work to effectively support our member institutions to advance educational quality, and student learning and achievement. Your participation is critical to our success.

The webinar will take place on the following two dates and should be recorded:

\*Monday, October 23, 11am-12noon

-Accreditation Committee Attendees: Ginni May and John Freitas

- \*Wednesday, November 1, 3-4pm
- -Accreditation Committee Attendees: Deborah Wolfe and Misty Burruel Link to Join: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/5087534230
- 5. Fall Plenary Session Breakout A description has been written and approved. ACCJC Webinar content may augment the Fall Plenary breakout PowerPoint.
- 6. Accreditation Institute the next program draft is due October 13<sup>th</sup>
  - Ginni has crafted an introduction for the Accreditation Institute
  - 100-150 attendees anticipated at the 2018 Accreditation Institute
  - Pre-session: New Evaluator Training for Faculty
    - o Pre-session training supports those faculty wanting to serve on an accreditation team
    - o ACCJC established the 60 faculty maximum
    - Committee discussed limiting registration to those attending the Accreditation Institute and then open up registration for those who only want to attend the "New Evaluator Training for Faculty"
    - Need to talk to ACCJC and the ASCCC President regarding limitations or restrictions and attendees ability to register for the pre-session and need to make the process as equitable as possible
  - New Accreditation Liaison Officer Training
    - o There are similar concerns regarding registration limitations and/or restrictions

#### General Session 2

- -History of Regional Accreditation in the United States
  - Executive Committee recommended a panel discussion
  - Accreditation Committee will explore paring Richard Wynn with Constance Carrol, Cindy Miles, or Rich Hanson; committee decided to limit the panel to two.

#### **General Session**

- -Compton College Story
  - Pending approval and agreement by Compton College
  - a. Theme "Change"
  - b. Goals/Outcomes Ginni will tweak the language for the goals and send to the committee
    - 1. Provide basic information on accreditation
    - 2. Provide information on effective practices in accreditation
    - 3. Empower and energize participants to take ownership of accreditation to...
      - a) Continuously improve their colleges, and
      - b) Identify existing infrastructure that supports and sustains ongoing evaluation
    - 4. "Provide a picture of accreditation" was removed from the goals
  - c. Strands (Four Strands: The Standards, ACCJC Accreditation and More..., Effective Accreditation Practices, and Accreditation in Practice)
    - 1. The Standards (Guided Pathways will be embedded across multiple standards (e.g. II, IV, etc.)
      - a) Overview of the Standards and Components of Guided Pathways

- 2. ACCJC Accreditation and More
  - a) Follow-up to History of Accreditation in the United States (Q&A with Richard Wynn and ?)
  - b) Workgroups 1 and 2: History and Update (Incorporate AFT Settlements)
  - c) Ginni will write up a draft of the titles and send to the committee later tomorrow (October 11, 2017)
  - d) Committee is interested in looking at disaggregated data and SLOs; an alternate breakout may be considered to address this area.
- d. Breakout Titles The Next Accreditation Institute Program Draft must be completed by October 13<sup>th</sup>
  - 1. Need the theme, goals/outcomes, strands by October 13<sup>th</sup>
- 7. Upcoming Events (http://asccc.org/calendar/list/events)

Area Meetings: October 13-14, 2017

Fall Plenary Session: November 2-4, 2017, Irvine Marriott

8. Future Meetings

November 14, 2017, 4:00 pm, CCC Confer

November 18, 2017, 9:30 am – 2:30 pm, Los Angeles City College

November 28, 2017, 4:00 pm, CCC Confer

December 12, 2017, 4:00 pm, CCC Confer

9. Adjourn

#### **Status of Previous Action Items**

**A. In Progress** (include details about pending items such as resolutions, papers, *Rostrums*, etc.)

#### **ASCCC Resolutions**

S15 2.01 Disaggregation of Learning Outcomes Data

Research has been completed and presented at the ACCJC Conference in April 2017 and Spring 2017 Plenary Session. An annotated bibliography was provided to the Academic Senate and the ASCCC Foundation as part of the SLO Disaggregation project funded by the Foundation. 2017 - 18: Research was presented at the ACCJC 2017 Partners in Excellence Conference. Committee will hold off on I.B.6 until we here back from ACCJC in January 2018. There could be a Rostrum to give an update on Disaggregation of Learning Outcomes Training, 2.01.

S15 2.02 ACCJC Written Reports to Colleges on Sanction

2017 - 18: The CCCCO Workgroups 1 and 2 have been involved in recommending many changes. An update will be presented at the Accreditation Institute.

F16 2.01 Local Recruitment and Nomination Processes for Accreditation Teams

2017 - 18: There will be a New Evaluator Training for Faculty at the Accreditation Institute Pre-session. In addition, a Rostrum article will be written to address the processes following the Accreditation Institute.

# Update to the Existing SLO Terminology Glossary and Creation of a Paper on Student Learning Outcomes

2017 - 18: The Chairs of the Curriculum and the Accreditation Committees are in the process of identifying committee members to serve on a task force to update the SLO Glossary and create a paper on Effective Practices for Student Learning Outcomes Assessment.

Strong Workforce Recommendations						
Timeline	Goal	Current Positions	Action	ASCCC Committee Involvement		Comments
TBD	9. a . Engage employers, workforce boards, economic development entities, and other workforce organizations with faculty in the program development and review process	7.05 S14 Research Tools for Program Review; 13.02 F12 Redefinition of Student Success; 21.02 S12 CTE Program Review	Co- develop	CTE LC AAC Curriculum (EDAC)	High	2017 - 18: Committees chairs to recommend to the president how to implement this recommendation. Resolution 21.02 S12 should be part of this conversation.
TBD	9. b . Promote effective practices for program improvement (retooling) and program discontinuance based upon labor market data, student outcomes and input from students, faculty, college staff, employers, and workforce partners.		Develop	Ed Pol, AAC, and Curriculum	High	2017 - 18: Ed. Policies to lead the conversation. Committee chairs to recommend to the president how to implement this recommendation. Chairs might consider exploring the development of a PDC Module using the ASCCC paper on program discontinuance. The Ed Pol might also be able to touch on

		some of
		recommendation in
		the upcoming on
		Educational
		Program
		Development.

# Papers/Rostrums

- S17 9.01
- F16 2.01
- **B.** Completed (include a list of those items that have been completed as a way to build the end of year report).



# Basic Skills Committee Meeting 5 September 2017, 8:30-9:30am

#### **CCC Confer**

Participant Passcode: 536698
Toll free number available: 888-450-4821

#### **MINUTES**

#### **Respectfully Submitted by Corinna Evett**

- I. Call to Order and Adoption of the Agenda
- II. Introductions
  - a. A good group of eager members introduced themselves:
    - i. Members present: Dolores Davison (chair); Randy Beach (2<sup>nd</sup>); Corinna Evett (Santiago Canyon College); Katie Krolikowski (Contra Costa College); Samuel Rodriguez (Reedly College)
  - Dolores is still reviewing paperwork to see if we can get a few additional eager members.
- III. Planned in-person meeting for October/November
  - a. Background info for face-to-face meetings & current and possible priorities
    - i. Will work specifically on committee priorities at these meetings.
    - ii. We are tasked with the priorities listed on the Excel doc that Dolores sent.
    - iii. We are also probably going to be pulled into AB705 (Multiple Measures) and the mathematics requirements in light of the CSU's mathematic requirement changes.
    - iv. We may have additional priorities once new legislation is passed.
  - b. Date for fall meeting: Friday, 8 December 2017
  - c. Location: Santiago Canyon College, Orange, CA
  - d. Travel Logistics
    - i. Dolores will send link for travel information to Samuel and Katie.
    - ii. Fly into Orange County/Santa Ana
    - iii. Book flights through the senate
  - e. Other?
    - i. Next phone meeting 10 October 2017 from 8:15-9:15 a.m.
- IV. Topics
  - a. Breakout session topics for Plenary session Plenary attendance?
    - i. Dolores, Randy, and Katie plan on attending.
    - ii. Samuel and Corinna are tentative.
    - iii. Dolores put in a hold for a basic skills topic for fall plenary
    - iv. At this weekend's exec meeting, Dolores will learn more about what we may or may not be assigned.

- b. Priorities this year
  - i. Email attachment
    - 1. Two of our priorities are resolutions
    - 2. Dolores will figure out what we have done to respond to the common assessment.
    - 3. Improve basic skills funding formula: We need to come up with a new formula. Dolores is going to be a part of the basic skills advisory committee at the Chancellor's Office, so she will give us updates as she learns more.
    - 4. Dolores will be the basic skills advocate making sure that we are a part of many conversations.
    - 5. Katie mentioned that basic skills might be a part of the guided pathways conversations.
      - a. Dolores mentioned that the senate is partnering with two other groups at the Chancellor's Office. Some exec members are more involved in the conversations than others. Randy's committee will touch on guided pathways. The transfer element is crucial, and guided pathways touches on everything we do, so basic skills will be involved as well.
    - 6. We'll have more information about the aforementioned after this weekend's exec board meeting.
  - ii. Possible participation in CTE/Noncredit Summit
    - 1. ASCCC has done a number of institutes for CTE and Noncredit. This year, the two will be combined to create a joint summit of sorts.
    - 2. The summit will need to include basic skills because of the adult education piece.
    - 3. We may be asked to participate in this in the spring; as soon as Dolores gets confirmation, she will let us know.
    - 4. It will probably be in the south because it's less expensive.
- V. Other Items for Discussion
  - a. None
- VI. Announcements/Events
  - a. OER Regional Meetings 15 and 16 September
  - b. CTE Regional Meetings 22 and 23 September
  - c. Fall Area Meetings 13 and 14 October, locations vary
  - d. Fall Plenary Session 2-4 November, Irvine Marriott
- VII. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 9:03 a.m.



# Curriculum Committee Wednesday September 27, 2016 3:30 PM until 5 PM

**Members present:** Cheryl Aschenbach, Karen Daar, Daniel Keller, Leticia Hector, Cynthia Reiss, Craig Rutan (Chair), Aimee Tran, Eric Wada, and Thais Winsome

#### Meeting called to order at 3:32 PM

- Minutes from 9/2 meeting have been approved and are on the ASCCC website
- **Update on Resolution 9.11 F15**: T. Winsome has drafted an email to send out to honors program directors to see who has been contacted by the for-profit honors program. With the responses, we can determine whether additional actions are needed to satisfy action requested in the resolution.
- Review of ASCCC Curriculum Website: The Academic Senate's curriculum website (www.ccccurriculum.net) needs curriculum streamlining added. Old info (2013) needs to be removed. SACC needs to be updated. We also need to add to FAQs, so members are encouraged to think about questions that they have or that have come up on the curriculum listsery. Prior to the next call, members are also encouraged to consider what else should be included on the website or what else could be revised/improved.
- **Review of PDC's Curriculum 101 Modules:** Suggestion that a module on program narratives be added or at least included as a Curriculum Institute breakout. If anyone notices information that should be changed for consistency with the 6<sup>th</sup> edition of the Program and Course Approval Handbook. Please note slide numbers and send a list of edits to C. Rutan.
- Topics for Curriculum Regional Meetings: Confirmed locations for the regional meetings are Folsom Lake College on November 17 and Long Beach City College Pacific Coast Campus on November 18. The regionals will include a general session and two rounds of breakout session with three breakout topics per session. Possible breakout topics include ADT submissions and double-counting (per the Chancellor's Office), noncredit, AB 705 and curricular impacts including potential for noncredit as prerequisites and corequisites (based on 5C dialog), EO 1100/1110 intermediate algebra, C- for Golden 4 (CSU), apprenticeship, OEI rubric and course design, ZTCs, dual enrollment, curriculum newbies, curriculum and financial aid and veterans. Send additional ideas to C. Rutan. Committee members will be presenting or facilitating for the Chancellor's Office presenters during the breakout sessions.
- Curriculum Institute Theme: Should be related to change and something that leads to a program image. Ideas: Opening the Loop, Let the Change Begin..., Upward Bound, Metachange, Curriculum Happens, Reinventing the Wheel/Reinventing Curriculum. Send additional ideas to C. Rutan.

• Fall Plenary Session Breakouts: There will only be one curriculum breakout at Fall Plenary. Unfortunately, no committee members will be able to join C. Rutan and C. Aschenbach because the other presenters will be Virginia Guleff (5C Co-chair) and Jackie Escajeda (CCCCO). Hopefully, additional presentation opportunities will be available at the Spring 2018 Plenary Session. Committee members attending the Fall Plenary Session are encouraged to the attend the curriculum breakout on Friday November 3.

Meeting adjourned at 4:54 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Craig Rutan

Approved October 6, 2017 via email



#### **Educational Policies Committee**

October 2, 2017 3:30 PM - 4:30 PM

Dial your telephone conference line: 1-719-785-4469\*
Participant Passcode: 260187
\*Toll free number available: 888-450-4821

\*6 - Mute/unmute your line

#### **MINUTES**

I. Call to order and adoption of the agenda

#### II. 17-18 Meeting Schedule

Group confirmed the face-to-face meeting at Chaffey College on December 13, 2017 from 10-3:30 PM. Those committee members who need to make travel arrangements should use the travel request form here http://www.asccc.org/content/flight-and-travel-request

#### III. <u>Educational Policies Committee Resolutions Assignments</u>

The committee received an update on resolutions assignments and discussed how to address resolutions not yet discussed.

Supplemental Instruction
Survey and Glossary

Committee is waiting for survey results from Crystal. Randy will disseminate as soon as received.

Approval of Grant Driven
Projects

Committee discussed the need for this resolution and whether it is still viable and concluded that the field is still inconsistent with policies regarding grant-funded projects. The committee would like to put forth a model policy. Randy will put together a draft, model grants policy based on samples received from Holly and others.

CTE Program Review

Randy discussed with CTE Leadership chair Lorraine Slattery-Farrell and agreed that this resolution has been addressed. Randy will prepare a statement for the website.

<u>Develop Training Guidance</u> <u>for Faculty Engaged in Peer</u> Evaluations Per ASCCC president Julie Bruno we need to establish expectations for the task force members and the time commitment involved. The committee discussed a possible online training module. Randy will send a proposal for a task force to the committee for review and then to Julie Bruno for follow-up with other system partners that represent faculty. Once representatives from those partners are identified, small task group of Holly, Rebecca and Randy will work with colleagues representing collective bargaining units to develop resources.

Re-enrollment Information for Admissions and Records Staff

Andrea and Rebecca will review title 5 language and report on the intent of the resolution at the next meeting. After that report, the committee will determine status of the resolution.

System Handbook on Guidelines and Effective Practices for Dealing with **Student Academic** Dishonesty

Randy will reach out to the CCCCO's Legal Office to determine if any steps have been taken on the topic.

Allowing Faculty to Submit the "Report Delayed" (RD) Symbol for Instances of **Student Academic** 

Dishonesty

Waiting for 5C to agendize the item.

Practices for Educational **Program Development** 

Develop a paper on Effective The 2016-2017 committee prepared a draft of a paper. The 2017-2018 committee will continue to work on the draft with the goal of approval by the Spring 2018 plenary.

Faculty Involvement in the **Creation of Dual Enrollment** Programs

Discuss on November 6

**Investigate Effective** Practices for Pathways Programs

Given the intense engagement of the CCCCO, specifically the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative, and the creation of the ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force, the committee will recommend to the president that this item is completed. Randy will prepare a statement for the website

Local Senate Approval for Participation in Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP)

Discuss on November 6

Addressing the Needs of Students Impacted by the Changes to Course Repetition

The committee discussed the background around the resolution and the intended outcomes. The committee discussed the resolution and the difference between repeatability and repetition. The committee is considering a Rostrum article. The committee felt that the data needed to address the resolution may not be feasibly obtained. The committee will continue to discuss it at the November meeting.

#### IV. **Educational Policies Paper**

Randy asked the committee to review the draft of the paper and leave comments in the document. The committee will take up the paper at the November meeting.

V. Announcements and Events

ASCCC Area Meetings October 13 and 14, 2017 ASCCC Executive Committee Meeting, November 1, 2017 ASCCC Fall Plenary, November 2-4, 2017

#### VI. Meeting adjourned at 5:02 PM

#### VII. Resources:

Membership Contact Info 17-18 Meeting Schedule

Travel form at: http://www.asccc.org/content/flight-and-travel-request

Reimbursement forms at:

http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/SenateReimbursementForm2016\_1.pdf



# **Equity and Diversity Action Committee**

20 September 2017 10:30-3pm

Chair's House, San Jose, CA

#### **AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order and Adoption of the Agenda: 10:33am
  - a. Dolores Davison (chair), Sam Foster (2<sup>nd</sup>), Eartha Johnson, Orlando Shannon, Michael Wyly
- II. Application for Statewide Service http://asccc.org/content/application-statewide-service
- III. EDAC Regionals
  - a. Specifics
    - i. 27 October at Solano
    - ii. 28 October at Fullerton
    - iii. Participation of committee members
  - General Session Focus on Civil Discourse. Explored the following foci: working with students; communication techniques/how-to initiate and sustain conversations on equity.
  - c. Topics for breakout sessions DACA/Basic protections that our students already enjoy and how to communicate this to students, including FERPA; Basic Skills and curriculum and Equity; ADT in Social Justice and social justice campaign on campus envisioning curriculum as a social justice issue; implications of sanctuary state how does that empower us, how does it protect us; faculty not recognizing need for equity conversations (how do we prompt this discussion); Celia would present on DACA; what kinds of take-always can we get from these; strategies for broaching these conversations; responsibilities as educators pedagogically and otherwise—why should this matter? In the weeds workshops about effective practices what tools can you bring back to the campus to aid other faculty
    - i. Dolores will create program and send to committee for approval
  - d. Equity from a student perspective
  - e. Other logistics for sessions
- IV. Plenary Planning
  - a. Breakout of Civil Discourse
  - b. Breakout to report current activities/other ideas
    - i. Initiating on starting these conversation
    - ii. Breaking down silos to better serve equity/SSSP Equitable Equity. Possible foci include Student Services and Equity Integrated Plan and/or tools/best practice for faculty leadership to break down silos.

#### V. Other assignments to EDAC

- a. DACA website and resources, to include: bibliography of programs, websites, resources; faculty resources; student resources.
- b. Resolution on Veterans Resource Centers
  - i. How is it managed?
  - ii. Gender issues
  - iii. What kinds of services are available for students/staff/faculty?
- c. Paper on hiring outline to exec in November. Dolores and Sam to review current paper for what might be refined/revised, as well as to identify additional topics for outline. Might rethink part-time hiring processes. Est. completion deadline for paper, April 2018.

#### VI. Announcements

- a. Events
  - i. Executive Committee Meeting, 29-30 September, Moreno Valley College
  - ii. Fall Area Meetings 13 and 14 October, locations vary
  - iii. CTE Regional Meetings 20 and 21 October
  - iv. EDAC Regionals 27 and 28 October
  - v. Fall Plenary Session 2-4 November, Irvine Marriott
  - vi. Curriculum Regionals 17 and 18 November

#### VII. Additional Announcements/Issues

Discussed assumptions in math and English and their potential impact on student success, including equity/social justice as it may impact curriculum change/reform. Dolores to discuss the impacts of this conversation with ASCCC CC Chair as possible future discussion/presentation, perhaps at Curriculum Regionals or Curriculum Institute 2018.

VIII. Adjournment at 2:40pm

#### **Equivalency Toolkit Work Group**

Monday, September 18, 2017 2:00-4:00 PM

**Zoom Teleconference** 

(See end of agenda for teleconference information)

#### **MINUTES**

I. Welcome, Introductions, and Selection of Note Taker

ASCCC co-chairs: John Freitas & Lorraine Slattery-Farrell

Members present: Paul Setziol, Michael Heumann, Chad Lewis, Roger Dickes & Robin Faulty Members introduced themselves and L Slattery-Farrell agreed to be note taker for the meeting.

II. Guiding Principles Scope, and Role of Work Group

The co-chairs opened the meeting with a discussion of the scope of work and provided some background information on the previous work around equivalencies and minimum qualifications. The chairs stressed the overarching goal of this group is one of a steering committee to monitor progress and provide input into the other task force work around equivalency issues.

#### III. Review of Outcomes/Findings of Past Work

a. Equivalency research and findings (Setziol)

Paul provided an overview of the research he conducted last year for ASCCC and spoke of his belief of a clear need for all colleges to engage in some form of equivalency process and the need for clear guidelines to the field on the role of faculty, administrators and HR professionals in an equivalency process.

b. Spring regional meetings – Toolkit ideas (Freitas, Slattery-Farrell)

The co-chairs provided an overview of the spring regional meetings and the group reviewed the handout **Summary of Responses to Toolkit Ideas**...

#### IV. Project Planning

a. Review and finalize draft framework of project objectives.

The group reviewed the document **ASCCC Equivalency Project Planning Matrix** and discussed priorities for the group to work on first. The group agreed this is a deliberative process that will take time to perfect and that rushing items out to the field is not necessarily in our collective best interest. The group discussed identifying smaller pieces of the work to highlight first and provide some relief to the field while still engaging in the larger pieces.

The co-chairs outlined the work of the sub-discipline task force and the intent to use those sub-disciplines as models for the toolkit work as well.

b. Meeting the objectives – prioritized actions, timeline, resources, responsible parties It was determined by consensus that curriculum mapping to disciplines and to GE are critically important. It was also agreed to prioritize policies and procedures to inform the body at large about why equivalency is needed and how it can be used to broaden the pool of applicants.

Some other ideas explored were:

Eminence mapping—broader understanding of how eminence can be used

Exploring the possibility of competency test for GE equivalency, perhaps credit by exam or looking at a percentile on the GRE exam. One suggestion included looking at National test on Acquired college skills.

The group further discussed the need to examine equivalency processes with evidence-based criteria.

#### V. Next Steps

The co-chairs will be meeting with the sub-discipline taskforce to discuss bringing industry and faculty together to map competencies in the fields identified. From those competencies some curricular mapping to GE and to disciplines can be done. It is the hope of the chairs that this work can lead to the development of rubrics/other tools for this group to evaluate.

#### VI. Calendar for future work group meetings

Mondays after 2:15p.m. are best for the group. The co-chairs will report back and plan a meeting following the work of the sub-discipline group.

#### VII. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3: 40p.m.

## **Draft Minutes EVENTS COMMITTEE MEETING** September 6, 2017

Time: 2:30 pm - 5:30 pm • Chancellor's Office Room 630

#### In Attendance:

Julie Adams, Executive Director Julie Bruno, President Sam Foster, Part-Time Leadership Institute John Freitas, Accreditation Institute (2<sup>nd</sup> Chair) Ginni May, Accreditation Institute Craig Rutan, Curriculum Institute Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, CTE/Collaborative Leadership Institute Staff: Tonya Davis, Office Manager

Erika Prasad, Communication and Development Director

#### I. **Purpose of the Events Committee**

Adams stated the purpose of the events committee. This committee's purpose is to assist its members with coordination of events as well as explain the roles of the office staff, the committee chairs and committee members. Adams advised members that the committee will meet at least three times a year (September, December, and May). Members will be notified by the Adams about the next scheduled meeting.

#### II. **Review Responsibilities**

- **A.** Chairs: Adams explained the responsibilities that committee members would have during the planning process as well as on-site at events. She also stressed the importance of adhering to the deadlines given to each committee member. She noted this year less staff would be available to assist onsite and committee members would be expected to provide onsite assistance as needed (meet and greet attendees). Adams advised chairs to provide a program overview to Prasad by September 30, 2017.
- **B.** Office: Adams explained that there will be one main staff member as a point of contact for all events. Adams will advise members in advance who that person will be. Staff will coordinate registration, breakout material postings, onsite staff coordination, mailings and other important details pertaining to the success of each event.

#### **Policies and Procedures** III.

- **A.** Attendees: The committee discussed any progress that the committee has made in planning. They also reviewed the number of registrants and agreed on the following limits and attendee restrictions for 2017-18 events:
  - i. <u>Accreditation Institute</u> The Institute would continue to allow 5 team members (faculty, administrator, staff) and would allow more if requested on a case-by-

- case. 91 were in attendance. May indicated she anticipates attendance from high level administrators (CIOs, CSSOs, CEOs) to attend this year's Accreditation Institute. The committee discussed their concerns and the possibility of outgrowing the meeting space due to the pre-session being offered. It was suggested to add an additional breakout totaling 5 to allow for space. Adams noted that Davis would follow up with the hotel on space and capacity charts and we would update the ASCCC website to reflect the February 22<sup>nd</sup> pre-session.
- ii. <u>CTE Leadership Institute</u> Last year's Institute was opened to attendee as first come first (faculty and counselors). Over 210 were in attendance. Adams advised the committee that the Collaborative Institute would replace the CTE Leadership May 4 5, 2018. ASCCC has joined partners to offer the system's first ever Noncredit Summit. It was recommended that Executive Committee approve a combined, integrated institute for CTE and Noncredit, with programming for Counseling and Adult Education. An agenda item is in place to discuss the budget and logistics at the September Executive Committee meeting.
- iii. <u>SLO Institute</u> Last year's symposium was opened on a first come first serve basis. Teams varied in numbers and size. Registration was marketed toward SLO Coordinators. 194 were in attendance. The 5th Annual SLO Symposium has been scheduled for Friday, February 9th, 2018. Adams advised the committee that she and staff would continue to work with Jarek Janio to secure a location, update ASCCC website, and pull together the program/logistics.
- iv. <u>Curriculum Institute</u> The Curriculum Institute will continue to limit faculty to 5 team members (faculty, administrators, staff) with majority being faculty, including chair and SLO Coordinator. 579 were in attendance. Rutan requested staff to follow up with the venue on space that will include 9 breakout sessions for this year's institute. Adams advised Rutan that staff would follow up with breakout information and capacity charts.
- **B. Presenters -** Members discussed the current presenter fees, policies and reasonable accommodations. Adams discussed the current process and noted changes:
  - i. Adams discussed the current presenter fees for each event with the chairs.
  - ii. Committee members are encouraged to register as soon as possible. Chairs should provide members with a link to the ASCCC online travel request form. Once the member is registered, staff will secure the room reservations according the online travel request form.
  - iii. Presenters and committee members should first seek funding from their college to pay for their registration fee and other associated fees.
  - iv. If presenters are unable to pay registration fee and other costs, the committee member or presenter is responsible for paying the posted presenter registration fee for each event. Travel and accommodations may be covered if deemed necessary. However, there is a limited amount of travel budgeted for presenters and/or committee members.
  - v. Adams discussed the process for asking Executive Committee members to present at institutes. She reminded committee members to not include Executive

Committee members on the program. Presenter's lists will be discussed with the President and Adams for approval.

#### IV. On-site Expectations and Procedures

As mentioned previously, less staff would be available to assist onsite and committee members will be expected to provide onsite assistance as needed (meet and greet attendees, etc.). Adams suggested that chairs create a matrix and assign tasks for committee members.

#### V. Review of Timelines and Program Specifications

The committee reviewed timelines for each event including deadlines for materials, presenter names, preliminary schedule, and final schedule. Chairs were encouraged to communicate program and structure changes to staff as soon as possible to accommodate hotel venue changes. The committee was reminded of their first deadline: a short marketing paragraph that will be posted online on each event's webpage and sent through the listservs. This paragraph should be submitted to Prasad by September 30, 2017. Chairs also brainstormed other ideas for marketing and ways to make each individual event more appealing. Adams will provide chairs with updated checklists.

#### VI. Budgets

- **A.** Adams reviewed the Accreditation Institute and Curriculum Institute budget with all committee members. Adams advised chairs that the budgets would be forthcoming for the Collaborative Institute and Part-Time Institute.
- **B.** Adams reminded the committee to keep presenter costs down and do not offer any "free" items to presenters (e.g. overnight stays, travel, meals, etc.). All presenter needs, including travel, audio visual, and overnight stays, should be directed to event staff.

#### VII. Evaluations

**A.** The committee discussed the effectiveness of evaluations sent out via Survey Monkey. It was noted that the evaluation questions are not particularly useful in planning future institutes as attendee participation is minimal. Members discussed providing attendees with a paper form evaluation. Chairs would provide enough content for surveys to be created in advance and have ready to disseminate on the last day of the event. Additional ideas included; an incentivized program to increase survey responses (example: complimentary registration to an event upon completion of survey). A recommendation to the Executive Committee should be made to discontinue use of the Survey Monkey based on lack of effectiveness.

#### **VIII.** Program Development

Adams discussed with members how to work with their committee on developing topics, breakout descriptions, contacting presenters, preparing/making presentations, following up with presenters. Members discussed timing (breakout lengths, pass time, lunch speakers or not), reviewed the hotel specifications, prepping presenters, and strand designations. As mentioned previously, chairs were encouraged to communicate program and structure changes to staff as soon as possible to accommodate hotel venue changes.

Adams also mentioned that presenters should come prepared with adequate technology. Chairs should be prepping presenters for A/V availability and always assume that internet is not available in breakout sessions. Chairs should also be prepping Mac users for using the LCDs. Presenters must provide their own VGA adapters.

#### IX. Brainstorming Themes -

Members provided first time chairs with feedback and experiences on planning an institute.

#### X. Other

The next meeting will take place via conference call???

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m. Notes submitted by Tonya Davis, Office Manager



ASCCC Legislative and Advocacy Committee
Minutes
September 21, 2017
4:30PM-5:30PM

CCC Call Confer 888-450-4821

Participant Passcode: 853496 Presenter Passcode: 9287170

#### Membership:

Julie Adams, Executive Director ASCCC
Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, College of the Canyons
Steve Cirrone, Sacramento City College
Dolores Davison, ASCCC Secretary
John Freitas, Treasurer ASCCC
LaTonya Parker, At-Large Representative ASCCC
John Stanskas, Vice President ASCCC, Chair

julie@asccc.org brillwynkoop@gmail.com steve.cirrone@scc.losrios.edu davisondolores@fhda.edu freitaje@lacitycollege.edu latonya.parker@mvc.edu jstanskas@valleycollege.edu

#### Charge:

The Legislative and Advocacy Committee is responsible for providing the President with background information on all legislation related to academic and professional matters. Through research and analysis, and representation on appropriate advocacy groups, the Committee will provide the President and the Executive Committee with recommendations on such legislation. The Committee is also responsible for providing legislative alerts to the local senates, identifying liaison persons to contact legislators, and providing support to local senates regarding California's legislative process as it has bearing on academic and professional matters. It is the goal of the Committee to provide the President and the Executive Committee with the resources to ensure that the Senate is recognized as the voice of authority with the Legislature and Governor's Office in the areas of academic and professional matters.

Members Present: Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, Steve Cirrone, Dolores Davison, John Freitas, John Stanskas

Members Absent: Julie Adams, LaTonya Parker

- 1. Important Dates and Events
  - a. Plenary Session Breakout November 2-4, Irvine Description for Legislative Breakout
  - b. In Person Committee Meeting January
  - c. Spring Plenary April 12-14, San Mateo
  - d. ASCCC Legislative Action Day, Spring, Sacramento Potentially Wednesday May 9 or Tuesday May 15, 2018

#### 2. Looking forward:

a. ASCCC Legislative Agenda Items

Last Year's List

Full-Time Faculty and Faculty Diversification

Audit Fee

Veteran's Support Centers/Services

Funding for Mental Health Services

Permanent and Sustainable Funding for C-ID

#### Recommended Legislative Agenda for 2017-2018

Full-Time Faculty and Faculty Diversification Audit Fee

Permanent and Sustainable Funding for C-ID

Dedicated Professional Development Money for ASCCC to convene faculty discipline meetings to improve student success and completion

Wrap-Around Student Support (Mental Health, Increased Direct Aid for Food and Housing Insecurity)

The committee discussed how these goals align with the system budget change request and the Board of Governors Vision for Success goals.

b. Legislative Periodical Update

The committee does not recommend a periodical for the fall plenary

- 3. Current Legislation Concerns
  - a. AB705

The ASCCC needs to provide direction to the field regarding implementation should the Governor sign

- 4. Next Steps: Tasks & Future Agenda Items / Meeting dates?

  Meeting the first week of October to determine title and structure for plenary breakout
- 5. Adjourn 5:40pm

ASCCC Legislative and Advocacy Committee
Minutes
October 4, 2017
4:30PM-5:30PM

CCC Call Confer 888-450-4821 Participant Passcode: 781949

**Presenter Passcode: 3343154** 

#### Membership:

Julie Adams, Executive Director ASCCC
Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, College of the Canyons
Steve Cirrone, Sacramento City College
Dolores Davison, ASCCC Secretary
John Freitas, Treasurer ASCCC
LaTonya Parker, At-Large Representative ASCCC
John Stanskas, Vice President ASCCC, Chair

julie@asccc.org brillwynkoop@gmail.com steve.cirrone@scc.losrios.edu davisondolores@fhda.edu freitaje@lacitycollege.edu latonya.parker@mvc.edu jstanskas@valleycollege.edu

#### Charge:

The Legislative and Advocacy Committee is responsible for providing the President with background information on all legislation related to academic and professional matters. Through research and analysis, and representation on appropriate advocacy groups, the Committee will provide the President and the Executive Committee with recommendations on such legislation. The Committee is also responsible for providing legislative alerts to the local senates, identifying liaison persons to contact legislators, and providing support to local senates regarding California's legislative process as it has bearing on academic and professional matters. It is the goal of the Committee to provide the President and the Executive Committee with the resources to ensure that the Senate is recognized as the voice of authority with the Legislature and Governor's Office in the areas of academic and professional matters.

Members Present: Steve Cirrone, Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, LaTonya Parker, John Stanskas

Members Absent: Julie Adams, Dolores Davison, John Freitas

- 1. Important Dates and Events
  - a. Plenary Session Breakout November 2-4, Irvine
  - b. In Person Committee Meeting January
  - c. Spring Plenary April 12-14, San Mateo
  - d. ASCCC Legislative Action Day, Spring, Sacramento Wednesday May 9

#### 2. Looking forward:

a. ASCCC Action on Legislative Agenda Items

#### **Approved Legislative Agenda for 2017-2018**

Full-Time Faculty and Faculty Diversification

Audit Fee

Permanent and Sustainable Funding for C-ID

Dedicated Professional Development Money for ASCCC to convene faculty discipline meetings to improve student success and completion\*

Wrap-Around Student Support (Mental Health, Increased Direct Aid for Food and Housing Insecurity)

\*Statewide Discussions about curriculum, serving various student groups, alignment, and better conversations and collaborations at the discipline level. This may be accomplished through an expansion of the C-ID mission to facilitate discipline dialog at the state level. This also may include improving money for colleges specifically for professional development that indicates support of discipline dialog as an explicit component of funding.

b. Fall Plenary Session Breakout Description

The committee approved the following description and outline of the session

Thursday, November 2, 2017

SECOND BREAKOUT SESSION (11:20 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.)

Legislative Update

John Stanskas, ASCCC Vice President

Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, Legislative and Advocacy Committee

Steve Cirrone, Legislative and Advocacy Committee

The first year of the current legislative cycle is drawing to a close and several bills have become law to direct our service to students. In addition, the ASCCC has adopted its legislative priorities as we continue to advocate for our students and faculty in academic and professional matters. Join us for a lively discussion about all things Sacramento as we look ahead to the next legislative year.

- 1. Legislative Cycle
- 2. Legislation that Passed (Group by topic)

ACR32

Student Wrap-Around Services

- 3. Legislation that Failed (Group by topic)
  Baccalaureate programs
  - ASCCC Leg Priorities
- c. Legislative Periodical Update

4.

The committee does not recommend a periodical for the fall plenary

- 3. Current Legislation Concerns
  - a. AB705
- 4. Next Steps: Tasks & Future Agenda Items / Meeting dates?

Meeting to finalize breakout at fall plenary, after October 15 deadline for the Governor to sign current legislation.

Send a doodle poll to schedule a face-to-face meeting in January or February

5. Adjourn 5:00pm



#### NONCREDIT COMMITTEE

Monday, September 25, 2017 1:00-2:00 PM Zoom

(See end of agenda for teleconference information)

#### **MINUTES**

Attendance: Curtis Martin, John Freitas, Randy Beach, Ginni May, Donna Necke, Bernie Rodriguez, Jan Young, Chantee Guiney (guest)

- I. Call to Order, selection of note taker Ginni May
- II. Committee meeting calendar January in-person meeting, committee members are to view their calendars so that we can discuss and schedule the meeting next week at our October in-person meeting.
  - John calendared a number of meetings. Some of the meetings may not be necessary. They can be canceled if not needed.
- III. Noncredit Distance Education Survey The Committee made some suggestions, John will incorporate them, send out again and then John will try to bring this to the Executive Committee later this week.
- IV. Noncredit Distance Education WSCH Calculation John shared the results of his conversation with LeBaron Woodyard, Kirsten Corbin, and Conan McKay. They went over the math for how to calculate Noncredit DE FTES, Title 5 Fiscal Regulations §58003.1 (John sent this to the committee members). The concern is the way WSCH is calculated for Noncredit DE courses-i.e. attendance counting. The regulation is based on the instructional hours based on the COR, as well as instructor contact hours and outside-of-class hours. Since units or in-class hours are used to calculate WSCH, this is problematic for NC since there are no units. There are instructional hours and instructor contact hours on the NC DE which is puzzling. There is mention of out of class hours as well. Typically, NC classes aren't required to include out of class hours on the course outlines. However, today, many do have out of class hours. Jan shared information from a survey: For the most part, most colleges have shied away from offering NC DE since it is financially problematic. There is interested in offering NC DE.
- V. Fall plenary
  - a. Resolutions noncredit distance education, others? John worked on a Resolution regarding Noncredit Distance Education to bring to the next Executive Committee Meeting for inclusion in the Area meeting packets.
    - Attendance counting was discussed.
    - The committee discussed whether or not this resolution was ready to be sent to the Executive Committee or should it be worked on some more and brought forth to the

Area Meeting. Some editing to the resolution took place. John will take in the edits and send to Ginni by Wednesday for the Resolutions packet.

CCC Apply and Residency Requirement could be addressed in a resolution. §58003.3 talks about alien students and suggests that colleges would not receive noncredit funding for undocumented students in their courses. Chauntee joined the phone meeting to discuss the CCC Apply issue. The concern with CCC Apply is that it is too complex. Chauntee is checking to see if there is a Noncredit representative on CACCRAO. Donna will be working on a resolution to address.

- b. Breakout session Noncredit Pathways to CTE. Bernie, Donna, and Curtis will be at the Plenary session this fall. John Freitas and Lorraine Slattery-Farrrell will be leading the breakout. Bernie agreed to participate, Donna is considering it. Ideas of another possible other presenters were given, such as L.E. Foisia at Mt. SAC/LAOC Regional Consortium.
- VI. Joint CTE/Noncredit Institute May 3-5 the Concept was shared and will be discussed at the in-person meeting next week.
- VII. "The New World of Noncredit" Conference Donna, Cheryl and John F are presenting. All committee members have been confirmed to attend.
- VIII. Upcoming Events http://www.asccc.org/calendar/list/events
  - a. Next meetings Thursday, October 5, 11-4, San Diego Continuing Education; Monday, October 23, 1-2 (tentative).
  - b. ASCCC Area meetings October 13 and 14, locations vary. Contact your area representatives.
  - c. Fall CTE Regional Meetings October 20, College of Alameda/October 21, Chaffey College
  - d. Civil Discourse and Equity Regional Meetings October 27, Solano College/October 28, Fullerton College
  - e. ASCCC Fall Plenary Session, November 2-4, Irvine Marriott Hotel.
  - f. Fall Curriculum Regional Meetings November 17, North/November 18, South.
  - g. Accreditation Institute February 23-24, 2018. Pre-session on February 22. Wyndham Anaheim-Garden Grove.

Adjourned at 2:08 pm

#### **Zoom Call-in/Login Information**

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/5041541143

Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +14086380968,5041541143# or +16465588656,5041541143# Or Telephone:

Dial: +1 408 638 0968 (US Toll) or +1 646 558 8656 (US Toll)

Meeting ID: 504 154 1143 International numbers

available: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/zoomconference?m=RPRDiLJnvAXIIrhz1Y6c9MTmTlPFu7z5

Or Skype for Business (Lync): SIP:5041541143@lync.zoom.us



#### NONCREDIT COMMITTEE

Thursday, October 5, 2017 11:00-4:00 San Diego Continuing Education Educational Cultural Complex 4343 Ocean View Blvd. San Diego, CA 92113 Room 132

(See end of agenda for Zoom teleconference information)

#### **MINUTES**

**Member present**: Bernie Rodriguez, Randy Beach, John Freitas, Ginni May, Donna Necke (phone), Jan Young, Curtis Martin (online)

**Guests**: Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, Chantee Guinney

- I. Call to Order at 11:04 pm, Ginni is taking notes, introductions all around
- II. Spring committee meeting calendar
  - a. Date and location for next in-person meeting—need agenda for joint institute submitted by mid-January, it was recommended that both Noncredit and CTE committees meet together, we are looking at January 9 or January 11 in Sacramento.
  - b. Spring online meetings—Mondays at 1:00 were agreed on for spring

#### III. Updates

- a. Chancellor's Office Update Chantee Guiney, Chancellor's Office. No update as Ms. Guiney was unable to attend.
- b. 5C Update noncredit was discussed at last 5C meeting, credit courses as prerequisites to credit courses—Title 5 is silent, so it was decided that it was allowable; credit/noncredit in same course section is a practice that is becoming more common—there is a need to track the progress of students in such classes: Positive attendance vs census-based; accounting procedures on incremental units—baseline to count in quarter units of tenth units; new grade symbol of EW (Excused Withdrawal) not specific to Noncredit courses; there were workgroup updates: catalogs, area of emphasis, cooperative work experience (Lorraine is on that workgroup this would be local with the new curriculum streamlining), Low-unit certificates, Substantial and non-substantial change to credit courses, TOP Codes/CIP Codes, statistics/C-ID/math.
  Noncredit perspective was explained work experience in noncredit cannot (or has not been) be offered because of liability—dollars are needed to pay for the insurance. There was discussion that with CDCP that there should be sufficient funding for CWE courses.
  ACTION: John will draft a resolution about CWE and bring to an Area meeting and
- Bernie will bring it to Area D.

  c. Noncredit distance education survey status—the survey was approved with one small

edit that John noted. John will wrap up the survey next week and send to the field.

- d. Fall plenary
  - i. Resolutions noncredit distance education in the packet, noncredit access for undocumented students – discussed within the committee and made some edits for Donna to take to Area C, John will draft a resolution about CWE and bring to an Area meeting and Bernie will bring it to Area D.
  - ii. Breakout session Noncredit Pathways to CTE: John, Lorraine, Bernie, L.E. AND there is another breakout that Donna will be on.

#### IV. Committee Priorities for 2017-2018 – See committee priorities spreadsheet

a. Assigned resolutions

Resolution 13.02 F15 and Resolution 9.07 S16—ACTION: Propose community effort among Senate, ACCE, the CO to update Noncredit at A Glance (2006) and Noncredit Instruction: Opportunity and Challenge, AND include Guidance on Using Noncredit Courses as Prerequisites and Co-requisites for Credit Courses

Resolution 16.02 F16—John needs to determine who to have a conversation with at the CO regarding the directive of this resolution.

Resolution 7.03 S16—same as for 16.02 F16—**ACTION:** The Noncredit Committee will provide a Rostrum Article for the May Rostrum – co-write with ACCE and ASCCC on the CCC Apply issue.

- b. Strong Workforce Task Force Recommendations
  - 12. b. Identify and disseminate best practices for using noncredit to provide opportunities for CTE students to build skills and knowledge—This is being addressed in the paper resulting from the resolutions above and with the Noncredit/CTE Joint Institute, maybe some professional development college modules.
  - 10. b. Disseminate effective practices for streamlining and improving processes for recognizing prior learning and work experience and awarding credits or advanced placement toward CTE pathways—This has been addressed as stated, and will be addressed further through the MCW with CTE C-ID work.
- V. Joint CTE/Noncredit Institute May 3-5
  - a. Review and discussion of institute concept The committee reviewed the Concept Document.
  - b. Planning structure overarching planning committee with chairs and co-chairs of the Noncredit and CTE Committees, 3CSN, and some other groups that John can fill in.
  - Brainstorming Ideas for breakout sessions, general sessions
     ACTION: Come up with additional topics for breakouts and general session and send to John by October 30, 2017.

#### VI. On the Horizon

134

- a. Rostrum article ideas next deadline is December 31 Donna is writing one on what has
  occurred at Mt. Sac to get faculty leadership involved in noncredit.
   Consider a Rostrum article on noncredit articulation Bernie will draft it
   CCC Apply issues by Randy for May Rostrum
- b. Identification and discussion of issues Strong Workforce matrix, noncredit student internships, guided pathways (The committee decided to stay tuned and see what happens this fall, will determine if any Rostrum articles or resolutions should be considered for spring), FON (The ASCCC will follow and update the committee.), effective noncredit curriculum creation, noncredit papers, others? It was suggested that

the Noncredit Committee work with the Faculty Development Committee to develop some modules and more professional development.

- c. Noncredit to Credit articulation
- d. Noncredit liaisons it was recommended that we actively recruit Noncredit liaisons.
   This could be done by first an email and then possibly a phone call.

   ACTION: Actively recruit by modeling the CTE liaison recruitment strategy.
- VII. "The New World of Noncredit" Conference review of program

  John and Cheryl are doing a breakout on Saturday about the ASCCC work in noncredit.
- VIII. Upcoming Events http://www.asccc.org/calendar/list/events
  - a. Next meetings Thursday, October 5, 11-4, San Diego Continuing Education; Monday, October 23, 1-2 (tentative).
  - b. ASCCC Area meetings October 13 and 14, locations vary. Contact your area representatives.
  - c. Fall CTE Regional Meetings October 20, College of Alameda/October 21, Chaffey College
  - d. Civil Discourse and Equity Regional Meetings October 27, Solano College/October 28, Fullerton College
  - e. ASCCC Fall Plenary Session, November 2-4, Irvine Marriott Hotel.
  - f. Fall Curriculum Regional Meetings November 17, North/November 18, South.
  - g. Accreditation Institute February 23-24, 2018. Presession on February 22. Wyndham Anaheim-Garden Grove.
- IX. Adjourned at 3:52 pm

#### **Zoom Call-in/Login Information**

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/5041541143

Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +14086380968,5041541143# or +16465588656,5041541143#

Or Telephone:

Dial: +1 408 638 0968 (US Toll) or +1 646 558 8656 (US Toll)

Meeting ID: 504 154 1143 International numbers

available: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/zoomconference?m=RPRDiLJnvAXIIrhz1Y6c9MTmTlPFu7z5

Or Skype for Business (Lync): SIP:5041541143@lync.zoom.us



# Online Education Committee Friday, September 1, 2017 11:30am-12:30pm Zoom Teleconference (See last page for teleconference information)

#### **AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order and Selection of Committee Note Taker
- II. Meeting Calendar
- III. Review of the Committee Charge and Responsibilities
  - a. Committee Charge

The Online Education Committee informs and makes recommendations to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the faculty regarding policies and practices in online education and educational technology. The Committee supports quality online education and the effective use of educational technology by researching issues, writing background and position papers, and making presentations at plenary sessions and other events as needed. When appropriate, the Committee interacts with Senate standing committees, advocates for policies, and proposes resolutions

 b. Live Binder overview (https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/16LxdTXnuPX8WUI8n0yPuQZSCARSDD72TTE k5g4xZLR8/edit#gid=1226851513)

- IV. Review of Committee Priorities for 2017-2018 see spreadsheet
  - a. Conditions of Enrollment for Online Education
  - b. Explore Participation in SARA for DE offerings
  - c. Creation of Local Online Education Committee
  - d. Definition of Regular, Effective, and Substantive Contact
  - e. Professional Guidelines and Effective Practices for Using Publisher Generated Materials
  - f. Update the 2008 Technology Paper
  - g. Using Saving from Adopting Canvas
- V. Fall plenary planning Plenary is November 3-5
  - a. Breakout session ideas submitted Accessibility, Regular Effective and Substantive Contact, and Hot Topics any other topics
  - b. Possible resolutions

for more information.

- VI. Announcements
  - a. Next meeting Friday, September 22, 10-3 (approx.), Sacramento City College
  - b. ASCCC Area meetings October 13 and 14, locations vary. Contact your area representatives.
  - c. ASCCC Fall Plenary Session, November 2-4, Irvine Marriott.
  - d. Fall Regional Meetings CTE, Open Educational Resources, and Curriculum. Click here

#### VII. Adjournment

## **Zoom Teleconference Information**

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/4985988827

Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +16468769923, 4985988827# or +14086380968, 4985988827#

Or Telephone:

Dial: +1 646 876 9923 (US Toll) or +1 408 638 0968 (US Toll)

Meeting ID: 498 598 8827 International numbers

available: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/zoomconference?m=L6nem40Ofv2eabYKW3EuopqDIW7m0IVX

Or Skype for Business (Lync):

SIP:4985988827@lync.zoom.us

Online Education Committee Friday, September 1, 2017 11:30-12:30 PM Zoom Teleconference Minutes Taken by Phylise Smith

**In Attendance:** Conan McKay, John Freita, Michael Heumann, Kandance Knudson, Phylise Smith, Caleb Fowler.

Meeting called to order by Conan McKay at 11:31 PM, Friday, September 1. Conan asked for a Note-taker. Phylise Smith volunteered.

1. Everyone introduced themselves. (Please edit as necessary- people spoke fast, difficult to write and hear at the same time.

Conan works at Mendocino College and he teaches Child Development. This is his 2<sup>nd</sup> Year as Chair fore the Online Education Committee.

Caleb is Dept. Chair of Computer Science. This is his first Academic Senate Committee.

John is at Los Angeles City College is Treasurer, past chair of Committee.

Kandace, Distance Ed Coordinator at Sac City College is on the Institutional Education Committee.

Phylise Smith is a Dance Professor at College of the Canyons in Santa Clarita. She's taught online for over 10 years. She represent the Visual, Fine and Performing Arts on her school's Ed Tech committee and is also a peer faculty reviewer with OEI. This is her first Academic Senate Committee.

2. After introductions, Conan reviewed the Committee Charge: Items to do- The spreadsheet of Committee Priorities for 2017-2018 was discussed and displayed on the computer screens.

The Agenda was as follows

- a. Conditions of Enrollment for Online Education
- b. Explore participation in SARA for DE Offerings
- c. Creation of Local Online Education Committee
- d. Definition of Regular, Effective and Substantive Contact
- e. Professional Guideline and Effective Practices for Using Publisher Generated Materials
- f. Update the 2008 Technology Paper
- g. Using Saving from Adopting Canvas

Question was asked if Committee charge was written in priority order. Answer was that the committee would decide the priority order and most likely it would be the 2008 Technology Paper. The goal is to get a solid rough draft. Conan noted that the current paper would be sent out in a week.

John asked about writing a Title 5 roster paper for Conditions of Enrollment for Online Instruction.

Online Education Committee Friday, September 1, 2017 11:30-12:30 PM Zoom Teleconference Minutes Taken by Phylise Smith

The Committee debated whether there was enough time to develop information on the Conditions of Enrollment. Kandace noted that other states have students participate in mandatory orientation and queried whether it was time to look at requirements for all students. She also said that participation

If SARA should be explored and how would we go about accessing Distance Ed Tech Advisory information that comes out of the Chancellor's Office.

Phylise asked how ESL and other students would be affected with mandatory orientation and specific conditions for enrollment. Her concern is that their access shouldn't be impeded. It was suggested that such concerns would be addressed in the updated paper.

Next Kandance asked if the Committee should look at the state federal definition of Regular Effective and Substantive Contact. It was suggested that the Committee could work with OEI on this item and to look at whether the OEI rubric addresses concerns relevant to this topic.

In reference to the remainder of the Agenda items, Conan noted that most schools likely had Online Education Committees but it was an item that could be researched. He also noted that it was important to review instructors Publisher Generated courses. The suggestion was made this review was necessary to avoid correspondence courses.

Question was asked whether the Committee would look into Regular Effective and Substantive Contact based upon a school's compressed and regular academic calendar. The Committee agreed that this was a topic that also could be addressed in the Technology paper.

Conan noted that schools need to utilize savings from adopting Canvas and the Committee should develop a mechanism for reviewing what campus are doing in regards to savings.

After discussion of the 2017-18 Committee priorities, it was decided that the update of the 2008 Tech paper would be the main priority. The goal is to have the paper by Spring 2018. The first draft should be ready by Feb, and  $2^{nd}$  draft should go to Plenary.

3. The next item of discussion was the Fall Plenary. Conan said the Plenary would take place on November 2-4 in Irvine. He asked if anyone had any breakout session topics. If so, the topics needed to be submitted immediately. He noted that Accessibility would most likely be discussed but other topics could be suggested. The question was asked about credit for online labs and non- credit but not all schools had this issue. So would this topic be germane?

Local resolutions and broad issues resolutions were discussed. The issue of faculty credit for lab online or non-credit classes might be a topic for a local resolution.

A question was asked about reimbursement for Plenary attendance. Attendance at plenary sessions is optional for Committee members. It's' best find local Academic Senate sponsorship.

# Online Education Committee Friday, September 1, 2017 11:30-12:30 PM Zoom Teleconference Minutes Taken by Phylise Smith

The time frame for Area meetings was discussed. They take place October 13 and 14. Once all agenda items were covered, Conan asked if there were questions or other concerns. There were none.

The meeting adjourned at 12:32 PM.

The next meeting will take place Friday, September 22 10-3 at Sacramento City College.

PS

9/5/17



## **ONLINE EDUCATION Committee**

Friday, September 22, 2017 10:00-3:00

Sacramento City College Learning Resource Center, room 120

#### **AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of the Agenda
- III. Introduction of members
- IV. Action items
  - a. Review and revise meeting calendar for the 2017-2018
- V. Discussion items
  - a. Committee Priorities
    - i. Resolution 9.01 Creation of Local Online Education Rubrics
    - ii. Resolution 9.03 Conditions of Enrollment for Online Instruction
    - iii. Definition of Regular, Effective and Substantive Contact
    - iv. Professional Guidelines and Effective Practices for Using Publisher Generated Course Materials
  - b. Ensuring the Appropriate use of Educational Technology: An update for local Academic Senates
  - c. Definition of Hybrid Course
  - d. Rostrum article ideas
  - e. Resolution ideas
  - f. Other?

#### VI. Announcements

- a. ASCCC Area meetings October 13 and 14, locations vary. Contact your area representatives.
- b. CTE Regional Meeting October 20, 2017 at College of Alameda. October 21, 2017 Chaffey College
- c. Civil Discourse and Equity Regional Meeting October 27, 2017 Solano College. October 28 Fullerton College
- d. ASCCC Fall Plenary Session, November 2-4, Irvine Marriott Hotel, Irvine Ca
- VII. Adjournment



#### **ONLINE EDUCATION Committee**

Friday, September 22, 2017 10:00-3:00

Sacramento City College Learning Resource Center, room 120

#### **AGENDA**

- Call to Order
- II. Approval of the Agenda
- III. Introduction of members This part was skipped.
- IV. Action items
  - a. Review and revise meeting calendar for the 2017-2018
    - i. Setting up a f2f in January: looking at Jan. 8, probably in the south (LACC or CoC), starting at 10:30 AM and going to about 3.
    - ii. Next Zoom meeting: Monday, Oct. 30 at 5:30-6:30 PM
    - iii. Tuesday, November 21, 12-1 PM
    - iv. Wednesday, December 13, 12-1 PM

#### V. Discussion items

- a. Committee Priorities: Discussion about reviewing the resolutions and determining whether to write rostrum articles:
  - Resolution 9.01 Creation of Local Online Education Rubrics: there was a
    wide-ranging discussion. We wondered if we should push the OEI rubric
    or, as John suggested, be more "agnostic" and allow colleges to decide on
    the rubric that works for them. However, Kadance noted that this would
    create a two-tiered system that would make the definition of "quality"
    murky. Conan pointed out that OEI Rubric accepted courses have higher
    success rates (not sure of citation for this).
  - 2. There was then more discussion about *how* the OEI rubric should be pushed to local colleges (and, again, whether we should do this).
  - 3. Caleb stated that this committee's time would be better served focusing on regular and effective contact.
  - 4. Bottom line: share with colleges that these rubrics work and should be implemented—be it OEI's or another.

- ii. Resolution 9.03 Conditions of Enrollment for Online Instruction
  - 1. This will require a potential Title 5 change in order to establish different conditions for online students. Looking at potentially using Quest or some other online training tool to provide training for students who want to take online classes. Should there be a co-requisite model? Should this be something that all students take, not just online students? Wake Tech (NC) has done this sort of training—and they have data on its success. Should this be added to the Hot Topics in Online Education breakout at plenary (talk about research and what they found at Wake Tech) and how it is working for OEI? There is a strong push at OEI to use Quest. Can the Senate urge the faculty to use Quest (or at least something like it) for their online courses? The conversation about this needs to start. DETAC: what could be implemented by regulation?
  - 2. John: This could require a rostrum article or white paper, but it also could be part of our DE paper.
  - 3. Conan: if we want all online students to take the course, we couldn't design it as a non-credit course (non-apportionment).
  - 4. Kandace: Time for us to look at this as an essential need for all students. Consider digital literacy as a basic skill at Sac CC. Consider this as a placement/assessment test for online learning
- iii. 7.03 (2015): Ensuring accurate info in California Virtual Campus Catalog. John stated that there is a problem with ADT courses and C-ID numbering. Conan will follow up with Amy from OEI to see if this has been resolved (very likely that this is the case).
- iv. Definition of Regular, Effective and Substantive Contact
  - 1. One big issue: disconnect between different definitions and no real definition of any of these terms. This is a big issue with financial aid.
  - 2. DO we want to identify what these are and how they are defined---put a model policy into the paper: professional standards for providing an online course?
- v. Professional Guidelines and Effective Practices for Using Publisher Generated Course Materials
  - 1. From DE perspective, the REC for this kind of material is significant, but there are many non-DE classes that use these materials. Hence, this isn't specifically a DE problem.
  - 2. Should this be addressed via a Rostrum article or should it be in the paper?
  - 3. Caleb: we shouldn't tackle this, as it goes far beyond DE. Perhaps set up a framework for looking into this.

#### b. THE PAPER

- i. The draft needs work, obviously.
- ii. Kandace: We need more recent research. There is a PPIC paper from 2016 that talks about online education; this could help inform some of this paper.
- iii. Old 2008 paper is just too out of date, so a complete rewrite is needed—and

- that is what we are working on.
- iv. There was a reminder that this paper is Senate's position on professional standards for DE.
- v. Should the Professional Development section be included?
- vi. Outline: there was a discussion about whether some items need to be emphasized and others minimized (or taken out).
- vii. Who is the audience? It is for faculty who need basic information on the ins and outs of distance ed. [Does your course meet the minimum standards outlined in this paper, etc] The paper should also be targeted towards senates as well to develop policies around these effective practices. Regulatory issues are key: people need most guidance on these.
- viii. Instructional technology: focus less on specific tools and more on effective ways to utilize your college's tools.
- ix. Add something about governance over DE—committees, role of your DE Coordinator in Senate and Curriculum, etc.
- x. This is a Senate paper, so the focus should be on the senate's role in DE and faculty purview over DE issues.
- xi. Kandace will set up a Dropbox folder and share it with the committee to make it easier to collaborate.
- xii. John: Annotated bibliography to share all the different resources available with the field.
- xiii. Look into prison ed and dual enrollment as well for inclusion in some way in the paper
- xiv. We then reviewed the outline in order to alter/amend its structure: regular and effective contact, accessibility, curriculum, student support, and resources and infrastructure(?); governance issues are spread throughout. Then within each section: have a Must, Should, Can structure.
- xv. There was a great deal of discussion to fine-tune this structure, especially equity, digital literacy, accessibility.
- xvi. Regular and effective contact are the key words: predictable, relevant, faculty-supervised, faculty-initiated
- xvii. Working draft by November 21
- c. Ensuring the Appropriate use of Educational Technology: An update for local Academic Senates
- d. Definition of Hybrid Course
- e. Rostrum article ideas
- f. Resolution ideas
  - i. One idea thrown out by Kandace re: holding more online conference stuff online (zoom conferences, etc)
- g. Other?

# VI. Announcements

a. ASCCC Area meetings October 13 and 14, locations vary. Contact your area representatives.

- b. CTE Regional Meeting October 20, 2017 at College of Alameda. October 21, 2017 Chaffey College
- c. Civil Discourse and Equity Regional Meeting October 27, 2017 Solano College. October 28 Fullerton College
- d. ASCCC Fall Plenary Session, November 2-4, Irvine Marriott Hotel, Irvine Ca
  - Breakout: hot topics in DE; add conditions for enrollment resolution issue; possibly add the lab problem with DE; also discuss the OEI rubric issue; possibly curriculum discussion about how to evaluate DE proposals; also student authentication
- VII. Adjournment at 2:40 PM

# Part Time Committee Meeting August 21, 2017

Members in Attendance: Julie Adams, Don Hopkins, Caron Lieber, Arnita Porter, Kyle Hull

The meeting was called to order at 12:05pm

Julie Adams sent out the survey results from the Part Time Faculty Leadership Institute on Monday August 21 before the call.

The Part -time committee had a discussion about what worked and what did not at the Part-time Faculty Leadership Institute.

- Several members liked the organization of the Institute
- Everyone thought the sessions were informative and received great feedback from the participants during the Institute
- Everyone liked the folders that were given out to all the attendees.
- Everyone like the Mock interview. It was discussed about possibly having one of the audience members be the interviewee. Evidentially decided that would not productive since the audience members really did not have the time to adequately prepare.
- It was discussed about possibly making the breakout sessions longer than the hour and fifteen minutes.
- Was discussed about the lack of participation on the last day of the Institute on Saturday. Julie Adams mentioned that the last day of any of the ASCCC events usually sees a significant drop off.
- Several of the committee members thought that the presenters should have access to the hotel WIFI for their presentations.

The Part-time Committee discussed ways to improve the Part-time Faculty Leadership Institute if it was to be held again.

- Identify a key note speaker on Saturday to keep the attendees at the event.
- Place the bulk of the information on Friday with follow up breakout sessions on Saturday so that participants are encourage to stick around.
- Front load the importance of staying the entire time for the attendees.
- Have the reception on Friday night instead of Thursday.
- Survey the field to determine when most of the colleges are finished with summer school as not to compete with summer school.
- Have a sign in sheet at the registration table for faculty to meet with another faculty to go over their vitae, teaching philosophy, and interview skills.
- Limit the attendance to a maximum of five people per college. If more faculty sign up, put them on a wait list and add them if the attendance allows closer to the event.
- Explore the possibility of scholarships to attend the Part-ime Faculty Institute.

# Committee Future Work

- Developing a newsLetter to be sent out via the ASCCC Part-time faculty Listserv
- Research local senates that have part-time faculty representation on their local senates and use those senates to distribute Information to the part-time faculty from the ASCCC.

- Have the ASCCC push more information out to the Part-time faculty listserv.
- Resolution 1.01 S16: Research effective practices for Mentoring Part Time faculty.
  - o Arnita shared LACCD Project Match Mentor Program
    - https://www.laccd.edu/Departments/DistrictResources/OfficeOfDiversi ty/Pages/Project-Match.aspx



LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

# Part Time Faculty Committee Meeting 11 September 2017, 12-1 p.m.

# **Zoom Teleconference Information**

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/5462550600 Or iPhone one-tap (US Toll): +14086380968,5462550600# or +16465588656,5462550600 Dial: +1 408 638 0968 (US Toll) or +1 646 558 8656 (US Toll) Meeting ID: 546 255 0600

# **Minutes**

- I. Call to Order and Adoption of the Agenda
  - a. Call to Order at 12:04
  - b. Minute Taker: Dolores Davison
- II. Introductions and Members Present
  - a. Sam Foster, Chair; Dolores Davison, 2<sup>nd</sup>; Lakita Long; Caron Lieber; Guillermo Salazar; Feny X
- III. Planned In-person Meeting –North in Fall, South in Spring
  - a. Possible dates –18 October
  - b. Location Sacramento City College; Sam will work with Feny X to schedule rooms and logistics
  - c. Travel Logistics Sam will forward travel information to those who will be flying
  - d. Other?
- IV. Committee Priorities
  - See email attachment Mentoring program for part time faculty; collect effective practices and develop resources for mentoring part time faculty, and report finding to the body;
    - i. Are there funds set aside?
    - ii. How would we sustain this?
    - iii. What would the mentoring program look like, and how would we support and sustain it?
      - 1. Develop an online system of communication for mentors and mentees
      - 2. Send out an email about effective practices at colleges
      - 3. Website on the ASCCC site with effective practices accessible to all faculty
  - b. Part Time Faculty Institute
    - i. Timing for the institute: will check survey, but committee should start thinking about options
- V. Plenary Breakout Session
  - a. Potential Topics -
- i. Effective practices at local colleges

- ii. Talking about the previous institute and its successes
- iii. Combination of the two above
- iv. Sam will work up the description for the program`
- b. Presenters check with senate leadership about scholarships; potential
- VI. Possible Resolutions for Fall Plenary
  - a. Having a part timer on the ASCCC Executive Committee
  - b. Looking at bylaws about making election to the executive committee more facile
    - i. Committee agreed to research bylaws and previous resolutions for possible resolution for spring plenary
- VII. Other Items for Discussion
- VIII. Announcements/Events
  - a. OER Regional Meetings 15 and 16 September
  - b. CTE Regional Meetings 22 and 23 September
  - c. Fall Area Meetings 13 and 14 October, locations vary
  - d. Fall Plenary Session 2-4 November, Irvine Marriott
- IX. Adjournment 1:15pm



LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

### **RELATIONS TO LOCAL SENATES COMMITTEE**

September 11, 2017 12:15 PM – 1:00 PM

# **Zoom Teleconference Information**

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: https://zoom.us/j/935530855
Or iPhone one-tap: US: +14157629988,,935530855# or +16465687788,,935530855#
Or Telephone: Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
US: +1 415 762 9988 or +1 646 568 7788

Meeting ID: 935 530 855

# **MINUTES**

Members Present: Rebecca Eikey, Lee Gordon, Leigh Anne Shaw, Peggy Campo, Carrie Roberson, Cheryl Aschenbach

- I. Call to Order
- II. Note Taker: Rebecca Eikey
- III. Adoption of the Agenda: Approved as presented (not formal motion, by consensus)
- IV. Approval of Minutes from August 21, 2017: Approved as presented (not formal motion, by consensus)
- V. Meeting Schedule 2017-2018
  - a. Teleconference/Phone meetings October, March, April: Discussed mid-October as next meeting; Rebecca will send out a Doodle Poll
  - b. In-Person meeting(s) January 17, 2018 location TBD: Possible meeting locations such as Skyline College or Sacramento; **ACTION**: Rebecca will follow up with ASCCC office to see if how we can meet in Sacramento at the Chancellor's Office.
- VI. Status of Previous Action Items
  - a. Assigned Tasks
    - i. Leadership Survey Results (Leadership Institute 2017): Discussed the results of the Leadership Survey. The survey was given to participants of the 2017 Leadership Institute as a way of having initial results that could help guide the work of the committee; the committee agreed that the results indicated that local senate leaders need assistance when issues arise locally, which seems more like Technical Assistance Request; most respondents do not conduct local senate training; other feedback included that even though respondents have access to local leaders, they were interested in regional support; the committee wondered if a PDC module could be developed for this; however the Leadership Academy already exists, do local leader know about this and use it? The committee also discussed whether or not the survey should be repeated with the field as not all of the respondents were local senate presidents. It was agreed that it should.
      ACTION: Rebecca will follow up with ASCCC office to see if a survey can be sent to the field for local senate presidents only.

Data & Progress on Short Term & Long Term Plan (local visit planning/discussion) The Executive Committee would like this committee to develop guidelines for local senate visits, including sample letters. A draft of what the RwLS committee developed last year will be reviewed at their next meeting.

**ACTION:** Rebecca will send the committee a draft of the guidelines.

# VII. Fall 2017 Plenary Planning

- a. Break-out session topic(s): The committee discussed possible titles for the Breakout Sessions such as Senate ABCs for New Leaders including Navigating Plenary and Accessing ASCCC Resources" with perhaps a resource for each letter of the alphabet; the committee discussed how the second Breakout session (follow up to the Leadership Institute: "Attended Faculty Leadership but Still have Questions") could have a less formal format (start with key tenets and ensure time for discussion which would include activities to get the participants involved, such as fill out cards with "one-burning question" and organizing the questions into categories or themes; or having posters with certain topics related to the survey; the committee agreed that reviewing Plenary Breakout descriptions can be done via email.
- b. Newbie Breakfast: This will be a Meet and Greet and will include members of the Executive Committee; there was concern about attendance; however it was understood that the Meet & Greet room would be near the registration desk; there was a question about having "First-Timers" as a flag for badges.

**ACTION:** Rebecca will follow up with ASCCC office about "First-Timers" as a flag for badges.

c. Other ideas: not discussed

# VIII. Announcements and Events

- a. ASCCC Executive Committee Meeting, September 29-30, 2017
- b. ASCCC Area Meetings October 13 and 14, 2017
- c. ASCCC Executive Committee Meeting, November 1, 2017
- d. ASCCC Fall Plenary, November 2-4, 2017

# IX. Adjournment

# **Status of Previous Action Items**

# A. In Progress

1. Rostrum Article related to Spring 2015 Resolution 17.04 "Collegial Consultation with Local Senates on Student Learning Outcomes Policies and Procedures"

# B. Completed



LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

# **Resolutions Committee**

September 20, 2017 3:00 pm – 4:00 pm CCC Confer

Dial your telephone conference line: 1-913-312-3202\*

Presenter Passcode: 4943967 **Participant Passcode: 144324** 

\*Toll free number available: 1-888-886-3951

### **MINUTES**

**Members Present**: Michael Dighera, Geoffrey Dyer, Leigh Anne Shaw, Rebecca Eikey (2<sup>nd</sup>), Ginni May (chair), Donna Greene

Members Absent: Carrie Roberson

**Guests**: Randy Beach

- 1. Select note taker—Ginni
- 2. Approval of Agenda approved
- 3. Approval of minutes will approve minutes of this meeting by email. Committee members will send comments by Friday. If no comments sent, Ginni will assume a vote of approval. Will send final minutes Monday.
- 4. Share cell-numbers send to Ginni, she will distribute so that committee members can communicate during Area Meetings and Session.
- 5. Overview of Resolutions Committee and expectations of committee work this year:

# The Resolutions Committee Charge

The Resolutions Committee charge is to provide accurate and timely documents of the resolutions that eventually are adopted at the Senate Sessions. The process begins with Senate Committees that submit resolutions to the Executive Committee, which in turn adopts resolutions for submission to Area meetings where more resolutions may be written. A resolution document is in the packet at the Session and additional resolutions are developed there and printed at the Session. A final document for Plenary Session deliberation is prepared including resolutions and amendments.

Meetings – schedule as needed

Events – all Resolutions Committee members have responsibilities at the Area Meetings and the Plenary Sessions.

# Area Meetings Fall 2017

Area A/B, October 13, 2017, 10:00-3:00

Area C/D, October 14, 2017, 10:00-3:00

# Fall 2017 Plenary Session

November 2-4, 2017, Irvine Marriott (ends Saturday at 3:30 pm)

# Area Meetings Spring 2018

Area A/B, March 23, 2018, 10:00-3:00

Area C/D, March 24, 2018, 10:00-3:00

# Fall 2017 Plenary Session

April 12-14, 2018, San Mateo Marriott (ends Saturday at 3:30 pm)

- 6. Area Presentation and Post-Area Meeting responsibilities:
  - a. Power Point
  - b. Resolutions Packet
  - c. Following the Area Meeting, send recommended edits, questions, and new resolutions to Resolutions Chair
  - d. Be available to assist with Resolutions Packet after Area Meetings: research past positions; check for grammar, typos, format, clarity
- 7. Plenary Session Responsibilities:
  - a. Assist at Area meetings
  - b. Assist at Submitting Resolutions and Amendments Sessions (Thursday and Friday)
  - c. Assist in putting together the Resolutions Packet (Thursday and Friday evening)
  - d. Track and document outcomes of Resolution voting, will need time-keepers (Saturday)
  - e. Be available to proofread the Final Approved Resolutions packet after (a few days after) the Plenary Session
- 8. Review the Power Point Ginni will make discussed edits and return to committee members by Friday. Committee members will respond to Ginni by Monday.
- 9. Upcoming Events (http://asccc.org/calendar/list/events)
- 10. Future Meetings meet Wednesday night before plenary session
- 11. Adjourn

# **Status of Previous Action Items**

**A. In Progress** (include details about pending items such as resolutions, papers, *Rostrums*, etc.)

# **ASCCC Resolutions**

# Papers/Rostrums

**B.** Completed (include a list of those items that have been completed as a way to build the end of year report).



LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

# STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Thursday, September 27, 2017 10:30 AM - 3:30 PM Irvine Valley College 5500 Irvine Center Drive Irvine, CA 92618 Life Sciences Building (LSB) 103

S&P LiveBinder - http://www.livebinders.com/play/play?id=1833713

# **MINUTES**

# I. Call to Order and Selection of Note Taker

John called the meeting to order at 10:50a.m. Lorraine will be the recorder for this meeting. On zoom: Conan McKay, Emily Berg and guests LeBaron Woodward and Rita Levy from California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CO)

In room: John Freitas, Lorraine Slattery-Farrell and Chad Lewis Kathy Schmeidler joined the meeting in person at 11:20a.m.

II. <u>Meeting Calendar for Fall 2016</u> – January in-person meeting will be held on JANUARY 10<sup>TH</sup> in Sacramento

# III. Review of Committee priorities for 2016-2017 – see priorities spreadsheet

a. Resolutions assigned to Standards and Practices
Discussed the resolutions assigned to the committee.

10.01 and 10.03 S10, 10.03R (and amendments) F16—noncredit faculty and faculty identified in the other areas of Title 5 are not in support of removing MQs from Title 5. All the MQs that were mentioned in 2010 resolution are actually now in the Discipline's list. Discussion with Le Baron about this and all agreed we did not need to make this change. Instead, we perhaps need to look at the Discipline's list process for revisions and clarify language in the discipline's list handbook on how discipline faculty can initiate the process through local senates. Timeline for handbook revisions—goal of January 2018 have revision to Exec for first reading. Need to engage professional organizations (ACE, EOPS etc.) about their role in process.

<u>10.02 \$16</u> sub disciplines: address non master's disciplines in CTE specifically and the need for specialization. The toolkit project will address this.

<u>7.01 F16</u> apprenticeship programs: broader resolution to look at academic programs and not MQs. Recommendation to move this resolution be moved to Education Policies committee and Curriculum committee.

**10.01 F16**John needs to write a paragraph for the website and will send it to the committee for comment and review.

<u>10.02 F16</u> create new or emerging disciplines—some kind of catchall for courses that can be assigned to this "catchall". Need lots of discussion on how this needs to be monitored closely so it is not used as a loophole. We could possibly float this to the sub discipline taskforce group.

<u>17.01 F16</u>We had a CO advisory on MQs that sent paper to field on best practices around

this. We held regional meetings explaining this and promoting this as a best practice. John, Lorraine and Sarah Hopkins (HR specialist) just submitted a Rostrum article about this. This will also be handled in the toolkit work.

# 10.02 \$17—faculty internship

Le Baron and Rita will provide a paper to the committee by November meeting with guidance to the field on this. Once committee provides feedback, it will be modified and hopefully out to the field by first week of December. All key stakeholders will distribute the document widely.

Other components of the resolution need to be discussed at another meeting. Put on agenda for the next committee meeting. There is also a subgroup from the CO working on some of this so we can report back on this to the committee.

<u>10.03 AND 10.04 S17</u>—related issues but 2 separate resolutions. Looking at non Masters MQ, the experience regulations are the same regardless of level of education in the specific discipline.

Discussion of the senate's desire to create a "grow your own" faculty program—look at if students are getting degrees in their disciplines and bring them in as interns/faculty. Are students earning experience in their field? Could they get apprenticeship experience that would count? Pharmacy Tech has an established way to deal with this too—so could model after.

Need to address if this can be dealt with in the toolkit work—committee agrees to move this to the workgroup and have them report back.

**10.05 S17** — kicked to the Equivalency toolkit group again.

**10.06 S17**—apprenticeship MQs in discipline's list LeBaron thinks this could be incorporated as a section under Apprenticeship; could separate by credit and non-credit Should Apprenticeship be a category of its own? How are we specifying this in the discipline's list. Discussed parallels between CWE and apprenticeship; proposed changes to apprenticeship funding and how this could impact assigning courses to disciplines

# b. Task forces to address specific resolutions and Strong Workforce recommendations

- i. **Equivalency Toolkit Project (13.a. and 13.b.)** is being addressed through this project. John provided an overview of the project. The framework was discussed and shared with the committee.
- ii. **Subdisciplines Project** update and discussion (**13.a. and 13.b.**) John provided an overview of this project also and requested committee members provide feedback by early October. Robust discussion around single course equivalency and how as academics we are not in support of this. Our courses are not simply courses they are part of a holistic program of study—the depth and breadth of the discipline is critical in each class.
- iii. **Equivalency Effective Practices White Paper** ---John provided an update about this; this has been delayed until the toolkit work has been completed. There is a guidance document from CO workgroup, a Rostrum article and so waiting for more concrete examples of effective practices are established.
- iv. **Faculty Internships**—this recommendation **(14.e.)** ties in to the MQ workgroup from CO and we will figure out how to engage in that work.

- a. <u>Credit apprenticeship minimum qualifications</u> pending Title 5 change .

  John provided an overview of the work that has been done in the last year on this issue.

  Ongoing discussions with CO and engaged apprenticeship faculty in process. Hearings were held in May 2016 and opposition to the senate's involvement was asserted. Apprenticeship community is tied to trade unions and there are political overtones at work. Anticipated meetings in summer were not held and the CO is now looking to move a proposal forward. Timeline would still be to go to plenary in fall, Consultation in November/December, BOG in January and action in March. Le Baron mentioned the proposal was discussed with CIOs and offered an opportunity to provide feedback.
  - b. <u>Disciplines List change proposals</u>—no changes have been submitted at the time of this meeting (9/27). Deadline is 9/30

# c. <u>Updating of Disciplines List Revision Handbook or Revision of Disciplines List Revision</u> process?

Ideas/ Discussion: Discussion of how the process is currently very passive and reliant on the field to be vigilant about their areas and the changes needed. Need to have better way to reach discipline faculty since it currently sits with senate presidents to share. Communication issues—do all faculty understand what "discipline list" is? Equivalency committee chairs, curriculum committee chairs are also good folks to communicate with. Process that does not allow for Exec to start a proposal—even if there appears to be a critical need. Perhaps there should be a provision for Exec to be able to initiate a proposal. Perhaps look at C-ID structure as way to engage discipline faculty---create cycle for specific disciplines. Looking at degree titles and updating those is also important. The non-Masters list is very vague and could use more descriptive language around professional experience.

**Action:** Look at handbook and identify areas that need to be clarified so we can revise handbook within framework of current process and provide better explanation on how the process works. Committee to come to December meeting with ideas for revisions. John will discuss posting process to the CO website with LeBaron also. We have a FAQ on discipline list that could be disseminated more broadly.

# V. Fall plenary - November 2-4

- a. **Breakout sessions MQs:** The Basics and More. We will probably provide updates on the workgroups. Emily, Lorraine and John will work on the breakout together. John will distribute description before 10/6.
- **b.** Possible resolutions John and Craig Rutan (ASCCC Curriculum Chair) are writing a resolution around issue of apprenticeship and potential FTES apportionment and academic and professional implications around this.
- c. **Disciplines list hearing**—scheduled for the Friday of plenary. This is where the MQ change to apprenticeship will be done (2<sup>nd</sup> hearing). All committee members that are attending plenary need to be in attendance at the hearing. John asked that all members review the apprenticeship proposal before our next meeting. The committee will discuss in detail on 10/16 meeting.

# VI. Ideas for Rostrum articles

Rostrum on educating the field on discipline list—perhaps facts and myths of equivalency/MQ process. Committee will catalog some myths and facts between now and December. Submission deadline for rostrum is December 30<sup>th</sup>.

VII. <u>Exemplary Program Award</u>—At our 11/13 committee meeting we will have a norming session by looking at a sample of applications and go through the rubric. The committee

members all need to review applications except the applications from their own college.

# VIII. <u>Announcements</u>

- a. Next meeting October 16, 2017, 8:30-9:30 (Zoom)
- b. ASCCC Area meetings October 13 (North)and 14 (South), locations vary. Contact your area representatives.
- c. ASCCC Fall Plenary Session, November 2-4, Irvine Marriott
- d. Fall Regional Meetings CTE, Civil Discourse and Equity, Curriculum. Click here for more information.
- e. Accreditation Institute February 23-24. Pre-session on February 22. Wyndham Anaheim-Garden Grove.

# IX. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:10p.m.

# Notes on AEBG Math Crosswalk Meeting October 10, 2017 10 to 2:40 CCCCO Sacramento

- I. Welcome, Introductions, & Background
  - A. Reviewed the EFL's (Educational Functioning Level Descriptors)
    - The descriptors are entry-level descriptors and illustrate what a typical student functioning at that level should be able to do.
    - Nationally recognized
    - o Six levels relative to the crosswalk discussion
      - ABE Adult Basic Education Levels
      - Beginning ABE
      - Beginning Basic Education
      - Low Intermediate Basic Education
      - High Intermediate Basic Education
      - Low Adult Secondary Education
      - High Adult Secondary Education
    - It was noted the EFL's were being updated to include statistics and quantitative reasoning.
      - · We may be looking at this at our next meeting
  - B. Reviewed the CB-21 Rubric (2009)
    - o 4 levels
      - Basic Mathematics (Arithmetic)
      - Pre-Algebra
      - Elementary Algebra
      - Intermediate Algebra
  - C. Reviewed Competency Maps developed by the CAI Math Workgroup
    - It appears that the transfer level competencies were removed
    - o Do not map with the College & Career Readiness Standards
      - Will address at a future meeting
- II. One level below Transfer: Intermediate Algebra
  - The group started by looking at the Competency Maps for Intermediate Algebra to see what EFL they would map to
  - The group determined it would be better to start with four levels below transfer
- III. Four levels below transfer: Basic Mathematics (Arithmetic)
  - The group looked at what each competency would map to a EFL.
  - After a few competencies, it was determined that the ELF Low Adult Secondary Education and Pre-Algebra did not map directly for some of the Low Adult Secondary Ed would map to Basic Math
  - o Also, were we looking at exit skills or prereq skills?
    - Group determined we would look at prereg skills
- IV. Prerequisite skills

- A. Using the CB-21 Rubric as our guideline, the CC faculty labeled each competency as to what it would be a prereq for at a CC
  - Any competency that had trigonometry was above transfer
    - Should note that a few of these competencies had other topics that would be a prereq for transfer level.
  - In a few instances, there was discussion on what our local college did and how broad the CB-21 Rubik was.
    - It was noted that a few years ago there were two DIGs were CB-21 Rubric was reviewed for potential updates. Also that the Basic Skills Math FDRG had reviewed.
- B. Using the EFLs, the Adult Ed, Noncredit, and High School faculty labeled each competency as to what it would be a prereq for at in terms of EFLs.
  - One Noncredit college stated they offer thru Algebra II in their program, it was decided they would not map this.

# V. Next Steps

- Competency Maps with prereqs and notes will be available on Google Docs for review and vote at the October 19 (9 to 11) conference call
- Anticipating having an in person meeting before Winter Break.
  - o Go over/map College & Career Readiness Standards and new EFLs.

# **California Community Colleges Curriculum Committee (5C)**

# August 24, 2017 10 AM – 3 PM Chancellor's Office Room 638A

Committee Members Present:	ASCCC: Cheryl Aschenbach, Randy Beach, Nili Kirschner, Ginni May, LaTonya Parker,Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, Tiffany Tran	
	CCCCIO: Irene Malmgren, Eric Shearer	
	Liaisons: Kim Harrell (CCCAOE), Jan Young (ACCE)	
	Chancellor's Office: Jackie Escajeda, Marilyn Perry	
Committee Members Absent:	Leandra Martin (CIO)	
Committee Members by	None	
Phone:		
Guests:	Kirsten Corbin (CCCCO), Raul Arambula (CCCCO), Mark Cohen	
	(COCI), Lynn Shaw (CCCCO), David Shippen (Tech Center), Pamela	
	Shaw (COCI), Jake Knapp (CCCCO)	
Chairs:	Virginia Guleff and Craig Rutan	
Meeting Location:	Chancellor's Office Room 638A	

# 1. Welcome and Introductions

Craig noted that there are no reports on this agenda because there are too many other items to cover today and the Chancellor's Office requested that there not be reports at this meeting to allow us more time to get work done.

- 2. Minutes from June 2017 meeting were approved with two minor changes.
  - a. Meeting dates for 2017-18 were established: Thursday, September 21, 2017 10:00-3:00 at Chancellor's Office
  - b. Thursday, October 19, 2017 10:00-3:00 at Chancellor's Office
  - c. Thursday, November 16, 2017 10:00-3:00 at Chancellor's Office
  - d. Friday, December 15, 2017 10:00-3:00 at Chancellor's Office
  - e. Friday, January 26, 2018 10:00-3:00 at Chancellor's Office
  - f. Thursday, February 15, 2018 10:00-3:00 at Chancellor's Office
  - g. Friday, March 16, 2018 10:00-3:00 at Chancellor's Office
  - h. Friday, April 20 2018 10:00-3:00 at Chancellor's Office
  - i. Thursday, May 17, 2018 10:00-3:00 at Chancellor's Office
  - j. Thursday, June 7, 2018 10:00-3:00 at Chancellor's Office

# 3. Review of 5C Charter

CCCCO titles have changed, so charter will need to be updated and approved at the

next meeting.

### 4. New Credit Course Certification

Jackie gave an update on the certification form. Senate president and CEO signatures will now be required in addition to CIO and Curriculum Chair. New courses to new programs will now be included in the certification. It will go out by early September with a due date of October 16.

# 5. Units/Hours – Increments less than 0.5 units

A problem has come up with calculation of credit units/hours. Title 5 55002.5e (new) refers to rounding down in 0.5 unit increments unless a college allows less than 0.5 units. The question is whether you can have a minimum unit size less than 0.5 units but use 0.5 as the rounding interval or whether colleges have to use the same minimum units as is used to round. It needs to be clarified, and then the COCI technology will use the proper decimal for rounding. Jake Knapp consulted briefly with the initial thought that there is latitude to use varying rounding intervals and will look further into the matter and discuss it with CO colleagues. With legal input, 5C will provide a recommendation to the Chancellor's Office so the COCI system can be set up to work as agreed. Erik Shearer reminded everything there is some guidance in the PCAH and that local policies will need to be developed. It was also suggested that the Chancellor's Office provide guidance regarding potential impacts of decisions made when colleges develop their local policies.

# 6. Revisions to §55040 to add EW

The Chancellor's Office has asked for a new grade of EW (Excused Withdrawal) primarily to help incarcerated students who are transferred or have their education interrupted involuntarily not have to deal with consequences of having W grades on their transcript. ASCCC has read it and provided feedback. ASCCC President Julie Bruno has asked 5C to provide additional feedback. There was some discussion that expanding the definition to include additional student populations puts the faculty in a difficult situation, but limiting it to only incarcerated students essentially "outs" a student when the EW is seen on a transcript. A&R folks are going to be asked for input as well. Generally, the committee was more uncomfortable with including additional populations than with the idea of an EW for incarcerated students. One final suggestion was to consider including incarcerated student withdrawals into the provisions of 55024(a)(10).

- 7. Definition of substantial/non-substantial change to existing credit programs
  Jackie suggested that there be a redefinition of substantial and non-substantial
  changes. This was a conversation started years ago, but the time is right to redefine
  both in order to help with streamlining and reduce the need for the Chancellor's Office
  to review individual courses.
  - a. There needs to be more clarity under substantial reasons for specific TOP Code changes: change to or from occupational TOP code

- b. Goals and objective change needs to be turned off for a period of time while colleges update using the COCI goal options, then this can go back to triggering a substantial change because of the different supporting paperwork that is needed. The only place program goal is used is at the point of submission; the purpose is to alert the CO staff how to review the document (what documents are needed). This is not an MIS element and is not used in any other way.
- c. Movement of low-unit certificate of achievement to 18+ unit certificate or the reverse is a unit change and should be a non-substantial change

# 8. Review and update membership of 5C task forces

Workgroup	Members	Task
Catalog rights	Craig, Virginia, Jackie,	It needs to meet before
	Cheryl, Dave	September 21
	DeGroot, Marilyn	
Cooperative Work	Kim, Eric, Lorraine,	This includes a review/cleanup
Experience	Eric Nelson, Maureen	of CWE Title 5 language,
	White	particularly hours/units and
		half-unit increments, CWE plans,
		and how orientation/check-in
		hours are counted, all with an
		intent to incorporate CWE into
		streamlining
Area of Emphasis	Raul, Randy, Tiffany,	Title 5 language defines an area
Degrees	Irene, Nili	of emphasis degree based on
		TOP code, but colleges didn't
		follow the TOP code definitions
		when designing the degree.
		Committee needs to discuss
		whether regulation needs to be
		changed to better reflect
		original intent or current
		practice. Field is looking for
		guidance about how big or small
		the degrees should be,
		particularly for number of
		electives, and more. Eric Shearer
		may provide some of the questions/concerns that came
		up during a presentation on this
		at Curriculum Institute
CB21/Basic Skills (ESL	Craig, Kirsten, Cheryl,	at carried and motitate
Coding)	Leandra, Ginni, Jan	
On hold/as needed:		May meet later

<ul> <li>Title 5</li> <li>Courses related in content</li> <li>Noncredit</li> </ul>		•	ASCCC Ed Pol will examine courses related in content/course repetition guidelines May later need to discuss & finish comingling credit/noncredit, co- req/prereq guidance
Future:  • CCLC Curric info	Eric, Randy, Kim, Raul, Jackie	•	Provide info for CCLC Trustees handbook/training

# 9. Update on COCI

Version 1.4 was launched at the start of last week with several bugs addressed and problems addressed. New problems were identified; they were taken care of with a hot fix. Now working on the next set of high priority items. Version 1.5 will be focused on fixing identified problems. One new item is the issuance of approval letters. Mark expressed his excitement for starting to work on prioritizing future work rather than concentrating on fixes. Pamela reported that a communications plan is in the works to address the realization that communications with the field could be improved. Marilyn provided feedback on her own experience with course and program submissions along with general feedback based on postings to the curriculum specialists listserve.

# 10. Creation of COCI subgroup of 5C

This group will work on establishing priorities for COCI. Members: Craig, Virginia, Jackie, Raul, Chantee, Kirsten, Nili, Marilyn, Eric, and Cheryl. Additional folks can be included in meetings on an as needed basis. This could include a noncredit curriculum Dean and specialist. Mark and David Shippen both expressed that the group will be needed to work on establishing immediate priorities but will also be establishing more long-range planning. Mark asked whether this group should also have any role in C-ID

11. Trustee Handbook – Request for section on curriculum from CCLC
Jackie met with Lizette Navarro, and CCLC would like some information about
curriculum to put into the trustee training handbook. It's not clear what the timeline is.
It would also be helpful to have parameters for what Lizette is looking for. Once we
have that information from CCLC, the workgroup can get together.

# 12. TOP Code manual and CIP Code Crosswalk

TOP Codes preceded CIP (Federal) Codes. We create new TOP Codes, but it's not clear what the process is for deciding when one should be created and how to request it. In the future, 5C should decide what group recommends to the Chancellor's Office (it would probably be 5C). We should also look more closely at the TOP-CIP Code Crosswalk; there are more TOP Codes that are not in the CIP Crosswalk. Plus, we should

align a CIP Code whenever a TOP Code is created. Someday TOP codes might go away as long as every program has a CIP code, but for now TOP codes are used in every data tool we have and aren't going anywhere. Craig, Virginia, and Jackie will outline a set of procedures to be considered at our next meeting.

13. Financial Aid and Low Unit Certificates of Achievement

Future agenda:
Noncredit/Credit comingling
(Cheryl will submit notes from last spring's work)

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

# CIO Executive Board Summary September 20, 2017

# 1. Strong Workforce Program

- a. Tab integrating SWP and AEBG has been added to Launchboard.
- b. Metrics for SWP and AEBG have been aligned through WIOA.
- c. CIOs report hearing rumors about possible integration of SWP and ARBG funding.
- d. CTE rebranding effort (Career Education) is underway with the goal of increasing transparency.

# 2. Apprenticeship

- a. ASCCC presented the different proposals for revisions to the minimum qualifications for credit apprenticeship instructors. Several CIOs expressed concern that the emergency provision in the Chancellor's Office proposal could expand and be applied to other disciplines. The CIOs did not take a position on which proposal they would support.
- b. The Chancellor's Office reported that they are trying to allow colleges to collect FTES for apprenticeship programs (currently funded through Montoya Funds) beginning in Fall 2018. This change would apply to new apprenticeship programs and existing programs would be allowed to shift to the FTES funding model.

# 3. Technology, Research, and Information Systems

- a. Full audit and evaluation of the division is currently underway.
- b. A visiting Vice Chancellor will be brought in and tasked with improving the student experience
- c. The division will be renamed Digital Innovations and Information Systems
- d. A guided pathways tab has been added to Launchbard. The new tab is based on the AACC Guided Pathways model.

# 4. Educational Services

- a. Transfer agreement with Western Governors University (WGU) to accept students that complete an ADT.
- b. All colleges, including the 3 AACC and 20 California Guided Pathways colleges, must attend a self-assessment workshop. A crosswalk will be provided to the 23 colleges participating in other guided pathways projects to help with the completion of the self-assessment.
- c. Colleges participating in the Chancellor's Office Guided Pathways program will need to complete a self-assessment and a multi-year workplan. Funding is expected in March and colleges will have five years to spend funding. 55% of funding will be allocated in years 1 and 2.
- d. Chancellor's Office would like the UC to accept all ADTs and not create a new degree program for UC transfer students that is different from the one for CSU transfer students.
- e. Educational Services will be surveying colleges that have completed the more challenging ADTs (chemistry, biology, physics, computer science, and music) to

determine how those colleges were able to meet the requirements outlined in SB440.

# 5. ACCJC

- a. Will be attending the October 5C meeting to work on alignment between the substantive change process and substantial changes with the Chancellor's Office.
- b. New ALO pre-session at the ASCCC Accreditation Institute.
- c. New peer reviewer training at the ASCCC Accreditation Institute.
- d. ACCJC is planning to move all Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) training to individual campuses.

Respectfully Submitted,

Craig Rutan



# **COMMON ASSESSMENT INITIATIVE**

# Common Assessment Initiative Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes Embassy Suites Sacramento June 14, 2017

	First	Last	Organization	Representing
Р	David	Beydler	Mt San Antonio College	ASCCC (6): Math-Basic Skills (1)
Р	David	Chun	Sacramento County Office of Ed	K-12 (2)
Р	Erik	Cooper	Sierra College	Assessment Directors (2)
Р	Marie	Eckstrom	Rio Hondo College	ASCCC (6): English-Basic Skills (1
Р	Arleen	Elseroad	Irvine Valley College	Admissions & Records (1)
Р	Susan	Gaer	Santa Ana College	ASCCC (6): ESL-Noncredit (1)
Р	Megan	Goudy	Antelope High School	K-12 (2)
Р	Louise	Jaffe .	Santa Monica College	Trustee(1)
Р	Alejandro	Lomeli	Student	Student Senate
Р	Connie	Moise	Palomar College	CISOA (1)
О	Sydney	Rice	Imperial Valley College	ASCCC (6)
Р	Josh	Roberts	Sacramento City College	ASCCC (6): English-Basic Skills (1
Р	Craig	Rutan	Santiago Canyon College	ASCCC
Ex-	U	oting Members		
Р	Tim	Calhoon	Butte College	CAI Partners
Ο	Bruce	Gilman	Saddleback College	CAI Partners
Р	Matt	Wetstein	Delta College	CAI Partners
Sta	ff and Partner	s:		
Р	Caryn	Albrecht	Butte College	CAI Partners
Ρ	Marina	Aminy	Saddleback College	CAI Partners
Р	Gary	Barnak	Saddleback College	CAI Partners
Р	Amy	Beadle	Butte College	CAI Partners
Ρ	Sean	Burke	Butte College	CAI Partners
Ρ	Jennifer	Coleman	Butte College	CAI Partners
Ρ	William	Fisher	UC Berkeley	CAI Partners
Ρ	Russell	Grant	CCCCO	CAI Partners
Ρ	John	Hadad	Butte College	CAI Partners
Р	Marissa	Jackson	Butte College	CAI Partners
Р	James	Lanich	CalPass Plus	CAI Partners
Р	Melissa	McManus	Butte College	CAI Partners
Р	Rhonda	Mohr	cccco	CAI Partners
Р	Mallory	Newell	De Anza	CAI Partners
О	Minerva	Perez	SJ Delta College	Project Monitor
Р	Eric	Skinner	cccco	CAI Partners
Р	Ken	Sorey	CalPass Plus	CAI Partners
0	Gary	Thompson	Unicon	CAI Partners
P	Adrienne	Vaughan	Butte College	CAI Partners
P	Pam	Walker	CCCCO	CAI Partners
P	Monica	Zalaket	Butte College	CAI Partners
	ests		Ü	
Р	Julie	Bruno	Academic Senate	
Р	Paul	Feist	cccco	
P	Stacy	Fisher	Foundation	
P	Barbara	Illowsky	Foothill De-Anza	OEI
Р	Terry	Kinney	CA Focus	<del></del> :
P	Tim	Nguyen	RP Group	External Evaluator
P	Terrence	Willett	RP Group	
	Terrence	VVIIICLL	iii Gioup	

Craig Rutan called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

P = Present, O = Online

Key:

# Item 1 - Introductory Business: Information

Attendees introduced themselves.

# Item 2 – Approval of Minutes: Action

There were no corrections to the minutes for April 4, 2017. Marie Eckstrom moved to approve the minutes and the motion was seconded by Josh Roberts. The motion passed.

# Item 3 – Questions and Clarifications: Information

There were some questions but they will be asked during the Chancellor's Office presentation.

# Item 4 – Annual Business: Action

# 4.1 Election of Co-Chair:

Craig Rutan was nominated at the last meeting. No other nominations were received. Louise Jaffe moved to approve Craig's nomination by acclamation and Erik Cooper seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

# Item 5 – Multiple Measures: Information

# 5.1 MMAP Phase III Project Update:

Mallory Newell went through the report which was included in the agenda. The report included accomplishments over the last three years including: developing multiple measures models, supporting pilot colleges, developing resources for colleges, working with partner organizations, and sharing lessons learned with the field. She went on to talk about the current integration of MMAP into institutional and statewide initiatives including work with the Basic Skills Initiative, State Equity Plan, and Student Support Services Program Plans. Mallory also talked about integration with: California Acceleration Project, California Guided Pathways Project, Student Success Scorecard, and how MMAP might be integrated into other initiatives. There is still a lot of work to be done. Over the next year or two they need to: continue to develop more multiple measures models, evaluate the multiple measures models, and provide ongoing support to pilot colleges.

Pam Walker asked how all of the Chancellor's Office entities understood everything that has been done in the MMAP project. She suggested there should be work on developing better linkages between good programs. Both Erik Skinner and Pam Walker acknowledged low staffing had probably resulted in less awareness than there should be and thought the Chancellor's Office needed to educate itself better and work on closing gaps. Craig Rutan asked about leveraging work the Dual Enrollment group has been doing. Integration conversations would help everybody. Erik suggested having a half-day meeting with a cross sectional group of Chancellor's Office team members.

Next steps should also include learning from research. Louise Jaffe thought there was a tendency to jump ahead without learning. For example, some colleges are using self-reported data, it is important to look at research to see if that practice is better than not using it. There is still a lot

of work to be done in a number of areas. There is also a need to put more focus on throughput and not just on course success. Matt Wetstein also noted the need to do a larger context analysis on other programs being provided simultaneously that have an impact on student success and throughput.

The group agreed colleges will need assistance in validating local models. It is also important to publicize bad impacts as well as good ones. Colleges need to be encouraged to be honest about the things that don't work. It is critical to learn from the research so that those things that work can be included in rules engines and ones that don't work can be taken out.

Mallory discussed long term sustainability for MMAP. There are about sixty-four colleges using MMAP and if AB 705 passes the others will need to get onto some kind of high school based multiple measures. Those colleges that haven't come on yet will probably need support. She also thought it would be important to create a central location to house multiple measures activities and to be the spokesperson for multiple measures going forward. Perhaps that could be in the Chancellor's Office or somewhere else where: questions can be addressed, a website can be maintained, and someone can serve as a liaison with CCCAssess regarding updates. Craig Rutan cautioned awareness of balance between a statewide mandate and local control. The Chancellor's Office has been reluctant to take away local decisions and there can be a lot of pushback against taking away local control and giving it to the system. Discussion of a centralized location and definition of multiple measures may get pushback. From the beginning there has been a challenge with the common assessment being legislatively mandated. Colleges prefer the legislature to stay out of anything that is in their purview.

The strength of multiple measures has come about because of the ability to take high school data and connect it with college data. The project will be stronger and stronger with the ability to refine and improve with more data, not with less. Louise cautioned against thinking about multiple measures as a standalone project without the Common Assessment. It is stronger as a combined system. Having multiple measures as part of the project has strengthened it this year, but she felt it would be counter-productive to start spinning MMAP as a separate project. Ken noted their recommendation was for continuation of the combined effort. This is not only a data and technology project; it is also a people engine. Members asked what percentage of CCC students do not have high school data and James Lanich explained roughly half of community college students are twenty-five or over without access to high school data, but they still might be able to use self-reported data. There are also students who are international or come from out of state.

# 5.2 MMAP Summary of Pilot College Implementation:

Ken Sorey presented preliminary outcome results from a small subset of colleges. This was requested by the Advisory Committee at the last couple of meetings and the full report was included in the agenda package. He noted that since each college has local control, there is not an easy way to aggregate the data. However, they did work to standardize how data is represented so it can be compared in context. He cautioned there was still a need to look at throughput since it may ultimately be more important.

A quick summary of results comparing transfer level English success rates between students using just the test or also using multiple measures showed they were usually within one or two points or multiple measures were outpacing schools just using a test. The results for colleges using multiple measures included some using a disjunctive model of best placement from test or multiple measures and others more closely aligned with the original Long Beach model than with the current MMAP model. Work is still needed to separate out how many students would have placed into transfer level courses on the basis of only their test or only multiple measures.

The math sample was very small and the results vary quite a bit. Peralta, for example, had a fair amount of variation in how multiple measures were implemented by counselors and they later revised it to something closer to the MMAP model. San Diego originally wasn't differentiating very well between the different transfer level math courses and allowed students to select from many instead of taking note of specifics in some of the recommendations.

The group discussed the definitions of college-level versus transfer-level courses. It comes up in whether or not courses are degree applicable or not.

This report didn't get into throughput; the first area of MMAP emphasis was student success and the promise of putting students who were able to succeed in courses. Throughput increases when students are placed higher because they have to take fewer courses to finish the sequence. It will take some time to get throughput data. Louise explained throughput is also one of the IEPI indicators with focus on transfer level year one and transfer level year two.

Mallory also noted there has been a consistent issue with not being able to get data back from all sixty-four colleges. As they increase these types of presentations and make it clear that is part of being a pilot, they hope to get more data back.

The multiple measures methodologies used by the schools were different from one another and were included at the end of the report.

5.3 English as a Second Language Multiple Measure Development- Research Brief:

Terrence provided an overview of ESL multiple measures development and some of the complexities involved. The brief included information about: course sequence variation, the data set, a decision-tree predictive analysis, multiple measures for ESL students, success variability by high school and college, and future research and limitations.

In creating validated multiple measures for ESL students that draw from their high school achievement data, this research study made rules for each of three categories of ESL sequences:

- 1. Top level of ESL is transfer-level
- 2. Top level of ESL is one level below transfer-level
- 3. Top level of ESL is two or more levels below transfer-level

The placement rules had similarities to those for English with cumulative high school grade point average (GPA) having stronger predictive utility than other high school achievement data such as course grades and test scores. However, most incoming ESL students at community colleges do not have high school data available; therefore, test scores and other multiple measures, such as the number of years studying English or the highest level of prior formal education, will be of great value. Additionally, the vast majority of students who were identified as English as a Second Language speakers in high school (87%) did not take ESL in community college, but instead enrolled in English courses designed for native speakers. For those who do have high school data available, it appears that concerns about great variability in ESL students' academic outcomes due to high school origin or college destination do not appear supported within this data set. It appears that ESL students will benefit from extra questions on the application to gather multiple measures information. The question that currently matters most is for how many years have you been studying English?

The brief included statistics broken into four categories related to high school ELL designation or course history and whether or not the student was taking ESL in community college. There are a large group of students on community college campuses at different stages of English language development. Community colleges also have sequences of different lengths so success rates were calculated after breaking then down into level by course type for the first community college language arts course taken. Rule sets were created for various course sequence lengths identified. However, Susan Gaer noted there is a small subset of students for whom the rule set would be useful since so many students come up through non-credit courses to credit courses and don't come from high school. Therefore, high school transcripts aren't as useful and tests are more important. Terrence agreed, that is where supplemental questions come in, since finding the right course and the appropriate support services will be important. There are also colleges where ESL courses are parallel to English courses and students can jump over to the other sequence if desired. Additionally, some ESL courses count for transfer level CSU or UC elective credit for English language learning, but not as transfer level for Freshman Composition.

Susan encouraged the MMAP team to dialogue with ESL faculty members who are expert in language learning. Terrence will direct appropriate staff toward ESL faculty. Susan also suggested getting the AEBG Consortium involved, and contacting Diana Bautista. Both non-credit and credit faculty are in CTESOL and want to be of service.

About 10% of the ESL population in the community college system is covered in this brief. Later Tim Nguyen reported that if FTES are represented by TOP code, the population of ESL students is about 2% on the credit side and about 38% of non-credit. This comes out to about 4% overall.

The brief included an appendix of Common Assessment Initiative English Language Arts pre-test-let questions and another appendix of ESL multiple measures questions that are currently being used by some community colleges.

5.4 Validating Placement Systems Comprising Test and Multiple Measure Information:

There are two types of placement error: over-placement in which the student is placed above their ability to succeed, and under-placement in which the student could have been successful at a higher level. Under-placement tends to be invisible and results in a cost of extra time to the student.

There are two distinct aspects of validation that should be conducted: (1) psychometric properties of the test instrument and of the predictive validity of non-test measures of student capacity and (2) validating the decisions made based on the output of the placement system. The second aspect of validation is the focus of this report. Test validation includes a number of important and wellknown metrics such as reliability, content validity, construct validity, and bias assessment. The validation of the actual placement decisions made on the basis of tests and other information, however, is less well-developed. The current California Community College Chancellor's Office standards call for validating placement decisions by asking students (and faculty) whether they felt they were properly placed. Such a form of validation is far from definitive as students are not experts in assessment and placement and, in such a situation, are subject to cognitive biases such as system justification and confirmation bias. The report described how to validate placement decisions using objective key metrics including throughput, throughput rate, predictive validity, and disproportionate impact. The first multiple measures evaluation metric looks at predictive validity and the second at optimizing throughput. Throughput is a proportion of a cohort of students who complete a gatekeeper course of some kind. Usually that is a transfer level course, but it could be at another level is the student goal is lower than transfer. This model takes into account the attrition costs of placing a student at a lower starting level.

# Action Item:

Erik Cooper asked Rhonda to put the predictive validity model on the agenda for the assessment work group. This report showed that at least a 0.15 correlation equivalent is sufficient, but the current standard is more rigorous, so a discussion needs to happen about that.

It is important to conduct disproportionate impact analyses for both transfer level course success rates and for throughput rates. The general recommendation is to have sufficient predictive validity to maximize throughput while minimizing disproportionate impact. There is a tradeoff between compensatory and disjunctive models. The math team is recommending disjunctive because it seems to be the best at disproportionate impact reduction for the best throughput maximization. However, compensatory models, especially at higher levels of math can have higher predictive validity. Louise felt over time a compensatory/blended model would get better. There are a lot of things happening at the same time with changes in K-12 and as there is increased engagement and alignment with K-12 things will improve. Terrence explained that in fact, if curriculum was directly articulated between the K-12 and community college system, there would be no need for a test. However, there will always be students from out of state, etc. so there will be a need for the test.

CCCAssess, as designed, also doesn't have a cut-score and instead is being mapped at each college to the curriculum being offered at that college. That will complicate things and makes professional

development very important. There is a plan to train local researchers, because even with the same curriculum on paper, things can map differently making it more complicated and interesting. This test also presents challenges with respect to whether it is feasible to use a compensatory model. The disjunctive model would be easier to implement.

Over time, as faculty get feedback, they will alter their curriculum. The goal of the initiative is to see that curricular change over time. The compensatory model might not make sense, but a blended model could. If colleges find that students who placed into transfer level math based on assessment tests have low success rates, it would make sense to look at adding support pieces to improve student success. A blended model will continue to make sense as more data and information about the student is available, as long as the weighting of the elements is proportionate to their predictive validity. It can be thought of as adjustments and continuous improvements being made to the model.

# 5.5 AB705 Update:

This bill has been amended multiple times; last on May 30th. It has passed the Assembly and is expected to be assigned to the Senate Education Committee. Craig Rutan believes it will pass. The Senate is still in communication with the author re specific language about getting students through transfer level courses in one year, because not all students are intending to transfer. It is important not to have an unintended consequence of disadvantaging or hurting CTE students or those with other goals.

Use of high school data is embedded in the language of the bill, but it does not necessarily require use of MMAP models. If transcripts are not available, colleges are permitted to use self-reported information. It also calls on the Chancellor's Office to develop guidelines and regulations around the language of the bill. It isn't clear how everything will end up but it does seem apparent this will happen. Colleges will have to do this in math and English; ESL is not included. The wording in the bill is something like "one or more of: high school GPA, high school courses taken, and high school course grades," must be included. Early versions said high school performance data and didn't specify particular items. How colleges choose to implement the bill will still be a local decision unless something changes. Basically, if there is something colleges are doing that increases the likelihood of completing a transfer level course within one year, that is what they are supposed to do.

### Action Item:

Rhonda will communicate with Government Relations to make sure to address a concern expressed in the committee that this language might undo the work of EAP. There were also concerns about whether colleges could still use co-requisites in courses below transfer level.

Matt noted the bill as currently written applies to transfer level placement; what happens at lower levels is under local control. The bill calls upon the Board of Governors to develop regulations around multiple measures, and if desired, the Chancellor's Office could cover these elements in regulatory language. Programs like EAP are also in Ed Code and aren't going away. The committee

suggested when the Chancellor's Office puts out language about AB 705 they try to learn from experiences with the multiple measures memo that took several revisions to be clear.

Each attempt to tweak this bill in conversations with the author has resulted in more restrictive language. Craig explained that at this point the Academic Senate is leaning toward not opposing and not supporting the bill.

What is happening with the CSU requirement of Intermediate Algebra for nine specific majors? There was a very serious meeting last week which included Academic Senate Presidents of both institutions and both Chancellors' Offices, along with the acceleration folks. A combined statement will be going out. Julie Bruno will also be doing some additional guidance and work with colleges to make sure the acceleration work is connected together. This is a significant issue to the faculty members of both systems and they need to come together inter-segmentally and make decisions on this work around acceleration. Pam explained it was a productive meeting on both sides. Unfortunately there has been a great deal of miscommunication or communication that didn't quite have all the necessary pieces attached to it. There was never a time when the community college system wasn't trying to be part of this connection and be supportive of the work being done. Both the CSU and the CCC are supportive of this work. There was a healthy discussion, and conversations will continue in the fall when faculty is available.

The memo about the nine majors is currently on hold and none of those requirements are currently in place for students. Students transferring fall 2017 will not be impacted.

# Item 6 – CCCCO Updates: Information

6.1 Chancellor's Office Reasoning for Audit:

Pam Walker explained that Debra Connick was unable to attend today due to a death in the family, so instead a team of Chancellor's Office representatives were there as a second team to present information and answer questions.

Some period of time ago the Chancellor's Office decided to do a deeper dive into the CAI project. They knew everyone was working hard and had a great deal of ownership after three years and a lot of hard work. Pam acknowledged turnover at the Chancellor's Office and at colleges brought up speculation and questions about what was happening. The Chancellor's Office wanted to make sure they were fully informed about what was happening with the project in order to communicate clearly and accurately with the legislature, Governor's office, faculty and colleges. The Common Assessment needs to serve colleges and students well, so the Chancellor's Office decided to take a moment to pause a program review and audit. They now have those significant findings and Pam and her colleagues will help CAI with what they think are the next best steps.

# 6.2 Project Audit Significant Findings:

The CAI project as currently planned, staffed, executed, and managed appears unlikely to achieve its near term goal of successfully producing a viable validation package by July 17, 2017 and

beginning a full offering of math, English, and ESL tests for all pilot colleges adopting in September 2017.

# Six key findings are:

- 1) The project schedule is not credible. It is not well formed, does not reflect a credible estimate, shows tasks assigned to people who are no longer on the project, and during our observation period several significant and necessary deliverable dates came and went without producing the work products included in the project's most recent plan.
- 2) The validation package is unlikely to be ready according to the current schedule. In addition to the credibility issues of the schedule, our team requested information about the approach and results achieved to date regarding data gathering and analysis that went largely unanswered or were answered in a superficial way. The sequence in which the package components are being created defies logic and makes acceptable precision unlikely.
- 3) The validation package currently targeted for mid-July delivery will likely have difficulty getting initial approval. According to the psychometrician who was on the team that looked at this project, the blueprint document that identifies competencies, content, and skill levels to be assessed that is used as the basis for creation of questions to test those competencies for targeted subject areas is one of the first things developed for an assessment instrument. It would drive the creation, development, data collection, and validation of that assessment instrument. According to the project schedule, the blueprints will be among the last sections of the validation package completed. Furthermore, the bias reconciliation panels were not conducted consistent with reasonable and customary practices because some areas were led by people who have a stake in the outcome of the project.
- 4) The project does not appear to have sufficient resources assigned to be successful. The project plans indicate a flurry of activity scheduled to occur over a period from May to July with a small number of people assigned to work concurrently on many tasks. During the period of our observation, many of those tasks began to miss either their previously announced dates, without comment, or were rescheduled later. Yet most must be completed prior to a validation package submission and subsequent production rollout of the pilot colleges for fall 2017.
- 5) The project will likely have difficulty gathering sufficient and representative statistical data to support a proper, necessary and complete validation this summer. The field test is unlikely to gather data from a sufficiently broad subject base to demonstrate lack of bias for students served by the community college system. Given that every test-let pair must have roughly 150 examinees traverse them to support statistical validity, it does not appear probable that all test-let paths will have sufficient traffic to support a complete and thorough analysis and evaluation.
- 6) CAI is not likely to have available each of the three contracted and main curricular test area, math, English, and ESL for offering to pilot colleges by September 2017. At this writing only math is active, for two weeks thus far, with relatively few cases working to capture usual both internal and external field test data. English is scheduled to begin field testing days from now, yet when we asked to review some of the tests our requests went unattended. ESL which includes at least three and potentially four curricular areas is only piloting the reading component now.

6.3 Project Next Steps; Including Paused Portions and Oversight:

There were several options that this group of four panelists: a psychometrician and three very significant project managers in technology gave the Chancellor's Office to consider:

- 1) Continue as it has been and hope it will work someday
- 2) Stop the project immediately
- 3) Stop the project as it is currently conceived and wind down in thirty days

The Chancellor's Office and executive team wants to make it work. They decided since the September target date is too aggressive, there is a need to pause the project in some format for thirty to ninety days to determine what is needed to make it work. The Chancellor's Office working with the Technology Center will hire a psychometrician and one or two additional analysts. These people and the existing project team would then perform an inventory of: what has been accomplished to date, what is available, and what remains to be done, while taking time to reassess team capabilities and to develop recommendations to augment the team and develop a credible schedule and cost estimate to complete the project.

No one in the Chancellor's Office wants to scuttle the project, but they know that work needs to be done to get it on track, otherwise they will have failed everyone. The Chancellor has indicated he wants to go with a pause to do a real significant analysis. That pause will not take in all aspects of the project. In conversations with Debra, Tim, and others, they realized the significance of the platform and technology moving appropriately. There is a need to pause and take a deeper dive on the test questions and how to get them validated so the community college system can get the best test opportunity for its students.

Erik Cooper paraphrased audit findings: the platform is on track, technology-wise things seem to be moving well, it is the validation which represents the largest problem due to the large number of test items and failing to meet the current schedule with the resources the project has. Pam agreed that was accurate summary. They believe the technology continues to move appropriately and recognize that should continue to move. Testing validation needs to be looked at.

The Chancellor's Office intends to eventually produce the test if at all possible. Eric Skinner reviewed the original legislative request for building some portable high quality assessment tools that can be used to improve placement in the system, and the development of a multiple measures warehouse model. That continues to be the Chancellor's Office objective. The recommendation is pausing aspects of the project for thirty to ninety days in order to do a deeper assessment and revise the timelines and the budget. One potential outcome is that things are so badly broken that it is necessary to step away completely, but they Eric Skinner really hopes and expects that won't happen. Instead, they hope to figure out how to adjust the timeline by x amount, with maybe the need for y amount more resources. Then with needed adjustments they want to get the project completed. The objective is to deliver on what the legislature asked: the assessments, the data warehouse, and the multiple measures approach. The plan needs to be adjusted based on what they find. But the objective is to deliver those three elements. They don't want to have the conversation that would be needed with the legislature if it turns out they won't be able to deliver any of those three things.

The panel that did the audit consisted of four individuals: one who had done a previous review for the CO and has done significant technical project management in the state of California. He hired three other people who are consulting software engineers, consulting project managers, and a consulting educational psychometrician from the University of Kansas, John Poggio.

No agreement has been reached about the team that will do the follow-up work, it is still in development. There was a proposal for a set of consultants that would do the work and there was some conversation about augmenting that team, including maybe in the psychometric realm. This is a draft plan; the specific plan has not been finalized yet.

Several members were dismayed and upset about not having been consulted by the audit team. They felt the audit might not have all of the necessary information and were confused about why no one reached out to them for information. Those members also felt the project had been in a "perpetual state of being audited" and that the Chancellor's Office representatives had promised repeatedly to communicate and had not done so in a timely manner. They felt frustrated.

Eric Skinner emphasized the Chancellor's Office has ultimately been tasked with this work and is accountable for delivering this product for the legislature. The districts are serving in a vendor capacity and an advisory capacity. Maybe that hasn't always been clear, but ultimately this project is not about pleasing everyone on the committee, nor how anyone at the table is represented, it is about how the Chancellor's Office will be able to deliver on a project they were tasked with delivering to the state of California. Those at the table in an advisory or vendor capacity role are here to support that goal. The intention is to put a timeline together and get it back to everyone so that everybody knows what is going on. Those doing the work on the ground work have a feeling of ownership but understand this is the Chancellor's Office's project and want to do the best job possible. Eric Skinner acknowledged there have been challenges in terms of the Chancellor's Office's capacity to work on this project and others. They will be looking at how they can do a better job going forward and at ways they might carve some resources out of the grants for policy leadership and project management. The lack of enough Chancellor's Office presence is part of why things have gotten off track and they need to pause certain aspects to make sure all of the right resources are in place to move toward finishing the project.

Many members were concerned the audit team and/or Chancellor's Office might be looking at reshaping the psychometric model at the core of CCCAssess, that is for a Rasch model, test-let adaptive assessment. This Advisory Committee has done a lot of work and rejected the existing form of assessment test because they were not good enough and did not provide any information that was helpful to faculty. CCCAssess has been focused on what is best for students. Stacy Fisher, Pam Walker, and Erik Skinner all confirmed this is not about changing the model. The role of the psychometric team is to go through and identify exactly what tests need to be done for the validation package to be complete. They were emphatic that the Chancellor's Office does not intend to "pause and start over," they intend to "pause and try to find resolution to keep moving forward."

There was some discussion about the 2001 Assessment Standards and the fact that they were left in place so they wouldn't "change the bar" in the middle of the CCCAssess test approval process. Louise noted those old standards were used to approve tests that everyone now feels are bad tests. Stacy explained the standards were also based on national standards for educational testing and were not specifically testing for specific things the other test did. Yes, those tests were approved, but they were also state of the art at the time. The standards check whether tests have: reliability, content validity, construct validity, and bias assessment; those four things have to be supported. Tim Nguyen also explained that it wasn't just bad tests, but tests being used incorrectly. It is necessary to have assessment done correctly with both the test and multiple measures. In order for that to happen, people locally at the college level need to understand and review the data; to a great extent that wasn't happening before. Conversations that are happening locally as a result of this project are changing that. Stacy reiterated, this is not about changing the model that is used. This is about how to take the model that has been created and conduct and complete a validation package that is sufficient to get it through the Assessment Committee.

There was a significant discussion about which elements of the project should and should not be paused and the reasons. Some members were concerned about the pause on the project because "there wasn't enough data," because pausing field testing would pause data collection. Item level work and item level testing will not be paused, especially on the ESL questions which need more item level data. Faculty work on reviewing rolls of ESL test questions should continue because that is part of item level work.

Julie Bruno wanted to clarify three commitments from the Chancellor's Office that faculty really cares about: 1) a test, 2) that it will be an adaptive test, and 3) it will have some level of information for faculty about their classes. Eric Skinner confirmed those have been and continue to be the Chancellor's Office's goals. After the thirty to ninety day review in the worst case there might be a need to go back to the legislature to revisit that commitment. The target, objective, and goals have not changed, the intention and hope is the review process will lead to a revised timeline and perhaps revised budget. Paul Feist will be putting out a Chancellor's Office statement in the next day or two. The communication he is working on ends with the phrase, "this will allow us to proceed to complete this pioneering effort."

Sean Burke, explained that project management is a math problem of balancing scope, schedule, and budget. There is exposure and risk when the Chancellor's Office can't provide quantitative data to the legislature etc. This pause is a due diligence exercise which is necessary to show that needed data. Stacy explained the quantitative data Sean is talking about is not from item or field testing, it is the evidence of exactly what will be provided in the validation package, how that information is going to be collected, and how it will be presented. That is what the Chancellor's Office has no information on. The fact that some people were not consulted makes the chances of now being able to uncover things that much more likely. Eric Skinner explained the decision has been made to: do a thirty to ninety day review and take care in how that is communicated; look at some other issues about what kind of work continues; and specify what kind of work continues. He noted that a lot comes down to making sure the project team has the time to develop the documentation required for the reviewers. The Chancellor's Office needs to make sure the

documentation is done or gets done so risk can be managed appropriately with the correct project oversight. This is a big project and over \$20M was put into this. The Chancellor's Office is responsible for making sure that we get the end result. The fact that some people were not consulted makes the chances of now being able to uncover things that much more likely.

Josh Roberts and a couple other members expressed concern that John Poggio was connected to the project early on and was a vocal advocate for multiple fixed-form tests as opposed to a test-let adaptive format. They were concerned about his involvement since he theoretically and philosophically leans away from the direction the project decided to move with a test-let adaptive model. Eric Skinner thought perhaps John Poggio's role should be discussed. The Chancellor's Office' objective and intention is to make sure the project succeeds. They wouldn't want the audit review team to be stacked against success.

William Fisher emphasized that nothing is off track. The shortcomings are to be expected. He said the project is on the track for success. This is a dream project and a dream team. He was upset with what he felt was constantly being confronted with lack of awareness of the work being done. Pam Walker reiterated the need to work on this together. She emphasized that it is not unusual for projects to get a program review or a project audit; it is not appropriate to "shoot the messenger." If there are other concerns they should be expressed to Tim and Sean. The Chancellor's Office will bring everything together early next week and get something out to the field.

Matt summarized that the Chancellor's Office is going to do a thirty to ninety day pause to review the project in terms of scope, schedule, and resources committed to it. While that is happening some activities can continue to go on. He thought it would be important to specify exactly what activities can continue and then to communicate that to the field. Assessment Center Directors and faculty involved need to have clear communication about what can continue during the thirty to ninety day pause. Tim Calhoon explained items continuing from the meeting last Friday were: the technology, not to stop item testing, and to continue work with McCann to beginning the process on working toward the writing sample.

Amy Beadle asked for permission to communicate to the core pilot colleges that a message would be coming from the Chancellor's Office, and Eric Skinner agreed that would be fine. Josh hoped Chancellor's Office messaging would encourage faculty to continue participation ("pause" may sound like "stop" to them and it would then be harder to get them restarted). Tim Calhoon asked if it would be possible for field testing to continue. Stacy would need to look at the audit report. Pam would like to combine their knowledge of all the processes and include Julie and Craig. She thought it would appropriate to let the leads know that something will be coming out, so they aren't alarmed. Amy thought it was important to have a conversation offline about continuing field testing if at all possible. Eric Skinner thought there was a need to formalize everything, but his preference would be to keep as much of the project going as possible while guaranteeing there is appropriate staff time available to get the necessary information to the reviewers. The things the Chancellor's Office is focusing on are a psychometric review and a review of the project schedule.

They want to get clarity and a credible schedule for getting to the end goal; that is what they want out of the pause period.

Craig highlighted the importance of communication going beyond the CBOs, CIOs and CEOs. There are others who are involved in different ways: Assessment Center Directors, matriculation staff, and Academic Senate Presidents. Messaging needs to be widely disseminated, so no one is left in the dark. It is also important for students to know what is going on since they ultimately will be waiting for us to get done with our work. Alejandro encouraged the Chancellor's Office to allow the continuation of field testing. As a member of the Student Senate, they did a lot of work to get the word out. They felt involved and invested in that communication aspect. Arleen, as someone who oversees assessment testing, also hoped that testing could continue since this is a peak time for testing and if it was paused there would be missed opportunities.

#### Item 7 – Platform Demonstration: Information

#### 7.1 Faculty Report:

John Hadad expressed his appreciation for all the work Unicon has done on the platform. They needed to push out some code to the production server to have the ability to generate placements and they have had no P1 (priority one) defects. Those would have required shutting down the system, and there have been none. Unicon has done a stellar job on a high quality product. Even when there has been a relatively high volume of users, the system has been stable, reliable and the team keeps "knocking it out of the park." John and Gary Thompson demonstrated the semifunctional prototype for the faculty report. This is a report which will present aggregated data for groups of students enrolled in a course. The threshold has been set at needing to have at least ten unique students in the file in order to aggregate information and maintain a level of anonymity. The initial version will probably need a CSV file from the faculty member and then the platform would produce the report. Soon after the Beta release they plan to have a tighter coupling with the SIS allowing for a more fully integrated and automated process.

The report provides information about the number of students requested, how many were actually considered, and the median time since they took the assessment. The English report included performance by category in: writing, research and response to reading, reading, and vocabulary and grammar. It also shows abilities students with those results typically demonstrate as well as abilities they should work on next. The information provided is roughly the same as what is on the individual student reports, but this report includes aggregated information.

Members praised the report and complimented its readability. Faculty members were excited about the benefits for K-12 to community college articulation and communication that can come from this platform. John also thought it would be a pretty straightforward future addition to eventually move to aggregating results by C-ID, which could be pulled by someone with statewide level access.

The team should have an example of an aggregate faculty report for math in the next sprint. The format should be similar, but there is some additional complexity because depending upon the course not all competencies would be applicable.

#### 7.2 Stratification within placement sequence specific to transfer level math:

The platform currently works by using thresholds of prerequisite or entry level skills and exit skills, to basically establish boundaries between CB21 levels. When courses are mapped to a level or competencies are mapped to courses, right now they are being looked at in aggregate to determine the threshold. If the student qualifies for the lowest level of transfer, right now the system will recommend everything and that is bad.

To solve that problem, the team has added the ability to have groups inside of a specific level. That takes the aggregation of competencies in all the courses at one level down to a group inside of that level. There is now an ability to add additional courses inside of a group that are both inside and outside of that level. This allows the ability to set up anchor courses and ghost courses. An anchor course is in a level and has competencies mapped to it. Those competencies are what "anchor" that course and establish the threshold necessary for students to demonstrate for a student measurement inside the assessment itself. After an anchor course is set up, a ghost course, for example a lab course, which goes along with it can be set up. The ghost course doesn't need to have competencies mapped to it; the competencies are attached to the anchor course. There must be an anchor course in a level, and ghost courses are optional. The system will ignore those ghost courses with no competencies mapped to them. Everything in the group must come from the same competency map (math, English, or ESL). This would allow courses like College Algebra or Statistics, which might be at the same level, to have different competencies mapped to them. When the college puts in the course they get to decide what group to put it into. This allows flexibility for STEM versus non-STEM courses. It also allows for recommendation of co-requisite courses as options including for acceleration. For example, a student with an English placement one level below transfer could be presented that as an option, along with the option of taking a co-requisite course along with Freshman Composition now.

#### 7.3 FERPA:

John communicated with a gentleman at ACCRO identified as the FERPA resource. John had multiple conversations with him and they reviewed the faculty report. The ACCRO representative has given the project a thumbs-up with proceeding. He also provided recommendations in terms of some of the disclosures the project wants to make to students specifically about how their data will be used, what data will be transmitted over to the SIS as part of the integration, and to identify where possible the specific schools that are going to receive the data based on the colleges they have applied to, etc. He has been a great resource for the project, has thrown no red flags, and has provided positive feedback.

Item 8 – Future Meeting Schedule and Closing: Information

September 28, 2017- San Diego December 7, 2017- Sacramento

# Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:22 pm.

## **Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee**

## Annual Report 2016-17

The Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) met five times at the CSU Chancellor's Office during the 2016-17 academic year (September, November, January, March, and May). The committee during the year consisted of the following members:

Mary Ann Creadon (Chair)	Literary Studies	CSU: Humboldt
Mark Van Selst (Vice Chair)	Psychology	San Jose State
Susan Gubernat	English	CSU: East Bay
Barry Pasternack	Business	CSU: Fullerton
Paula Selvester	Education	CSU: Chico
Bill Eadie	Journalism and Media Studies	San Diego State
Steven Filling	Accounting and Finance	CSU: Stanislaus
Denise Fleming	Education	CSU: East Bay
Jodie Ullman	Psychology	CSU: Northridge
Stachia Boykin	Student	(CSSA)
Sarah Bentley	Student	(CSSA)
Michelle Hawley	CSU Campus Academic Affairs Administrator	CSU: Los Angeles
Christine Mallon	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development	CSU Chancellor's Office

Alison Wrynn	State University, Associate Dean, Academic Programs	CSU Chancellor's Office
Jackie Escajeda	Dean, Intersegmental Programs and Credit Curriculum	CCC System Office
Virginia May	CCC Academic Senate Representative	Sacramento City College (Mathematics)
Tiffany Tran	CCC Campus Articulation Officer	Irvine Valley College
Ceci Hermann	CSU Campus Articulation Officer	San Francisco State

Regular or frequent guests this year included Christine Miller, Chair, ASCSU; Catherine Nelson, Vice Chair, ASCSU; Kate Stevenson, Mathematics Faculty, CSU Northridge and Co-Chair, QRTF; Kevin Baaske, Co-Chair, Online Oral Communication Pilot; Patrick O'Rourke, CSU Director of Active Duty and Veteran Affairs. Both members and guests participated in person and via video link.

#### Recommendations

AP Computer Science Principles Course and Exam. The committee received a presentation on the elements of this AP course, and made a recommendation that it did not meet the approved criteria for general education credit in Area B4. At the same time, we encouraged the College Board to monitor the progress of CSU implementation of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force report, and the revision of our standards for admission, as well as the goal of achieving a required fourth year of quantitative reasoning in high school.

**Online Oral Communication Pilot.** The committee concluded its pilot of online oral communication courses in the CCC. A report from the pilot committee was received in March, and in May the committee recommended a revision of the Guiding Notes to include the use of online courses, along with a set of "best practices" developed from the pilot.

**Online Oral Communication Guiding Notes.** The recommendation for changes to the CSU guiding notes include: reproducing the sense of an audience, attention to the on-camera setting and formality expected of public speaking expected by college graduates, and practice ahead of time in use of the technology for the presentation.

**Credit by Exam for Defense Language Institute Courses and Exam.** This item did not produce a recommendation to the Chancellor at the time of the review, but a recommendation on a further process. The committee reviewed syllabi and other material of DLI language courses to

receive GE credit for the exam that would follow these courses. The committee sent the material to the CSU World Languages Discipline Council for their review. At its final meeting in May, the WLC Council reported that the syllabi appear to lack the appropriate writing and culture components required for CSU GE credit in Area C. The committee recommended at the May meeting that the WLC Council President and Patrick O'Rourke, the CSU Chancellor's Office representative, consult to clarify the writing and culture components so that GEAC can offer a formal recommendation on this request for credit by exam. Alison Wrynn from the Chancellor's Office offered to facilitate this consultation.

#### **Other Actions and Reports**

**Institute for Teaching and Learning.** Emily Magruder provided updates on the ITL Summer Institute at the September GEAC meeting and again in November on the October Annual Teaching and Learning Symposium. Because there were no upcoming planned institutes or conferences, we did not have any additional reports with regard to ITL.

Math 110 C-ID Descriptor. A new descriptor for C-ID Math 110 was produced in late fall of 2016 that potentially compromised the ADT (Associate Degree for Transfer) for those degrees that require intermediate algebra. The new descriptor was intended to accommodate the Statway and statistical pathways pilots, instituted by GEAC, that are underway in some CCCs. GEAC accordingly sent a letter to pilot programs informing them that new pilot proposals would not be accepted, pending a resolution of the possible confusion created by the new descriptor. The letter also asked for student learning outcome assessments from the current pilot courses, as well as the "best practices" being used to advise students about which math classes (with or without intermediate algebra) they needed in order to support their chosen major. These provisions for extending the pilot—SLO assessment reports and best practices for advising--are laid out in the 2015 pilot extension document, as is a provision for obtaining persistence assessments for students who transferred to the CSU having taken the pilot courses at a CCC. At the end of the academic year, the committee chair had received two assessment reports and one letter describing counseling practices with regards to the different ADTs.

Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report. The committee received a report and summary of the QRTF final report at its September meeting from the co-chairs of the Task Force: Professors Steven Filling and Kate Stevenson, along with Task Force members Professors Denise Fleming and Mark Van Selst. The committee approved a statement of appreciation for the work of the QRTF, and received regular updates on the progress of the various recommendations during the course of the year. At its May meeting, GEAC was provided with a draft of revised Area B4 standards, composed by Professors Stevenson, Van Selst and Filling. We reviewed the draft and suggested changes, and passed the draft on to both the Academic Affairs and Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committees of the ASCSU for their review.

**GETask Force.** During the year a Task Force on general education was instituted, and its co-chairs, Professors Christine Miller and Jodie Ullman, helped provide a useful distinction between the tasks of GEAC and the tasks of the Task Force. While some overlaps might occur, they said, in general the vision and interest of the GE Task Force was larger than the usual more immediate and practical duties of GEAC.

#### **Discussions and Issues**

Review of Guiding Notes. The process for review of Guiding Notes was discussed with several ideas proposed. One idea is to have pairs of committee members review and discuss a specified section of the Guiding Notes, and if they believe changes are needed, propose revised draft language for that section to the committee. Another idea is to have the committee as a whole go through the document at the meetings and revise as a committee of the whole. One issue is that those most familiar with the document (primarily CCC articulation officers) are not the same people as those who are taxed with the responsibility of composing and revising the notes (CSU discipline faculty). While the committee was able to oversee the revision of the oral communication guiding notes, and begin the discussion of Area B4 guiding notes, there was no consensus about how to efficiently revise the document as a whole. With the move towards largely online reviews for courses proposed for GE the prior practice of having one or more GEAC members attend the yearly review meeting is no longer tenable.

Role of Upper Division GE. The committee discussed the need to articulate the difference between upper and lower division general education courses, as well as the need to articulate the importance of campus autonomy in designing upper division GE. GEAC reviewed the catalog language of various campuses about the role of GE in general, as well as any particular language used to describe upper division GE, and noted that very few campuses explicitly assert the distinction between lower and upper division GE. The committee agreed that GEAC's advice to campuses to make the distinction clear to their students is vital, and also agreed that existing innovative and unique approaches to upper division GE (e.g., thematic clusters) should be supported.

**GE Assessment.** The committee discussed the need for effective guidance to campuses with regard to GE assessment. It was suggested that campuses that most recently completed semester conversion might have outcomes that are more up-to-date, and that the catalog language and other campus descriptions of GE may provide language and ideas for revising outcomes. In addition, WASC mid-cycle review processes, which include reports on program effectiveness, may be a good place to find language and best practices for GE assessment.

#### Possible Agenda Items for 2017-18

- Provide guiding notes for Area B4 in line with revised standards, now that the QRTF report is beginning to be implemented.
- Receive an update from CCCs regarding the status and success of upper division GE courses on CCC campuses with baccalaureate degrees.
- Receive a report on the consultation between the WLC Discipline Council President and DLI representatives regarding credit by exam for DLI language courses, and decide on further action.
- Establish a process for the review and revision of the Guiding Notes that accommodates both the needs of the CCCs and the expertise of the CSU faculty.
- Determine a process for acquiring requested data on student learning outcomes and persistence for those students who took statistics pathways (pilot) courses.
- Clarify the relationship between the language in the recent revision of EO 1100 regarding upper division general education and campus autonomy and innovation of upper division GE.
- When the GE Task Force produces its report, review its recommendations and consider appropriate responses.
- Draft advice to campuses regarding GE assessment, and in particular assessment of upper division GE.
- Review both revised EO 1100 regarding GE, and EO 1110 regarding academic preparation for possible discussion, advice or recommendations pertinent to GE.

#### Relevant Academic Senate CSU 2016/17 resolutions pertinent to General Education

Commendation of the CSU Academic

A3 3234 17/LA	Conference 2017 (Attachment) (pdf)
AS-3284-17/APEP	Cessation of Implied Equivalency of General Education (GE) Area B4 for Intermediate Algebra(pdf)
AS-3275-16/AA/APEP	Commendation of Ken O'Donnell (pdf)
AS-3271-16/AA	Establishment of an Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Task force to Study General Education (pdf)

AS-3294-17/FX

AS-3270-16/APEP <u>Implementation of the Quantitative</u>

Reasoning Task Force (QRTF)

Recommendations (Attachment) (pdf)

AS-3269/AA/APEP <u>Course Grading in the Golden Four (pdf)</u>

AS-3268-16/FGA <u>ACR 158 (Holden): Undergraduate Student</u>

<u>Transfers(pdf)</u>

AS-3265-16/APEP Implementation of Quantitative Reasoning

<u>Task Force (QRTF) Recommendations That</u> <u>Reflect Items Previously Approved by the</u>

Academic Senate CSU(pdf)

AS-3264-16/EX Receipt of the Quantitative Reasoning Task

Force Report (pdf) (attachment)

# Relevant (newly updated since final GEAC meeting of 2016/17) revision of EO 1100 (General Education) and EO 1110 (Academic Preparation)

#### **Executive Order 1100**

General Education Breadth Requirements

#### Executive Order 1110

Assessment of Academic Preparation and Placement in

First-Year General Education Written Communication and

Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Courses