



Friday, June 5, 2020

Zoom Videoconferencing

Zoom Link: https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_3VOqRcdfTHKQjuOuF9rHDw

Friday, June 5, 2020

10:00 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 4:30 p.m. Executive Committee Meeting

All ASCCC meetings are accessible to those with special accommodation needs. 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 april@asccc.org 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: Members of the public wishing to comment on an agenda item or another topic within the not on the agenda will be given the opportunity to ask questions via Zoom. Public testimony will be invited at the end 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: http://www.asccc.org/executive_committee/meetings.

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 not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

D. Executive Committee Norms, pg. 4

E. Calendar, pg. 5

F. Local Senate Visits, pg. 14

G. Action Tracking, pg. 27

H. One Minute Check-In

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. May 8, 2020 Meeting Minutes, Aschenbach, forthcoming.

B. Hayward Award and Exemplary Program Award Rubrics, Dyer/Bean, pg. 29

C. Deactivation of Basic Skills Initiative Website, Mica, pg. 34

III. REPORTS

A. President's/Executive Director's Report – 30 mins., Stankas/Mica

B. Foundation President's Report – 10 mins., Aschenbach

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, CAAJE, CCA, CCCI, CCL, CFT, CIO, FACCC, the RP Group, and the Student Senate.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Legislative Report – 20 mins., Davison, pg. 35

The Executive Committee will be updated regarding bills and other legislative actions.

B. Guided Pathways Implementation – 10 mins., Stankas, pg. 36

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

C. Faculty Role in Governance – 15 mins., Stankas, pg. 37

The Executive Committee will be updated on the Faculty Role in Governance in the system and discuss further direction.

D. Faculty Diversification – 15 mins., Stankas, pg. 38

The Executive Committee will be updated on Faculty Diversification in the system and discuss future direction.

E. Faculty Leadership Institute Program (Final) – 20 mins., Davison, pg. 39

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the final program for the 2020 Faculty Leadership Institute.

F. Effective and Equitable Transfer Paper – 15 mins., Davison/Morse, pg. 40

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the paper to be sent to Fall plenary for possible adoption by the body.

G. Curriculum Institute – Final Program – 20 mins., Aschenbach, pg. 41

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the final program for 2020 Curriculum Institute (Virtual Conference).

**H. Equivalency Paper Update First Reading – 20 mins.,
Dyer/Davison/Roberson, pg. 42**

The Executive Committee will review and consider for approval the second draft of the updated paper Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications.

I. 2020 Academic Academy Draft Program – 20 mins., Pilati/Mica, pg. 112

The Executive Committee will review and consider for approval the second draft of the updated paper Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications.

**J. Model Hiring Processes and Guiding Principles Canvas – 15 mins.,
Bean/Foster, pg. 119**

The Executive Committee will consider the recommendation from FLDC to publish the Hiring Canvas shell with a welcome video.

V. DISCUSSION

A. Chancellor's Office Liaison Report – 30 mins., Stankas, pg. 120

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 – 15 mins., Stankas/Davison, pg.

121

The Executive Committee will receive an update on the recent Board of Governors and Consultation meetings.

C. Online Community College District Board of Trustees Meeting – 15 mins., Stankas/Davison, pg. 122

The Executive Committee will receive an update on the recent Online Community College District Board of Trustees Meeting.

D. Online Education— *outstanding* faculty/course recognition – 15 mins., Dyer/Roberson, pg. 123

The Executive Committee will consider a means to recognize faculty/online courses in collaboration with CVC-OEI.

E. Distance Education Guidelines – 10 mins., Dyer/Aschenbach, pg. 124

The Executive Committee will be updated on and discuss the status of the Distance Education Guidelines.

F. Year-End Debrief – 30 mins., Stankas, pg. 126

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, Curry, pg. 127
- ii. CTE Leadership Committee, Roberson, pg. 129
- iii. Equity and Diversity Action Committee, Cruz, pg. 131
- iv. Faculty Leadership Development Committee, Bean, pg. 136
- v. Online Education Committee, Roberson, pg. 143
- vi. Standards and Practices Committee, Dyer, pg. 145
- vii. Transfer, Articulation and Student Services Committee, Foster, pg. 147

B. Liaison Reports

- i. African American Student Virtual Town Hall and Success Week, Bean/Cruz, pg. 152
- ii. CCLA19 Meeting, Bean, pg. 153
- iii. Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC), Bean, pg. 154
- iv. Distance Education & Educational Technology Advisory Committee (DEETAC), Dyer, pg. 155
- v. Latinx Student Success and COVID-19 Virtual Town Hall, Bean/Cruz, pg. 178

C. Senate and Grant Reports

- i. C-ID Advisory Committee, Aschenbach, pg. 179
- ii. Guided Pathways Task Force Meeting, May, pg. 184
- iii. Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW), Davison, pg. 188

D. Local Senate Visits

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Executive Committee Community Norms

Approved February 2-3, 2018

Authenticity

- Commit to being your authentic, truthful self.
- Be honest. Speak truth as you see it and ensure that your words and actions match.
- Allow others to speak their truth and listen without prejudice as they do.
- Listen with respect as others speak. Be informed by what they say.
- Be open to outlying opinions or ideas and share the air to allow time for others to speak.

Practice Self-Awareness, Presence, and Patience

- Be mindful of your own possible assumptions or biases, reflect on them, and set them aside. Forgive someone if they fall short or express bias.
- Be positive and respectful when speaking of others (e.g., if the person heard what you said would it be hurtful)
- Forgive yourself if you need to stop, rewind, and change your mind.
- Practice patience when others dig deeper or change their minds.
- Be mindful when communicating. Be mindful of behaviors that may appear to be a macroaggression and passive aggressive behaviors.
- Recognize your potential attachment to issues. Bring options and interests to the group for discussion and be open to other possibilities.

Collegiality, Criticism, and Feedback

- Honor experience, knowledge, and the diversity of our perspectives
- Critique, with respect and humility, not maliciousness
- When an issue or conflict arises, engage individuals directly to resolve the issue or conflict.
- Support others to find a positive way to express concerns or conflict and to find resolution.
- Be a trusted ally who can be a sounding board and will help you redirect negativity into positive action.
- Recognize that we are more than one opinion or position and avoid labeling or stereotyping someone based on past decisions or opinions

Honor the Space and the Dedication of The Committee

- Give thought and attention to innovative ideas during a meeting and avoid making rapid decisions or reacting to an idea too quickly or derisively.
- Establish clarity between what comments should be kept in confidence and what can be expressed outside the meeting. Respect that shared expectation of privacy.
- Acknowledge and celebrate the work of all of the Executive Committee members and Staff
- Praise publicly and provide constructive criticism and other critique privately.



SUBJECT: Calendar •Upcoming 2019-2020 Events •Reminders/Due Dates		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: I. E.	
		Attachment: Yes (5)	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	Inform the Executive Committee of upcoming events and deadlines.	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 5 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Order of Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	April Lonerero	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonerero	Action	
		Information	X

Executive Committee Agenda Item

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

Upcoming Events and Meetings

- **2020 Faculty Leadership Institute** – Virtual Conference – June 17-19, 2020
- **Executive Committee Meeting** – Zoom – June 17, 2020
- **2020 Curriculum Institute** – Virtual Conference – July 7-10, 2020
- **Executive Committee Meeting** – Riverside – August 13-15, 2020

Please see the 2019-2020 Executive Committee Meeting Calendar on the next page for ASCCC Executive Committee meetings and institutes.

Reminders/Due Dates

July 27, 2020

- Agenda items for the August 13-15, 2020 meeting
- Committee reports, if applicable

Curriculum Institute

- Final Program to Krystinne by **June 10, 2020.**
- AV and Event Supply needs to Tonya by **June 10, 2020.**
- Final program to printer **June 24, 2020.**
- Materials posted to ASCCC website **June 24, 2020.**

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

2019-2020 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING DATES

*Unless otherwise noted, meetings typically start 11:00 a.m. on Friday and end by 4:00 p.m. on Saturday.¹

Meeting Type	Proposed Date	Campus Location	Hotel Location	Agenda Deadline
Executive Meeting	July 9, 2019		Embassy Suites, Sacramento, CA	June 20, 2019
Executive Meeting	August 8 – 10, 2019		Mission Inn, Riverside, CA	July 22, 2019
Executive Meeting	September 6-7, 2019	Cerro Coso College	Hilton Garden Inn Palmdale, Palmdale, CA	August 19, 2019
Executive Meeting	September 27 – 28, 2019		Marriott Riverside, Riverside, CA	September 9, 2019
Area Meetings	October 11 -12, 2019		Various Locations	
Executive Meeting	November 6, 2019		Renaissance Newport Beach Hotel	October 17, 2019
Fall Plenary Session	November 7-9, 2019		Renaissance Newport Beach Hotel	
Executive Meeting	December 6–7, 2019		Courtyard Oakland Emeryville, Emeryville CA	November 18, 2019
Executive Meeting	January 10 – 11, 2020		Marriott Riverside, Riverside, CA	December 12, 2019
Executive Meeting	February 7-8, 2020		San Jose Marriott, San Jose, CA	January 21, 2020
Legislative Training and Advocacy Day	March 3-4, 2020		Sheraton Grand Sacramento, Sacramento, CA	
Executive Meeting	March 6 -7, 2020	North Orange Continuing Education	Irvine Marriott, Irvine, CA	February 18, 2020
Area Meetings	March 27 – 28, 2020		Various Locations	
Executive Meeting	April 15, 2020		Oakland Marriott City Center	March 26, 2020
Spring Plenary Session	April 16-18, 2020		Oakland Marriott City Center	
Executive Meeting	May 8, 2020		Kimpton Sawyer Hotel, Sacramento, CA	April 20, 2020
Executive Committee/ Orientation	June 5-7, 2020		The Landing Resort and Spa, South Lake Tahoe, CA	May 19, 2020
EVENTS				
Event Type²	Date		Hotel Location⁺	
Academic Academy	September 12-14, 2019		Queen Mary Long Beach	
Fall Plenary Session	November 7-9, 2019		Renaissance Newport Beach Hotel	
Part-Time Faculty Institute	January 24-25, 2020		Napa Valley Marriott Hotel & Spa	
Accreditation Institute	February 21-22, 2020		San Diego Marriott La Jolla	
Spring Plenary Session	April 15-18, 2020		Oakland Marriott City Center	
Career and Noncredit Institute	April 30-May 2, 2020		San Mateo Marriott	
Faculty Leadership Institute	June 18-20, 2020		Newport Beach Marriott Hotel and Spa	
Curriculum Institute	July 8-11, 2020		Riverside Convention Center	

¹ Times may be adjusted to accommodate flight schedules to minimize early travel times.

² Executive Committee members are not expected to attend these events, other than the Faculty Leadership Institute. +North or South location may change based on hotel availability.

2019-2020 REGIONAL MEETINGS DATES

- ***September 5, 2019** – ESL CB21 Recoding Project Regional Meeting: *Clovis Herndon Center*
- ***September 11, 2019** – ESL CB21 Recoding Project Regional Meeting: *Cypress College*
- ***September 23, 2019** – ESL CB21 Recoding Project Regional Meeting: *Skyline College*
- ***October 24, 2019** – Fall Guided Pathways Regional Meeting North: *Lake Tahoe Community College*
- Canceled
- ***October 25, 2019** – Fall Guided Pathways Regional Meeting South: *Allan Hancock College*
- ***November 1, 2019** – Fall Curriculum Regional Meeting North: *Folsom Lake College*
- ***November 1, 2019** – Fall Guided Pathways Regional Meeting North: *Folsom Lake College*
- ***November 1, 2019** – Fall Guided Pathways Regional Meeting South: *Victor Valley College*
- ***November 2, 2019** – Fall Curriculum Regional Meeting South: *Los Angeles Pierce College*
- ***November 22, 2019** – Fall Guided Pathways Regional Meeting North: *Shasta College*
- ***November 22, 2019** – Fall Guided Pathways Regional Meeting South: *Imperial Valley College*
- ***March 13, 2020** – Guided Pathways Workshop: *Fresno City College* - Canceled
- ***March 20, 2020** – Guided Pathways Workshop: *Santiago Canyon College* - Canceled
- ***April 24, 2020** – Guided Pathways Workshop: *Merritt College* - Canceled

*Approved

EVENT TIMELINE 2019-2020

Academic Academy: September 12-14, 2019

Fall Plenary: November 7 – 9, 2019 | Part-Time Faculty Institute: January 24-25, 2020

Accreditation Institute: February 21-22, 2020 | Spring Plenary: April 15-18, 2020

Career and Noncredit Institute: April 30-May 2, 2020 | Faculty Leadership Institute: June 18-20, 2020

Curriculum Institute: July 8-11, 2020

June, July 2019

Academic Academy

1. June: Draft program to July Executive Committee meeting – June 20, 2019
2. July: Final program to August Executive Committee meeting – July 22, 2019

August 2019

Academic Academy

1. Final program to ED: August 12, 2019
2. AV and events supplies to events team: August 16, 2019
3. Hotel rooms requested to events team: August 16, 2019
4. Program to printers: August 26, 2019

September 2019

Academic Academy

1. Materials posted to website: September 2, 2019

Fall Plenary

1. Pre-Session resolutions due to Resolutions Chair September 20, 2019.
2. First program draft due August 19, 2019 for reading at September 6-7 Executive Committee Meeting. This draft will be posted on the ASCCC website to provide information for possible participants to determine if they would like to register.
3. Paragraph explaining the purpose of and possible direction for all ASCCC Institutes due to Tonya by September 30, 2019.

Part-Time Faculty Institute

1. Program draft due September 9, 2019 for first reading at September 27-28 Executive Committee Meeting. This draft includes topics for posting on the website so that possible participants have an idea about the institute direction.

October 2019

Fall Plenary

1. Final resolutions due to Krystinne October 2, 2019 for circulation to Area Meetings.
2. AV and Event Supply needs to Tonya by October 1, 2019.
3. Any outside presenters are due to John and Krystinne by October 4, 2019 for approval.
4. Final Breakout Descriptions due to Krystinne by October 4, 2019.

5. Deadline for Area Meeting resolutions to Resolutions chair: Area A & B October 11, 2019; Area C & D October 12, 2019 – DUE October 16, 2019.
6. Resolutions posted to website: October 25, 2019.
7. Final program to printer October 24, 2019.
8. Materials posted to ASCCC website October 24, 2019.

Part-Time Faculty Institute

1. Presenters list due to Krystinne and John by October 14, 2019.
2. Program draft due October 24, 2019 for reading at November 6 Executive Committee Meeting. This draft will be fully developed with descriptions for approval by the Executive Committee.

Accreditation Institute

1. Program outline to Executive Committee for first reading – October 24, 2019

November 2019

Part-Time Faculty Institute

1. Final program draft due November 18, 2019 for final reading at December Executive Committee Meeting. This draft will be fully developed with descriptions for approval by the Executive Committee.

Accreditation Institute

1. Program draft to Executive Committee for first reading – November 18, 2019 for December meeting

December 2019

Part-Time Faculty Institute

1. Final program to Krystinne by December 20, 2019
2. All hotel and AV needs to Tonya by December 20, 2019
3. All hotel room nights need to be requested by December 20, 2019

Spring Plenary

1. First reading of draft papers due December 12, 2019 for reading at January Executive Committee Meeting.
2. Determine theme. Brainstorm keynote presenters and break out topics with the Executive Committee at January Meeting.

Accreditation Institute

1. Final program to Executive Committee for final reading – December 12, 2019 for January meeting.

Career and Noncredit Education Institute

1. Program outline to Executive Committee for first reading – Due December 12, 2019 for January meeting.

January 2020

Part-Time Faculty

1. Final Program to Krystinne by January 3, 2020.

2. Final program to printer January 10, 2020.
3. Materials posted to ASCCC website January 13, 2020.

Spring Plenary

1. Breakout topics due to Krystinne by January 3, 2020 for first reading at February Executive Committee Meeting. The preliminary program will be finalized at the February meeting for posting on the ASCCC website.

Accreditation Institute

1. Final program to Krystinne – January 27, 2020
2. AV and event needs to Tonya – January 20, 2020
3. All hotel rooms requested – January 20, 2020

Career and Noncredit Institute

1. Program draft to Executive Committee for first reading – January 21, 2020 for February meeting.

Faculty Leadership Institute

1. Program outline to Executive Committee for first reading – January 21, 2020 for February meeting.

February 2020

Spring Plenary

1. Pre-Session resolutions due to Resolutions chair February 14, 2020.
2. Second draft of papers due February 18, 2020 for reading at March Executive Committee Meeting.
3. Area Meeting information due to Tonya February 21, 2020.

Career and Noncredit Institute

1. Final program draft to Executive Committee for final reading – February 18, 2020 for March meeting.

Faculty Leadership Institute

1. Program draft to Executive Committee for first reading – February 18, 2020 for March meeting.

Curriculum

1. Develop theme and specifications for event.
2. Draft program outline due February 18, 2020 for first reading at March Executive Committee Meeting. Submit possible topics for general sessions and breakouts

March 2020

Spring Plenary

1. Final resolutions due to Krystinne for circulation to Area Meetings March 6, 2020.
2. AV and Event Supply needs to Tonya by March 20, 2020.
3. Any outside presenters are due to John and Krystinne by March 6, 2020 for approval.
4. Breakout session descriptions due to Krystinne by March 13, 2020.
5. Final Program to Krystinne by March 20, 2020.
6. Deadline for Area Meeting resolutions to Resolutions chair: March 28, 2020.
7. Final program to printer March 30, 2020.

8. Materials posted to ASCCC website April 1, 2020.

Career and Noncredit Education Institute

1. Program due to Krystinne – March 20, 2020
2. AV and events supply needs to Tonya – March 30, 2020
3. All hotel rooms requested by March 30, 2020

Curriculum

1. Program draft to Executive Committee for first reading - due March 26, 2020 for April meeting.

April 2020

Career and Noncredit Institute

1. Final program to printer April 10, 2020.
2. Materials posted to ASCCC website April 10, 2020.

Faculty Leadership

1. Final program draft to Executive Committee for final reading – April 20, 2020.

Curriculum

1. Presenters list due to Krystinne and John by April 30, 2020.

May 2020

Faculty Leadership

1. Final Program to Krystinne by May 25, 2020.
2. AV and event supplies to Tonya by May 25, 2020.
3. All hotels requested by May 25, 2020.

Curriculum

1. Final program draft due May 19, 2020 for final reading at June Executive Committee Meeting.

June 2020

Faculty Leadership

1. Final program to printer June 1, 2020.
2. Materials posted to ASCCC website June 1, 2020.

Curriculum

1. Final Program to Krystinne by June 10, 2020.
2. Final program to printer June 24, 2020.
3. AV and Event Supply needs to Tonya by June 10, 2020.
4. AV and event supplies to Tonya by June 10, 2020.
5. Materials posted to ASCCC website June 24, 2020.

2020-2021 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING DATES

*Unless otherwise noted, meetings typically start 11:00 a.m. on Friday and end by 4:00 p.m. on Saturday.¹

Meeting Type	Date	Campus Location	Hotel Location	Agenda Deadline
Executive Meeting – Orientation	June 17, 2020		NA	TBD
Executive Meeting	August 13-15, 2020		The Mission Inn Resort & Spa, Riverside, CA	July 27, 2020
Executive Meeting	September 17-19, 2020	Merritt College	North	August 28, 2020
Area Meetings	October 16-17, 2020		Various Locations	
Executive Meeting	November 4, 2020**		The Westin South Coast Plaza, Costa Mesa, CA	October 16, 2020
Executive Meeting	December 4-5, 2020		The Kimpton Sawyer, Sacramento, CA	November 16, 2020
Executive Meeting	January 8-9, 2021		Hotel Maya, Long Beach, CA	December 15, 2020
Executive Meeting	February 5-6, 2021		Residence Inn San Jose Airport, San Jose, CA	January 19, 2021
Executive Meeting	March 5-6, 2021	AREA C	South	February 16, 2021
Area Meetings	March 26-27, 2021		Various Locations	
Executive Meeting	April 14, 2021**		Los Angeles Marriott Burbank Airport, Burbank	March 26, 2021
Executive Meeting	May 7, 2021		Residence Inn San Jose Airport, San Jose, CA	April 19, 2021
Executive Committee/ Orientation	June 4-6, 2021		TBD by President	May 17, 2021
EVENTS				
Event Type²	Date		Hotel Location³	
Academic Academy	October 8-10, 2020		Embassy Suites, San Francisco Airport – Waterfront, Burlingame, CA	
Fall Plenary Session	November 5-7, 2020		The Westin South Coast Plaza, Costa Mesa, CA	
Part-Time Institute	February 18-20, 2021		Southern California	
Spring Plenary Session	April 15-17, 2021		Los Angeles Marriott Burbank Airport, Burbank, CA	
Career and Noncredit Education Institute	April 30- May 2, 2021		San Mateo Marriot, San Mateo, CA	
Faculty Leadership Institute	June 17-19, 2021		The Citizen Hotel, Sacramento, CA	
Curriculum Institute	July 7-10, 2021		Pasadena Convention Center, Pasadena, CA	

¹ Times may be adjusted to accommodate flight schedules to minimize early travel times.

² Executive Committee members are not expected to attend these events, other than the Faculty Leadership Institute. +North or South location may change based on hotel availability.

Academic Senate

2020 - 2021

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 13 – 15, 2020	July 27, 2020	August 3, 2020
September 17 – 19, 2020	August 28, 2020	September 4, 2020
November 4, 2020	October 16, 2020	October 23, 2020
December 4 – 5, 2020	November 16, 2020	November 23, 2020
January 8 – 9, 2021	December 15, 2019	December 22, 2019
February 5 – 6, 2021	January 19, 2021	January 25, 2021
March 5 – 6, 2021	February 16, 2021	February 22, 2021
April 14, 2021	March 26, 2021	April 2, 2021
May 7, 2021	April 19, 2021	April 26, 2021
June 4– 6, 2021	May 17, 2021	May 24, 2021

Local Senate Campus Visits 2016-2019

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

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
Area A			
American River	Executive Committee	9/30/2016	Executive Committee Meeting
	May	9/21/2018	AB 705 Presentation with Network for Equity in Math Education
Bakersfield	Bruno	11/28/2017	Collegiality in Action
	Cruz, Henderson	2/21/2019	Faculty Diversification Regionals
Butte	Goold, Davison, Aschenbach, Freitas	10/13/2016	Curriculum Regional
	Davison	5/12/2017	Butte Chico Center/ Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
	Executive Committee	3/2/2018	Executive Committee Meeting
Cerro Coso	Henderson	5/8/2019	Cal City Prison Graduation
	Executive Committee	9/6/2019	Executive Committee Meeting
	Stankas	1/30/2020	Collegiality in Action
Clovis	Davison	8/29/2016	IEPI PRT
	Davison	5/3/2017	Member/Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
	Aschenbach, May, Curry	9/5/2019	ESL Recoding Regional
Columbia			
Cosumnes River	Beach, Parker	3/8/2018	TASCC Regional
	Rutan, May	10/6/2018	AB 705 Regional
	Aschenbach	1/16/2019	Governance
Feather River	Beach	3/11-14/2018	ACCJC Team Visit

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
Folsom Lake	May, Goold, Aschenbach	10/14/2016	
	Goold	11/22/2016	Discipline Conversation
	Aschenbach, Rutan	11/17/2017	Curriculum Regional – North
	May, Mica	11/1/2019	Guided Pathways Regional Meeting
	Aschenbach	11/1/2019	Curriculum Regional Meeting
Fresno	Cruz	1/10/2019	Guided Pathways Convocation
Lake Tahoe			
Lassen	Bruno	4/25/2018	Collegiality in Action
Los Rios CCD	May, Mica, Rother	3/7/2019	Recoding Regional Meeting
Madera	Stanskas, Davison	1/31/2020	Collegiality in Action
Merced	Aschenbach	4/27/2017	PDC Visit for Julie Clark
	May, Aschenbach, Roberson, Stanskas	3/23/2018	Area A Meeting
	Aschenbach, Eikey	2/6/2019	Technical Visit – MQs and Equivalency
Modesto	May	3/24/2017	Area A Meeting
Porterville			
Redwoods, College of the			
Reedley	Aschenbach	5/3/2019	CTE Minimum Qualification Toolkit Regional Meeting
Sacramento City	Beach, A. Foster, Smith	2/19/2017	Diversity in Hiring Regional Meeting
	Foster, Davison	10/18/2017	Part Time Faculty Committee Meeting
	Freitas, Slattery-Farrell, Stanskas	4/3/2018	CTE MQ Workgroup Faculty Meeting
	Cruz, Henderson, Parker, Eikey	11/29/2018	FDC/ EDAC Hiring Regional Planning Meeting
	Parker, Roberson	12/11/2019	CTE / Noncredit Committee Meeting

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
San Joaquin Delta	Smith	11/18/2016	Formerly Incarcerated Regional Meeting
	Rutan	1/29-30/2018	Curriculum Visit
	Dyer, Aschenbach, May, Stanskas	3/22/2019	Area A Meeting
	Stanskas	9/25/2019	Collegiality in Action
	May, Cruz	2/24/2020	GP Equity
Sequoias, College of the	Dyer, Davison, May, Roberson	10/12/2018	Area A Meeting
	Fulks, Selden	1/31/2020	Guided Pathways Visit
Shasta			
Sierra	Freitas, May	10/4/2017	10+1
	May, Aschenbach, Bruno, Roberson	10/13/2017	Area A Meeting
	Bean, Bruzzese	8/15/2019	Technical Visit - Building Relationships in Governance
	Bean, Foster	9/19/2019	Faculty Leadership Development College
	Aschenbach, Bean, Davison, May, Stanskas	12/3/2019	ICAS
Siskiyou, College of the	Aschenbach	2/25/2020	Assistance Visit Governance
Taft	Aschenbach, Eikey	1/17/2019	Minimum Qualifications
	Stanskas	1/29/2020	Collegiality in Action
West Hills Coalinga			
West Hills Lemoore			
Woodland College	Freitas, Rutan, Foster, Adams	10/28/2016	MQ North Regional
	Beach, Parker	2/10/2018	TASCC Committee Meeting
	Davison, Foster	4/6/2018	EDAC Regionals
	May	5/30/2018	MQRTF Meeting
	Curry, Dyer, Roberson, May, Aschenbach	10/11/2019	Area A Meeting
Yuba	Cruz, Henderson	2/25/2019	Faculty Diversification Regional
	Donahue	8/14/2019	Guided Pathways Workshop
	Bean, Roberson	10/24/2019	Shared Governance - Technical Assistance

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
Area B			
Alameda, College of	Bruno	11/21/2016	Collegiality in Action
	Aschenbach	10/20/2017	ISF (CTE Regional)
Berkeley City			
Cabrillo	Davison	4/28/2017	Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
	Bruno	2/5/2018	Collegiality in Action
	May, Aschenbach	10/5/2018	Curriculum Certificates
	Aschenbach, Parker	10/30/2019	Local Senate Visit - Noncredit
Cañada	Rutan	2/9/2018	Curriculum Technical Assistance
Chabot	Smith	3/21/2017	Area B Meeting
	Davison	9/13/2018	
	Bruno, Davison		FACCC Meeting
	Rutan	11/6/2018	Noncredit Visit
	Davison, Roberson	1/31/2019	Governance
	Aschenbach	4/28/2020	IEPI PRT - Virtual
Chabot – Las Positas District	Davison	5/23/2017	Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
Contra Costa	Aschenbach	1/22/2020	Curriculum Visit/Presentation
DeAnza	Cruz	10/12/2018	Area B Meeting
	Stanskas, Davison, Aschenbac, May, Bean, Mica	2/6/2020	ICAS Meeting
Diablo Valley	May, Rutan	1/22/2019	Noncredit Curriculum
	Davison	11/12/2019	RP Leading Versus Lagging Convening
Evergreen Valley	Roberson, Eikey, Beach, May	5/12/2018	Guided Pathways Regional Meeting
	Parker, Cruz, Eikey	9/19/2018	Faculty Development Committee Meeting

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
Foothill	Executive Committee	3/3/2017	Executive Committee Meeting
	Davison	6/4/2019	Curriculum Committee - CPL
	Foster	10/24/2019	Local Senate Visit - Counseling Service Area Outcome Support
	Aschenbach	2/24/2020	Assistance Visit Governance
Gavilan	Executive Committee	9/6-7/2018	Executive Committee Meeting
Hartnell			
Laney	May	3/6/2017	District (PCCD) Enrollment Mgmt.
	Corrina Evett		
	Stanskas	8/28/2018	Peralta District Collegiality in Action
Las Positas	May	9/16/2016	SLO vs. Objectives
	May	8/16/2018	CLCCD Speaker at Convocation
Los Medanos			
Marin, College of	Davison	3/17/2017	Curriculum Streamlining
	Davison	9/15/2017	OER Regional
	Eikey	1/15/2019	Minimum Qualifications Equivalency
Mendocino	Bruno	9/22/2017	Collegiality in Action
Merritt	Davison	3/17/2017	Curriculum Streamlining
Mission	Davison, Freitas	12/8/2016	Local Visit
	May, Roberson	3/15/2019	Curriculum Regionals
	Cruz	9/26/2019	FACCC SouthBay Advocacy Summit
Monterey Peninsula	Freitas, Bruno	11/10/2016	Local Visit
	McKay	2/7/2018	IEPI PRT
	Henderson, Cruz, Davison	3/22/2019	Area B Meeting
	Aschenbach	4/29/2020	Technical Assistance Visit - Virtual
Napa Valley	Beach	11/14/2016	IEPI PRT Team Member

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
Ohlone	McKay, Davison	10/19/2017	Local Senate Visit
	Stanskas	9/26/2018	Collegiality in Action
	Davison	8/23/2019	Governance/Local Senate
Peralta CCD	Parker	11/4/2019	Local Senate Visit - Noncredit
San Francisco, City College of	Davison	3/8/2017	Technical Curriculum
	Rutan	2/5/2019	AB 705
	Parker	4/26/2019	FACCC Counselor's Conference
San José City	Davison	5/24/2017	Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
	Rutan, May	5/18/2018	Curriculum Regional
	Foster, Bruzzese	8/30/2019	TASSC In-person Meeting
San Mateo, College of	McKay, Rutan	10/12/2018	AB 705 Workshop
	Stanskas, Davison, Aschenbach, May, Bean, Mica	10/4/2019	ICAS
Santa Rosa Junior	Beach	11/21/2016	EDAC Strategic Plan Meeting
	Slattery-Farrell, Foster	3/10/2017	MQ
	May, Roberson	1/24/2018	GP Resource Team
	McKay	3/23/2018	Area B Meeting
	Aschenbach	10/3/2018	Tech Visit - Gov and Consultation
	Aschenbach, Roberson		Counselor Conference (Petaluma Campus)
Skyline	Davison, Beach, LSF, McKay, Crump	10/21/2016	Curriculum Regional Meeting
	Stanskas	1/25/2017	BDP Articulation
	McKay, Davison	10/13/2017	Area B Meeting
	May	3/5/2019	Recoding Regional Meeting
	Aschenbach	9/23/2019	AB 705 ESL Recoding Regional
	Aschenbach	12/14/2019	Curriculum Committee Meeting

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
Solano	Stankas, McKay, Smith, Davison	10/14/2016	Area B Meeting
	Rutan	2/16/2017	BDP Accreditation
	Foster, Davison	10/27/2017	EDAC Regional
	Aschenbach, Davison, May, McKay	10/24/2018	WEDPAC/EDAC Tour
	Cruz, Davison	10/11/2019	Area B Meeting (Off-site due to PG&E power shut down)
West Valley	Davison	11/8/2016	Local Senate Visit
	Aschenbach	12/7/2016	Noncredit Asst. (Zoom w/WVC Noncredit Task Force)
	Bruno	2/6/2018	Collegiality in Action
	Davison	8/24/2018	Local Senate Accreditation
Area C			
Allan Hancock	Cruz	10/25/2019	Guided Pathways Regional Meeting
Antelope Valley	Freitas, Slaterry-Farrell	11/29/2016	Equivalency Toolkit MQ Workgroups
Canyons, College of the	Freitas, Stankas	10/21/2016	MQ & Equivalencies Presentations
	Davison	10/5-6/2017	Civic Engagement Summit
	May, Roberson, Eikey	12/18/2017	Resolutions Committee Meeting
	Aschenbach	10/18/2018	Tech Visit, Advisory Committees
	May	3/18/2019	Recoding Regional Meeting
	May	9/20/2019	Guided Pathways and Governance
Cerritos	Rutan, May	5/19/2018	Curriculum Regional
	Davison	1/18/2019	FACCC Policy Forum
	Cruz	5/9/2019	Faculty-Employee Diversification Action Planning Session
Citrus	Roberson	8/23/2018	Local Senate Visit, Guided Pathways
	Eikey, Davison, Bruzzese, Bean	3/23/2019	Area C Meeting
Cuesta	Fulks	11/14/2019	Local Senate Visit, Guided Pathways
	Cruz	11/15/2019	CEO Training, with ACHRO

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
East LA	Freitas, Foster, Bruno	3/25/2017	Area C Meeting
	Davison		Mini PRT
El Camino	Executive Committee	2/3/2017	Executive Committee Meeting, Governance
	Freitas	10/20/2017	Presentation for ECC PRIDE P.D. Meeting
	May, Roberson	1/18/2018	GP Resource Team
	Parker, Eikey	10/19/2018	ECC Pride Leadership Presenters
Compton College	May, Roberson	8/25/2017	Guided Pathways
	Eikey, Stankas, Bruzzese, Aschenbach	10/13/2018	Area C Meeting
	Stankas	2/8/2019	Collegiality in Action
Glendale	Rutan, Foster	9/24/2016	Accreditation Committee Meeting
	Aschenbach	12/8/2016	Noncredit Committee Meeting
	Freitas, Slattery-Farrell, Stankas	6/9/2017	
	Freitas, Eikey, Bruno	3/24/2018	Area C Meeting
LA District	Davison	3/10/2017	Curriculum Workshop
	May	10/18/2019	Local Senate Visit - AB 705
LA City	Rutan	9/22/2017	LACCD District Academic Senate Summit
	McKay, Freitas	1/5/2018	Online Education Committee Meeting
	Beach	3/9/2018	TASCC Regional
LA Harbor	Rutan	5/5/2017	TOP Code Alignment
LA Mission	Eikey, Aschenbach	3/16/2018	Governance
	Dyer, Velasquez Bean	2/15/2020	Standards and Practice Committee Meeting
LA Pierce	Roberson	8/23/2018	Guided Pathways Visit
	Aschenbach	11/2/2019	Curriculum Regional Meeting

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
LA Southwest	Roberson, Parker	2/13/2019	RWLS Committee Meeting
	Aschenbach, Roberson, Stankas	2/28/2019	GP and Local Senate Visit
	Executive Committee	3/1/2019	Executive Committee Meeting
	Stankas	5/9/2019	Collegiality in Action
LA Trade-Technical	Smith	10/21/2016	Formerly Incarcerated Regional Meeting
LA Valley	Rutan, Aschenbach	12/9/2017	Curriculum Committee Meeting
	Aschenbach	3/17/2018	Curriculum Committee Meeting
	May	12/14/2018	Curriculum Committee Meeting
Moorpark	Freitas, Stankas, Eikey	10/14/2017	Area C Meeting
	Eikey	5/8/2019	CTE Minimum Qualification Toolkit Regional Meeting
Mt. San Antonio	Davison, LSF, Aschenbach, Beach, Rutan	10/22/2016	Curriculum Regional
	Davison	2/23/2017	Dual Enrollment Toolkit
	Davison, Rutan, Beach	2/25/2017	Curriculum Committee Meeting
	Aschenbach	6/4/2017	Curriculum Assistance
	Aschenbach	7/19/2018	Curriculum Assistance
	May	11/17/2018	Curriculum Regional
	May	8/1/2019	Senate Governance and Guided Pathways
Oxnard			
Pasadena City	Foster, Freitas	11/15/2016	Area C Meeting
	Roberson, Beach, Eikey, May	5/11/2018	Guided Pathways Regional Meeting
Rio Hondo	Beach	9/27/2018	Guided Pathways
	Cruz	8/21/2019	Technical Visit - EDI Focus
	Bean, Davison, Donahue, Bruzzese	10/12/2019	Area C Meeting
	Foster, Bruzzese	1/31/2020	TASSC In-person Meeting
Santa Barbara City	Stankas	1/18/2019	Collegiality in Action

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
Santa Monica	McKay	9/14/2018	Equity and Diversity Action Committee Meeting
Ventura	Freitas	4/2/2016	Area C Meeting
	Freitas, Beach	1/18/2018	Noncredit Presentations
West LA	Roberson	5/8/2017	Mini PRT
Area D			
Barstow	Rutan, Stanskas, S. Foster, Beach, Slattery-Farrell	3/25/2017	Area D Meeting
	Slattery-Farrell, Stanskas	8/29/2017	Technical Visit
Chaffey	Slattery-Farrel, Freitas, S. Foster	3/10/2017	MQ Regional
		10/21/2017	CTE Regional
	Beach, Eikey	12/13/2017	Educational Policies Committee Meeting
Coastline			
Copper Mountain			
Crafton Hills	Rutan, Beach, Foster, Parker, Slattery-Farrell, Stanskas	3/24/2018	Area D Meeting
Cuyamaca			
Cypress	Freitas, Stanskas	1/20/2017	
	May	8/3/2019	GP, Local Senate. Curriculum
	Aschenbach, May	9/11/2019	AB 705 ESL Recoding Regional
Desert, College of the	Rutan, Fulks	1/24/2019	Guided Pathways/AB 705
Fullerton	Beach	9/20-21/16	SLO Presentation
	Davison, Foster	10/28/2017	EDAC Regional
Golden West			
Grossmont	May, Eikey	4/30/2018	Governance
	May	5/13/2019	Curriculum and Guided Pathways

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
Imperial Valley	Beach	4/7/2017	Governance Presentation
	Donahue	11/21/2019	Guided Pathways Regional Meeting
Irvine Valley	Davison, Rutan	5/15/2017	Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
	May	3/16/2019	Curriculum Regional
Long Beach City	Davison, Rutan	4/26/2017	Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
	Aschenbach, Rutan	11/18/2017	Curriculum Regional - South
	Beach, Pilati	3/23/2018	Guided Pathways
	Davison, Foster	10/16/2018	Accreditation Committee Meeting
	Stankas, Davison, Aschenbach. May, Bean, Mica	9/12/2019	ICAS
MiraCosta	May Beach	9/28/2016	Educational Policies Committee Meeting
	Foster, Freitas	8/10/2017	Educational Policies Committee Meeting
	May, Aschenbach	3/13/2019	Recoding Regional Meeting
Moreno Valley	McKay, Stankas	1/27/2017	Online Education Committee Meeting
	Executive Committee	9/29-30/2017	Executive Committee Meeting
	May	2/27/2020	Guided Pathways Visit
Mt. San Jacinto	Foster	11/17/2017	SI Institute
	Rutan	1/30/2019	Chemistry
	May	1/15/2020	Chemistry/Curriculum Visit
Norco	Davison, Slattery-Farrell, Eikey, Aschenbach	1/11/2018	RWLS Committee Meeting
	Cruz, Henderson	2/28/2019	Faculty Diversification Regional
	Foster, Rutan, Parker, Stankas	3/23/2019	Area D Meeting
North Orange - Noncredit	Executive Committee	3/6/2020	Executive Committee Meeting
Orange Coast	Aschenbach	2/9/2018	SLO Symposium
	Beach, Pilati	3/16/2018	Guided Pathways
Palo Verde	Rutan	8/31/2017	TOP Code Alignment

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
Palomar	Aschenbach, McKay	12/3/2016	Noncredit South Regional Meeting
	Rutan, Parker, Foster, Davison	10/13/2018	Area D Meeting
	Stankas	4/15/2019	Collegiality in Action
Riverside City	Freitas, Stankas, Slattery-Farrell	10/29/2016	MQ South Regional Meeting
	Davison, Rutan	5/30/2017	Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
	Davison, Stankas	11/4/2019	Assembly Higher Education Hearing on Faculty Diversification
Saddleback	Davison	3/15/2017	Curriculum Tech Visit
	Rutan	1/30/2019	Noncredit
San Bernardino Valley	Executive Committee	9/9/2016	Executive Committee Meeting
	Rutan	5/11/2018	AB 705 Implementation
	Rutan, Parker	9/20/2018	AB 705 Regional
	Foster, Davison	2/19/2019	Accreditation Committee Meeting
	Dyer, Bruzzese	10/30/2019	Local Senate Visit - Brown Act/Roberts Rules
	May, Mica, Cruz, Donahue	1/30/2020	Guided Pathways Taskforce
San Diego City	Beach	1/19/2018	FACCC Board
San Diego Cont. Ed.	Rutan, Slattery-Farrell	10/15/2016	Area D Meeting
	Smith	11/19/2016	TOP Code Alignment
	Stankas, A. Foster	5/2/2017	Tech Visit
	Foster, Davison		PT Faculty Meeting
San Diego Mesa	Davison, Rutan	5/22/2017	Curriculum Streamlining Workshop
	May	9/22/2018	MQRTF Meeting
	Curry, Donahue	1/16/2020	Educational Policies Committee Meeting
San Diego Miramar	May	10/28/2016	IEPI Convening for Planning
	Bruno	5/1/2018	Collegiality in Action
Santa Ana	Beach	8/23/2017	Presentation on Role of Local ASCCC Senates Governance
	Foster, May, Bruzzese	1/25/2019	SLO Symposium

COLLEGE	VISITOR	DATE OF VISIT	REASON
Santiago Canyon	Davison, Beach, Rutan	12/8/2017	Basic Skills Committee Meeting
	Rutan, Parker	1/10/2019	Noncredit Committee Meeting
Southwestern	Rutan	12/12/2016	TOP Code Alignment
	Beach, A. Foster, Smith	2/10/2017	Diversity in Faculty Hiring Regional Meeting
	Davison, Foster, Beach	4/7/2018	EDAC Regional
	Parker	9/17/2018	TASCC Meeting
	Davison, Stanskas	9/17-18/2018	Board of Governors and Trustee for California Online CCD
Victor Valley	Fulks	11/1/2019	Guided Pathways Regional Meeting

Action Tracking as of 3/6/2020										
Action Item	Month Assigned	Year Assigned	Orig. Agenda Item #	Assigned To	Due Date	Status	Description	Status Notes	Month Complete	Year Complete
Professional Development College	March	2019	IV. Q.	Executive Director		Assigned	To explore the allocation of resources to continue the Professional Development College and report the findings at the next budget update.	3.6.20: Approval from the Executive Committee to move the PDC to OERI.	March	2020
Revision of Data 101 Paper	June	2019	IV. H.	Educational Policies Committee; Lead: Nathaniel Donahue	Nov-19	In Progress	A revised Data 101: Guiding Principles for Faculty will be brought to the November 6, 2019 Executive Committee Meeting for review.	7.9.19: Can/Should this be delegated? 8.10.19: Reassigned from Roberson/Davison to the Educational Policies Committee. 9.27.19: Reviewed by Educational Policies Committee, recommended a new paper and Rostrum article on Data 101 and 10 years. Item will return in December based on the direction of Plenary Resolutions.		
Legislative Report	December	2019	IV. A.	FACCC Liaison and Legislative and Advocacy Committee Chair		Assigned	The FACCC Liaison and Legislative and Advocacy Committee Chair to communicate the Executive Committee's concerns to FACCC regarding AB 705 cleanup language and that reopening the law in this legislative cycle is premature.			
Proposed Revision to the ASCCC Mission and Values Statements and the Proposed Vision Statement	December	2019	IV. G.	Mayra Cruz		In Progress	A revised draft of the Vision, Mission, and Values statements will be brought to the Executive Committee for review.	2.7.20: The Vision, Mission, and Values statement was reviewed and approved at the February Executive Committee Meeting. 3.6.20: The Vision, Mission, and Values statement will be brought to Spring Plenary for adoption.	April	2020
Referred Resolutions From Fall Plenary	December	2019	IV. H.	The President and Guided Pathways Chair		Assigned	The President and Guided Pathways Chair request time at the CATESOL Spring Workshop to provide information regarding CB 25 coding and the inclusion of ESL courses.			

Action Tracking as of 3/6/2020										
Action Item	Month Assigned	Year Assigned	Orig. Agenda Item #	Assigned To	Due Date	Status	Description	Status Notes	Month Complete	Year Complete
Faculty Leadership and Development Committee (FLDC); Professional Development College	December	2019	IV. K.	Faculty Leadership Development Committee		In Progress	The Academic Senate Foundation and FDLC develop a proposal of a redesigned leadership academy. The PDC modules will be evaluated for effectiveness and necessary updates.	<p>1.10.2020: A draft proposal was brought for discussion at the January Executive Committee Meeting. The FLDC will work to further develop the proposal for approval by the Executive Committee Meeting.</p> <p>3.6.2020: The Faculty Empowerment and Leadership Academy was approved with considerations from the Office regarding funding.</p>	March	2020
ASCCC Brand Survey	January	2020	V. D.	ASCCC Office		Assigned	The Visual Designer will develop mock concepts based on the feedback from the discussion to be discussed at a future Executive Committee Meeting.	<p>2.7.20: The Executive Committee discussed the proposed levels of change to the ASCCC logo and branding.</p>		



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Hayward Award and Exemplary Program Award Rubrics		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: II. B.	
		Attachment: Yes (2)	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will consider for approval the revised rubrics for the Hayward Award and the Exemplary Program Award.	Urgent: Yes	
		Time Requested: NA	
CATEGORY:	Consent Calendar	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Geoffrey Dyer/Michelle Bean	Consent/Routine	X
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND: During the February, in-person meeting of the Standards & Practices Committee, the committee began to revise the Hayward and Exemplary Program Award rubrics to better include equity, diversity, and inclusion as criteria for the awards. Though the Hayward Award already had diversity as a criterion, Standards & Practices has since revised both rubrics to reflect equity, diversity and inclusion.

A tier one activity of the 2020 California Community Colleges *Vision for Success Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Task Force Report* is for “ASCCC to evaluate the Academic Senate faculty award application process and embed equity, diversity, and inclusion criteria.” The updated rubrics align with the ASCCC’s inclusivity statement. The Standards & Practices Committee recommends the attached revisions to the Hayward Award and Exemplary Program Award rubrics.

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



The Hayward Award for “Excellence in Education” – Rubric (2020-21)

Nominee number _____

	0	1	2	3	4
a. Commitment to serving and empowering students from diverse backgrounds and experiences <u>and promoting equity and inclusion</u>	Not present	Awareness of the value for student centered operations is shown but lacks evidence of activities demonstrating commitment to serving students of <u>diverse backgrounds and promoting equity and inclusion</u> .	Evidence detailing activities demonstrating minimal commitment to serving students of <u>diverse backgrounds and promoting equity and inclusion</u> included in the application.	Evidence detailing some activities demonstrating a strong commitment to serving students of <u>diverse backgrounds and promoting equity and inclusion</u> in candidate form. Some evidence in supporting letter as well.	Significant evidence detailing activities demonstrating a strong commitment to serving students of <u>diverse backgrounds and promoting equity and inclusion</u> in both candidate form and supporting letter. Activities demonstrate willingness to go beyond standard expectations in job description.
b. Participation in campus, professional, and/or student activities	Not present	Evidence shows limited participation in one or more campus activities.	Evidence shows engaged participation and leadership in at least one campus activity or project.	Evidence shows engaged senior leadership (president, chair, etc.) in at least one campus activity or project.	Evidence shows long term engaged senior leadership (president, chair, etc.) in multiple campus activities and projects.
c. Commitment to education and currency in the discipline	Not present	Evidence of interest and limited engagement in discipline related activities.	Evidence of engagement in at least one regional, state, or national discipline group, industry, or professional organization.	Evidence of criteria from #2 as well as engagement with department faculty to similarly engage them in their discipline communities.	Evidence of engagement in multiple organizations and sustained engagement with department faculty and students to similarly engage them in their discipline communities.
d. Commitment to the mission of California community colleges .	Not present	Description details an understanding of one or two aspects of the community college mission.	Description details a broad understanding of CCC mission and how candidate’s role affects all aspects of the mission including evidence of commitment to open access.	Evidence of criteria from #2 with a description of some candidate activities that directly support open access and student success.	Strong evidence for multiple activities directly supporting several aspects of the CCC mission. Evidence of activities being institutionalized that lead to sustained support for open access and helping students succeed across the curriculum.
e. Community, state and/or national activities that represent the profession	Not present	Evidence of interest and limited representation in regional, state or national activities that extend their participation and influence beyond their discipline or institution.	Evidence of sustained representation in at least one regional, state or national discipline group, industry, or professional organization. Descriptions detail a broader scope of activities such as serving on	Evidence of sustained representation in at least one of the previously mentioned organizations in a leadership role to further that organization’s purposes while also broadening their abilities as a leader and their capacity to represent in areas that	Evidence of sustained representation in several of the previously mentioned organizations as an experienced leader and evidence of engagement with other like-minded participants to improve upon their participation and

			committees outside of their core interests.	are not traditional to their expertise.	experiences as well as to further the organization's purposes.
--	--	--	---	---	--

Exemplary Program Award – Rubric (20-21) Name of College and Program _____

	0	1	2	3	4
a. Indicators of Overall Program Success	Not present	Cites positive program attributes but lacks supporting detail Too vague	Indicators of program success cursorily cited Quality and/or quantity of data is insufficient	Sufficient number of indicators of program success cited Quantitative OR qualitative data is present but ambiguous	Significant indicators of program success cited. Detailed and substantive quantitative AND qualitative evidence
b. Evidence Showing Need and Innovation	Not present	Cites program uniqueness but lacks supporting detail Too vague	Evidence of innovation cursorily cited	Evidence of innovation clearly cited Evidence shows that program is innovative in addressing a recognized need	Evidence of innovation clearly cited Evidence shows that program researched need, planned an innovative intervention, and successfully implemented it
c. Evidence of Intentional Efforts to Promote Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion	<u>Not present</u>	<u>Cites equity, diversity, and inclusion but lacks supporting detail</u> <u>Too vague</u>	<u>Evidence of equity, diversity, and inclusion cursorily cited</u>	<u>Evidence of intentional efforts to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion clearly cited</u> <u>Evidence shows that program promotes equity, diversity, and inclusion</u>	<u>Evidence of intentional efforts to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion clearly cited</u> <u>Evidence shows that program promotes equity, diversity, and inclusion in multiple, effective ways</u>
d. Demonstrated Collaboration	Not present	Cites program collaboration but lacks supporting detail Too vague	Evidence of collaboration cursorily cited	Evidence shows collaboration is expanding within existing working relationships at the college or with community partners	Evidence shows new collaboration formed within the college or with community partners where none existed before the program

<p>e. Evidence of Program Supporting Your College's Mission Statement</p>	<p>Not present</p>	<p>Cites evidence supporting mission statement but lacks supporting detail</p> <p>Too vague</p>	<p>Evidence supporting mission statement cursorily cited</p>	<p>Evidence shows program supports elements of mission statement by clearly connecting program to one or more area of the statement</p>	<p>Evidence shows program supports elements of mission statement by clearly connecting program to one or more area AND being included in college planning (such as program review, master plan, accreditation, etc.)</p>
<p>f. How This Program Could Be a Model For Other CCs</p>	<p>Not present</p>	<p>Cites positive program attributes but lacks supporting detail</p> <p>Too vague</p>	<p>Discussion of how this program could be a CC model is cursorily addressed</p> <p>Too costly or boutique to replicate</p>	<p>Discussion of how this program could be a CC model is addressed accurately</p> <p>Moderate cost or challenge to replicate</p>	<p>Detailed discussion of how to replicate this program at other colleges.</p> <p>Moderate to no cost</p>



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Deactivation of Basic Skills Initiative Website		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: II. C.	
		Attachment: No	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will consider for approval the deactivation of the Basic Skills Initiative website	Urgent: Yes	
		Time Requested: NA	
CATEGORY:	Consent Calendar	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Krystinne Mica	Consent/Routine	X
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

The CCCBSI.org is a website for the Basic Skills Initiative project which was a grant funded initiative from the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) and began in 2006 as part of the strategic planning process. The goal of the BSI was to improving student access and success.

This website has not been updated nor funded for updating since 2011 and contains outdated documents and resources. The platform that currently hosts the website will be discontinued by October 2020. It would require spending funds, as well as dedicating staff in order to rebuild and move the website to another hosting platform.

The Executive Committee will consider for approval deactivating the cccbsi.org website and archiving the information contained in the website via the ASCCC's shared drive.

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

2SUBJECT: Legislative Report		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: IV. A.	
		Attachment: Yes, forthcoming	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will be updated regarding bills and other legislative actions.	Urgent: Yes	
		Time Requested: 20 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Action Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Dolores Davison	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	X
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

The legislature has reconvened and is considering bills for the remainder of the 2020 legislative session. The May Revision was released on 14 May 2020 and will be discussed.

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

OSUBJECT: Guided Pathways Implementation		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: IV. B.	
		Attachment: No	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will be updated on the implementation of the CCC Guided Pathways Award Program and discuss future direction.	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 10 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Action Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Stanskas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonerio	Action	X
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in partnership with the Chancellor’s Office and the Research and Planning Group, is leading the effort to support guided pathways implementation at local colleges.

The Executive Committee will be updated on the implementation of the CCC Guided Pathways Award Program as well as the efforts of the ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force and discuss/provide future direction.

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Faculty Role in Governance		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: IV. C.	
		Attachment: No	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will be updated on the Role of Faculty in Governance in the system and discuss further direction.	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 15 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Action Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Stankas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	X
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

The Executive Committee will be updated on the Role of Faculty in Governance in the system and discuss further direction.

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Faculty Diversification		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: IV. D.	
		Attachment: No	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will be updated on Faculty Diversification in the system and discuss future direction.	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 15 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Action Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Stankas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	X
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

The Executive Committee will be updated on Faculty Diversification and discuss future direction.

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Faculty Leadership Institute Program (Final)		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: IV. E.	
		Attachment: Yes, forthcoming	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will consider for approval the final program for the 2020 Faculty Leadership Institute.	Urgent: Yes	
		Time Requested: 20 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Action Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Dolores Davison	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	X
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

The Faculty Leadership Institute (FLI) will be offered in a virtual format in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, beginning on Wednesday, 17 June 2020. The Executive Committee is asked to suggest any last changes to the program prior to it being distributed.

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Effective and Equitable Transfer Paper		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: IV. F.	
		Attachment: Yes, forthcoming	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will consider for approval the paper to be sent to Fall plenary for possible adoption by the body.	Urgent: Yes	
		Time Requested: 15 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Action Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Dolores Davison/David Morse	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	X
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

The paper was revised to include all of the suggestions from the previous Executive Committee comments as well as those on the Google drive.

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Curriculum Institute – Final Program		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: IV. G.	
		Attachment: Yes, forthcoming	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will consider for approval the final program for 2020 Curriculum Institute (Virtual Conference).	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 20 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Action Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Cheryl Aschenbach	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	X
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

The Executive Committee has previously taken actions on a proposed structure and breakout topics, and then at its May 8, 2020 meeting took action to shift the Curriculum Institute to a virtual event. As delineated in the list of key event dates for the Curriculum Institute, the Curriculum Committee presents a final program for adoption by the Executive Committee.

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Equivalency Paper Update First Reading		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: IV. H.	
		Attachment: Yes (1)	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will review and consider for approval the second draft of the updated paper <i>Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications</i> .	Urgent: Yes	
		Time Requested: 20 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Action Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Geoffrey Dyer/Dolores Davison/Carrie Roberson	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	X
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND: In March of 2020, the Executive Committee approved the outline of the planned updates to the paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications*. In April, the Executive Committee provided constructive feedback on the initial draft, which highlighted the legal permissibility of equivalency, its relationship to faculty diversification, the viability of the *CTE Faculty MQ Toolkit* in providing resources for documenting equivalence to the associate’s degree, and pertinent considerations regarding eminence. The second draft synthesizes feedback from the Executive Committee’s first reading of the document. The draft now highlights the role of equivalency in an institution’s overall hiring procedures as they relate to an institutional commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion through the application of institutionally-focused, systemically aware, equity-advancing practices. The model board policy and administrative procedure in the appendix have been modified to recommend that local academic senates regularly review their local equivalence process to ensure it is in alignment with an institution’s commitment to advancing equity, diversity, and inclusion. Singular, gender-specific pronouns have been replaced with inclusive terms, and deficit-minded language casting the equivalency process as inherently problematic has been replaced with more accurate terminology. The proposed draft is commentable in [Google Doc](#) and is also included here.

Please note that, for the ease of the Executive Committee, new additions are indicated with underline and deletions with strikethrough. Upon approval, these formatting features should be removed. Additionally, many of the more significant changes new to second reading are highlighted with a comment of “new” or “new to second read” in the Google Doc.

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

Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications

Planned Adoption: Fall 2020-Adopted Spring 2016

2019-2020 ASCCC Executive Committee

Krystinne Mica, Executive Director, ASCCC

John Stankas, Chemistry, San Bernardino Valley College

Dolores Davison, History – Women’s Studies, Foothill College

Cheryl Aschenbach, English, Lassen College

Virginia May, Mathematics, Sacramento City College

Geoffrey Dyer, English, Taft College

Mayra College, De Anza College

Michelle Bean, English, Rio Hondo

LaTonya Parker, Counselor, Moreno Valley College

Carrie Roberson, Education, Child & Family Studies, Butte College

Stephanie Curry, Library Science, Reedley College

Anna Bruzzese, Sociology, Los Angeles Pierce College

Sam Foster, Chemistry, Fullerton College

Silvester Henderson, Music, Los Medanos College

Nathaniel Donahue, Art History, Santa Monica College

2015-2016 Standards and Practices Committee

John Stankas, (Chair), Chemistry, San Bernardino Valley College

Julie Adams, Executive Director, ASCCC

Randy Beach, English, Southwestern College

Lisa Cook, ESL, Laney College

Alicia Rodriguez Estrada, History, Los Angeles Trade Tech

Michelle Sampat, Reading, Mt. San Antonio College

Paul Setziol, Music, DeAnza College

Executive Summary

In 1988 the Community College Reform Act (AB 1725) began to phase out credentials for faculty in favor of a process for establishing minimum qualifications to teach in a discipline. Part of that process included a way to determine equivalencies that are at least equal to the state-adopted minimum qualifications for a particular discipline.

According to Education Code §§ 87359 and 87360, individuals who do not possess the minimum qualifications for service may be hired as faculty members if they possess “qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications.” The Disciplines List, called *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*, is a list of Board of Governors’ adopted minimum qualifications for hiring faculty, which uses the term “equivalency” to describe processes to support this regulation.

Faculty diversification is a longstanding goal of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office reported in its 2018 Equal Employment Opportunity Report that while under-represented minority students make up over half of the California Community Colleges' students, full time faculty of color make up less than thirty percent of the system's tenure track, full time faculty, and part-time faculty of color make up an even smaller percentage of the system's adjunct faculty. Equivalency is a means of broadening applicant pools, which in turn can promote diversity by providing the opportunity for more qualified applicants to be considered for faculty positions.

The equivalency process is an important component of the hiring process, and as such is an important aspect of equity-minded practices relating to faculty diversification. Institutionally focused, systemically aware, and equity-advancing practices should permeate the hiring process, and a district's locally determined equivalency process is an important component of a district's overall commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Every district must have an equivalency process, and the determination of equivalency is the purview of the academic senate. Education Code §87359 (b) requires that "[t]he process, as well as criteria, and standards by which the governing board reaches its determination regarding faculty members shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board." While neither the Education Code nor Title 5 Regulations provide additional guidelines for what constitutes *at least equivalent*, each district's governing

board, acting on the advice of its academic senate, must establish its standard for equivalency, permitted the standard is not less than qualifications specified on the Disciplines List. Once equivalency regarding an individual applicant has been determined, Education Code §87359(a) requires that the governing board take action on the equivalency before hiring occurs. Because the equivalency process was created by AB1725 and chaptered into the California Education Code, districts are not free to ignore provisions within the law.

The Academic Senate has consistently supported the following basic principles for granting equivalency:

- Equivalency promotes diversity by broadening the applicant pool.
- Equivalent to the minimum qualifications means *equal* to the minimum qualifications, not *nearly* equal.
- ~~The applicant~~ Applicants must provide evidence ~~he or she~~ they have ~~has~~ attained the breadth of coursework or experience equal to the general education component of an earned associate's or bachelor's degree.
- ~~The applicant~~ Applicants must provide evidence ~~he or she has attained~~ demonstrating attainment of the skills and knowledge provided by specialized coursework required for the degree listed in the Disciplines List.
- Local hiring procedures should support applicants seeking equivalency by providing public-facing information that makes clear the definition of and process

for requesting equivalency and provides resources to help applicants new to the California Community Colleges and unfamiliar with its nomenclature navigate the equivalency process.

Commented [1]: new to second read

- Faculty members exemplify to their students the value of an education that is both well-rounded and specialized and has consistently defined associate's degree parameters. Faculty should act as models for students by demonstrating a breadth of general education knowledge and a depth of knowledge that is discipline specific.
- Eminence should not be used as the sole criteria for granting equivalence (ASCCC Resolution 10.01 SP09).
- No provisional or conditional equivalency should exist.

Many criteria for determining equivalency seem obvious and can be handled in a simple manner. Others are more difficult. Most district equivalency policies recognize at least one of three ways of demonstrating equivalency: 1) course work, 2) work experience, and 3) eminence in the field. In addition, a sub-set of experience or a combination of the three may be recognized. But whatever the means are for making determinations, equivalency should never mean less than the qualifications specified on the Disciplines List.

Establishing equivalency through coursework is often relatively simple, as transcripts are concrete documents that can be compared to concrete criteria. A somewhat more difficult case occurs when the name of a degree is close to that specified on the

Disciplines List but the coursework is slightly different. Other more difficult cases occur when work experience is proposed as the equivalent of academic work. Knowledge acquired in a course could also be gained in other ways; however, the ~~problem~~ challenge lies in obtaining convincing evidence to establish that an applicant has enough educational preparation through an alternative means to be judged equally knowledgeable as someone with the appropriate degree.

General education preparation should be distinguished from discipline specific preparation. The Academic Senate supports the principle that all community college faculty exemplify the qualities of a college-educated person. For this reason, the universal requirement for all disciplines includes at least an associate degree in addition to six years of experience. When a local academic senate evaluates an applicant's equivalency, an equivalency committee should consider whether the applicant satisfies the general education qualification for which he or she seeks equivalency. In addition, the applicant should be expected to provide evidence of equivalent preparation that is as reliable and objective as a transcript. *The Career Technical Education Faculty Minimum Qualifications Toolkit (2019)* provides tools, including tangible examples by general education area, for documenting equivalence. Thus, the candidate seeking equivalence should be measured by the same ~~yardstick~~ standard as a candidate who possesses the minimum qualifications. Moreover, processes for determining eminence should be defined in hiring practice criteria and should indicate that, regardless of the discipline, general education preparation is vital to instruction of any subject in order to provide an essential cross-curricular breadth and depth.

Many local academic senates use an equivalency committee to ensure that the equivalency process is consistent and fair. This committee is either a subcommittee of the academic senate or a separate committee whose membership is determined by the academic senate. Although making the judgment of whether a specific candidate's experience is equivalent to the minimum qualifications can be difficult, faculty in the discipline play a critical role in informing the decision. However, to ensure that the process of determining equivalency is applied consistently across the campus, it must include faculty from outside the discipline and appointed by the academic senate. The benefits to having a breadth of discipline representatives on an equivalency committee are the following:

- The breadth or general education requirements equivalent to an earned degree may be more readily addressed when faculty from other disciplines are involved.
- Committee decisions are easily communicated and the logic and credibility of a specific decision is more easily understood by administrators, external partners or agencies, and future senate leaders when more faculty voices are involved.
- Decision-making is more consistent when committee representatives are constant rather than dependent on the discipline and their decisions are made without bias.

The role of the Human Resources office should be limited to collecting, date-stamping, and forwarding applications and other pertinent information to the academic senate or equivalency committee. A college district that attempts to use its human resources office staff to establish equivalence not only risks creating a situation in which candidates are not evaluated appropriately but is out of compliance with the Education Code and Title 5 Regulations (see Education Code §87359 (b) and Title 5 §53430 (b)).

Colleges must remember that minimum qualifications in a discipline—and, by extension, equivalency—are the same whether the position is full- or part-time. Title 5 Regulations do not allow for a different standard of equivalency for part-time faculty. An applicant is either qualified to teach the full range of courses in a discipline or not, regardless of whether applying for a full-time position or a part-time position. Education Code §87359 (a) (see also Title 5 §53430) states, “No one may be hired to serve as a community college faculty ... unless the governing board determines that he or she possesses qualifications that are *at least equivalent* to the minimum qualifications specified” (italics added). In addition, minimum qualifications are determined for disciplines, not for courses or subject areas within disciplines. Legal Opinion L 03-28 (R. Black, 2004) (see Appendix C), supports the position that “a district is not authorized to establish a single course equivalency as a substitute for meeting minimum qualifications in a discipline.”

Colleges must understand that when a faculty member is hired, he or she is hired by a district’s governing board. The faculty, through the academic senate, is granted the purview to determine if a potential faculty member meets the minimum qualifications, but the governing board and administration have the purview to determine if the

applicant shall be hired. The fact that an applicant meets the minimum qualifications does not guarantee an offer of employment by the administration.

This paper concludes with recommendations for the determination of equivalencies, including who determines equivalency, that equivalency is granted for a discipline, that policies and procedures must be consistent, objective, evidence based, and mindful of general education and specialization, and that local governing boards include action on the equivalency as part of their subsequent hiring action.

Following the recommendations, this paper provides a proposed equivalency model as well as a legal opinion stating that local districts are not authorized to establish a single course equivalency.

Introduction

This paper is the ~~third~~ fourth revision of the ASCCC paper on equivalency adopted by the delegates to the plenary session in 1989. The original paper was intended to help local academic senates develop policies and procedures in response to Education Code §87359, which requires that each district's governing board and academic senate jointly develop an equivalency policy. ~~This revision~~ The 2016 version was called for by resolution in Fall 2014 and ~~adds~~ added new considerations and content called for by faculty subsequent to the 2006 version. The Fall 2014 Resolution 10.01 states,

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges survey the field to identify local practices for establishing equivalence to minimum

qualifications, including the use of eminence; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges revise the paper Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications and bring it to the body for adoption at the Spring 2016 Plenary Session.

Like the 2006 revision, ~~this~~ the 2016 ~~revision provides~~ provided a more thorough discussion of equivalency than the original paper and the 1999 revision. It also ~~includes~~ included the legal opinion from the General Counsel of the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office distributed December 23, 2003, which upholds the prohibition on single-course equivalencies. In addition, it ~~includes~~ included results of the Academic Senate's 2015 survey on equivalency practices in California community colleges.

In 2019, the CTE Minimum Qualifications Workgroup released the *Career Technical Education Faculty Minimum Qualifications Toolkit*, which furnishes specific tools for determining and documenting equivalency, particularly to specific general education areas. The document reports that a survey, primarily to California Community Colleges CTE faculty revealed that "the equivalency process is underused and varies greatly in application across districts and local campuses." At a 2020 Faculty Diversification Strategies Partners meeting hosted by the ASCCC and including representation from the Association of Chief Human Resources, the California Community Colleges Chief Instructional Officers, the Chief Student Services Officers Association, and the Chief

Executive Officers of the California Community Colleges, participants reported that at their districts requests for equivalency were always denied. The 2020 update to the paper clarifies and reiterates that not only is granting equivalency legally permissible, but that all districts are required to have an equivalency process. This version of the paper has been updated to reflect the *Career Technical Education Faculty Minimum Qualifications Toolkit* and to promote the use of equivalency procedures as a means of broadening faculty applicant pools as a vehicle to support system-wide faculty diversification efforts. The new version casts the equivalency process as a critical component of hiring processes as they relate to equity, inclusion, and diversity by applying institutionally-focused, systemically aware, equity-advancing practices.

Commented [2]: new

The concepts discussed in the first ~~three~~ four equivalency papers remain substantively unchanged in this paper; however, this update includes practical suggestions and considerations inserted to help local senates in refining their policies and procedures regarding this important academic and professional matter.

The 2015 Equivalency Practices Survey

To determine how academic senates are meeting their responsibilities for establishing and implementing equivalency policies and procedures, the ASCCC surveyed local senates in fall 2015. While the survey results indicated that most colleges and districts have equivalency policies and most academic senates recognize the need for

equivalency committees, 15% of respondents reported that the administration determines equivalency on their campuses despite the fact that equivalency is the purview of the faculty and the academic senate.

Further findings indicated the need for regular evaluation, review, and revision of equivalency policies. Only a few colleges reported that a recent review and revision of their equivalency policy had occurred by the local academic senate. Of the 59 colleges that are part of multi-college districts who responded to the survey, 34 reported that they coordinate equivalency decisions with the other colleges in their district while 25 reported that they do not.

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

The survey results and the resolution highlighted the need for local dialogue by academic senates regarding equivalency policies, procedures, and practices.

The Meaning of Equivalency

The term “equivalency” is found in the Disciplines List, which is a list of minimum qualifications for hiring faculty adopted by the Board of Governors[1]. Equivalency refers

to any qualifications that are at least equal to the state adopted minimum qualifications for a particular discipline and the process used for determining faculty preparation that is equivalent to minimum qualifications. The academic senate should review the minimum qualifications of faculty applicants carefully to determine if equivalency is necessary or not.

A common question involves faculty applicants who may have a different baccalaureate degree title from the listed master's degree. For example, the Disciplines List identifies the minimum qualifications for chemistry as a "Master's in chemistry **or** bachelor's in chemistry or biochemistry **and** master's in biochemistry, chemical engineering, chemical physics, physics, molecular biology, or geochemistry **or** the equivalent." Therefore, an applicant for the discipline of chemistry who possesses a baccalaureate degree in biological sciences and a master's degree in chemistry meets the minimum qualifications and does not need an equivalency process because a master's in chemistry meets the qualifications. However, an applicant with a baccalaureate degree in chemistry and a master's degree in biological sciences will require completion of the district equivalency process despite holding a bachelor's degree in chemistry because a master's in biological science is not listed as meeting the minimum qualifications.

District equivalency policies usually recognize up to three ways of demonstrating equivalency: 1) coursework, 2) work experience, and 3) eminence in the field. A combination of the three may be the foundation for equivalency determination.

Regardless of the basis for equivalency determination, the applicant's evidence and the

academic senate's process must document that the minimum qualifications have been met or exceeded to grant equivalency.

Benefits and ~~Pitfalls~~ Challenges of Equivalency

One benefit to having an equivalency process is that it allows for greater flexibility in hiring by creating a more diverse pool of potential faculty with a variety of qualifications equivalent to minimum qualifications. Applicants who can provide conclusive evidence that they have education and experience at least equal to what is required by the minimum qualifications deserve careful consideration, even if their degrees have titles different from those recognized in the Disciplines List or if they acquired their qualifications by an unconventional route. If the granting of equivalency were not an option, some fully qualified candidates would not receive consideration.

Equivalency is necessary to consider qualified candidates when titles of degrees are different from the degrees listed in the Disciplines List. While the ASCCC has successfully revised the disciplines list revisions process to an annual cycle, per the direction of Resolution 10.01 F16, faculty have asserted through Resolution 10.01 S18 that many updates to individual disciplines are needed, as "The original Disciplines List was approved in 1989, with many of the discipline minimum qualifications having remained unchanged since its original publication." However, even the annual process of revising the disciplines list for a single discipline is an extensive one, and many of the minimum qualifications in the Disciplines List do not reflect current degree titles in the same discipline. Without the legally required use of equivalency processes, many qualified applicants would be excluded.

On the other hand, the authority to determine equivalent qualifications is not ~~a license~~ an incentive or justification for a district to lower or waive standards and accept less-qualified individuals. The fact that a particular candidate is the best a college can find does not change the requirement that he or she must possess qualifications at least equal to the published minimum qualifications.

Legal Requirements

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is empowered through California Education Code section 87357(a)(1) to make recommendations to the California Community Colleges Board of Governors regarding minimum qualifications for faculty. Through the ASCCC's disciplines list revisions process, faculty initiate and lead minimum qualifications proposals through public hearings, debate by and action by ASCCC delegates, and approval by the Board of Governors for inclusion in the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in the California Community Colleges*, also known as the Disciplines List. Users of the Disciplines List will note that the legal requirement for an equivalence process and the legal permissibility of employing a candidate who possesses qualifications at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications are reflected throughout the Disciplines List, generally in its introduction, and specifically with the words "OR the equivalent" for each discipline.

Every district must have an equivalency process. The process for establishing equivalency needs to specify what the district expects in terms of course work, work

experience, and eminence when considering equivalency applications. Education Code §87359 (b) requires that “[t]he process, as well as criteria, and standards by which the governing board reaches its determination regarding faculty members shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board.” Subsequent changes proposed to jointly agreed upon policies or procedures for establishing equivalency should undergo the same process for approval. The governing board must rely primarily on the advice of its academic senate, and both must jointly agree to proposed changes.

The goal of any equivalency policy should be to ensure the transparent and fair determination of equivalency for applicants that possess qualifications at least equal to the minimum qualifications. The process should be documented and justifiable so that a determination of equivalency is understandable, clear, and supported upon review. Sound policy dictates that the practice of granting equivalencies must not mean lowering standards. Conversely, a district is not allowed to refuse to consider equivalencies in the name of raising standards. The equivalency process was created by AB 1725 in 1988 and chaptered into the California Education Code. Districts are not free to ignore this provision within the law. Academic senates should regularly review their policy, procedure, and practice for determining equivalency and update them for clarity and effectiveness as needed as well as to maintain accreditation standards regarding the upkeep of all policies and procedures.

The local academic senate, with the concurrence of the district board, is responsible for defining and maintaining the equivalency process for faculty applicants. Academic senates must focus on sound policies and procedures rather than expediency when determining equivalency. Policies and procedures that are designed primarily to address last-minute staffing needs threaten the principle that every instructor in the California Community College system is at least minimally qualified. The Education Code establishes faculty and the governing board as jointly responsible for developing policies and practices and designates the academic senate as primarily responsible for determining individual cases of those claiming equivalency. The Education Code does not establish the criteria that districts apply to determine equivalency. While §87359 states that equivalency means “qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications,” neither the Education Code nor Title 5 Regulations provide any further guidelines for what constitutes “at least equivalent.” When taking an action on equivalency on the advice, recommendation, or expertise of its academic senate, a governing board sets its standard for equivalency in the eyes of the law, even if that standard may appear weak to a reasonable person.

Once the local equivalency process has determined a recommendation regarding an individual applicant, Education Code §87359(a) requires that the governing board take action on the equivalency before hiring occurs.

Colleges must also understand that applicants who are granted equivalency and subsequently hired retain that status for their entire career in the district that granted the equivalency. When faculty members apply for positions in other districts, they may need

to go through equivalency processes in those other districts because equivalency is not transferable from district to district.

Principles

The Academic Senate has consistently supported the following basic principles for granting equivalency:

- Equivalency promotes diversity by broadening the applicant pool.
- Equivalent to the minimum qualifications means equal to the minimum qualifications, not nearly equal.
- The applicant must provide evidence of attaining coursework or experience equal to the general education component of an earned associate's or bachelor's degree.
- The applicant must provide evidence of attaining the skills and knowledge provided by specialized course work required for a master's degree or requisite experience and coursework for disciplines that do not require a master's degree.

The Academic Senate believes that faculty members must exemplify to their students the value of an education that is both well-rounded and specialized.

Equivalence as Part of the Hiring Process

A community college's commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion should be intentional, explicit, and evident in all aspects of the institution. Focusing on the

institution itself; promoting awareness of systems, nationally and within the institution, that require re-valuation to eliminate ingrained biases; and intentionally advancing equitable practices and equity-mindedness are three principles which can be leveraged to increase equity, diversity, and inclusion at a community college. The ASCCC's commitment to equity and faculty diversification is decades long and well-documented through many resolutions and adopted position papers reaching back before the careers of many faculty began. In the California Community Colleges' current equity framework, institutions seeking to foster equity, diversity, and inclusion will continually reassess their culture and practices. The ASCCC has provided extensive guidance and resources on hiring procedures as they relate to faculty diversification in the 2018 paper *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures*.

It is important to note that the hiring process is of critical, if not paramount, importance with respect to an institution's ability to attract diverse, qualified applicants. A college's local equivalency process matters greatly as a component of its overall hiring process and the California Community Colleges' goal of diversifying faculty. If the equivalency process is exclusionary by nature, or if requests for equivalency are routinely denied without due consideration of applicants' requests for equivalency, evidence, and adherence to locally established standards for equivalency, then the equivalency process, its relationship to the institution's overall hiring procedures, and its ability to meet the system-wide goal of faculty diversification should be carefully examined. Local senates should act to review equivalency processes to ensure that equivalency is only granted to candidates who possess preparation that is at least equivalent to the

minimum qualifications while also considering the equivalence process's relationship to the college's hiring process and to equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Commented [3]: new to second read

Criteria for Determining Equivalent Qualifications

Many criteria for determining equivalency seem obvious and can be handled in a simple manner. Others are more difficult. The three means of demonstrating equivalency are coursework, work experience, and eminence.

Any applicant should be expected to provide evidence of equivalent preparation that is as reliable and objective as a transcript. Thus, the candidate seeking equivalence should be measured by the same criteria as a candidate who possesses the minimum qualifications. Evaluating experience depends on the candidate's ability to provide objective, detailed information from some sources other than the candidate's statements about what exactly ~~he or she~~ they did.

Commented [4]: entire doc needs pronoun updating--thanks!

Establishing equivalency through coursework is often relatively simple, as transcripts are concrete documents that can be compared to concrete criteria. Another clear-cut example of equivalency through coursework occurs when someone has all the appropriate courses for the relevant degree, but the applicant's diploma or degree has a different title or area of expertise. For example, if someone earned a degree in business because a particular college or university combined its economics and business programs but the coursework on the transcript shows the academic work completed is the same as that for an economics degree, then that business degree is equivalent to a

degree in economics for the potential faculty member. Instances where determining equivalency when the title of an applicant's earned degree or the title of some coursework is slightly different from the minimum qualifications have increased with the rise of specialized titles at the university level. Review of the catalog descriptions of courses and degrees ~~are~~ is helpful in these cases.

A somewhat more difficult case would occur when the name of a degree is close to that specified on the Disciplines List but the coursework is slightly different. An example of this ~~problem~~ challenge occurs in determining whether a degree in education with a concentration in mathematics is equivalent to a degree in mathematics. Another example of a non-standard title may be an earned doctorate in mythological studies. The applicant with such a degree may be equivalent to the disciplines of English or religious studies but a careful review of coursework is needed.

A perennial question regarding equivalency involves applicants who may have advanced to candidacy for a doctorate, completed coursework at the graduate level, but do not have an earned degree other than at the baccalaureate level. It is common in some fields to enter a doctoral program without first completing a Master's degree. While local determinations may vary, equivalency committees should note that if the applicant is hired through equivalency and subsequently fails to complete another earned degree, the district board has hired a person with only a Bachelor's degree and some units to teach in a discipline that typically requires a Master's degree. Neither the district nor the academic senate can revoke the determination of equivalency because it was found that the faculty member was at least equal to the minimum qualifications at

the time of hire. This example serves to illustrate the concept that no provisional equivalency is allowed. The applicant must be determined to meet the minimum qualifications at the time of hire. The ASCCC advises that local senates should consider these cases with extreme caution.

One last example involves using work experience in determining equivalency to the master's degree. For example, a journalist with a bachelor's degree in English who has 12 years of work experience in journalism may be an applicant to teach in the discipline of Journalism, which typically requires a master's degree. The academic senate or equivalency committee will need to evaluate the components of a master's degree to determine if the applicant's work experience is commensurate with the earned ~~the an earned~~ degree. Typically, no general education requirement exists for a degree beyond the baccalaureate level. The committee may therefore wish to consult the requirements published in local university catalogs to earn a Master's degree in journalism and evaluate the materials submitted against those requirements. Of course, no predetermined amount of experience or number of years of work is unquestionably equivalent to a particular degree; ten years of experience may not be equivalent to any degree while two years of work may be equivalent, depending on the breadth and depth of the experience. Equivalency depends on the nature of the experience and the expectations typically required of a discipline.

Equivalency to the Associate's Degree

A particular ~~problem~~ consideration that may arise when colleges ~~consider~~ review equivalencies for career technical areas is determining how an applicant who lacks an

associate's degree has acquired the broad knowledge that a general education program provides as well as the discipline specific knowledge. Evaluation of experience depends on the candidate's ability to provide objective, detailed information from some source other than the candidate's statements about what exactly ~~he or she~~ the applicant did. For example, military service often requires technical training and certificate attainment that, while not the same as college credit, may be equivalent to college credit in certain areas of the general education pattern. While the provision and consideration of such evidence can be a challenge for applicants and local senates, general education preparation should endow instruction of any subject with an essential cross-curricular breadth and depth while specialization or discipline requirements demonstrate detailed familiarity with a field of study. The ability to communicate a broad understanding regarding the context of discipline specific knowledge is key in all disciplines. The general education pattern establishes a baseline knowledge expectation of all faculty. The ASCCC contends that both the discipline specific expertise to give depth of knowledge and the general education breadth of knowledge are required to meet equivalency.

Colleges must also distinguish between general education preparation and specialized preparation. The ASCCC supports the principle that all community college faculty exemplify the qualities of a college-educated person. All faculty must be able to communicate the manner in which how the discipline content is relevant applies to the myriad other fields of study and the world at large. For this reason, the universal minimum requirement for all disciplines includes at least an associate's degree. *The CTE Faculty MQ Toolkit* provides specific resources for considering, evaluating, and

Commented [5]: new to second read

documenting equivalence to the general education pattern delineated in Title 5 §55063, including equivalency portfolio model standards and a CTE minimum qualifications general education equivalency worksheet to assist applicants throughout the process. These are excellent resources that local senates should thoughtfully consider when updating local equivalency processes.

When an equivalency committee reviews an applicant's possible equivalency, the committee should consider whether the applicant satisfies the general education qualification for which he or she seeks equivalency. One of the most difficult cases occurs when work experience is proposed as the equivalent of academic work. Knowledge acquired in a course could also be gained in other ways; however, the problem lies in obtaining convincing evidence to establish that an applicant has enough necessary educational preparation through an alternative means to be judged equally knowledgeable as someone with the appropriate degree. Of course, no set amount of experience is unquestionably equivalent to a particular degree. Equivalency depends on the nature of the experience and the ability to document the connection between the experience and the requirement of qualification.

The issue of equivalency to the associate's degree has been reported as a persistent concern in some career technical fields where the minimum qualification is any associate's degree and six years of work experience. For example, a fashion designer without any degree, who has spent two decades in the fashion industry and can provide documented evidence of a breadth of work and experience in print and film might apply to teach in the discipline of Fashion and Related Technologies. The equivalency

committee or academic senate must consider whether the applicant has the equivalent to the general education breadth requirements and the equivalent depth of a discipline required of an associate's degree.

For this example, the depth of a discipline requirement may not be in question, but the general education component is. Some academic senates have used the requirements for an associate's degree outlined in Title 5 when examining cases like this. Title 5 Section 55063 defines the components of the Associate's degree as follows:

- competency in reading
- competency in written expression at the level of Freshman Composition
- competency in mathematics at the level of Intermediate Algebra
- at least 18 units of discipline specific preparation
- at least 18 units of general education in the areas of
 - natural sciences
 - social and behavioral sciences
 - humanities and
 - language and rationality.

Some colleges may ask how applicants meet or exceed these requirements to be evaluated by the academic senate's equivalency committee. *The CTE Faculty Minimum*

Qualifications Toolkit contains extensive resources to assist local senates and equivalency committee in evaluating and documenting equivalency to the associate's degree.

In the absence of a clear and agreed upon way to determine what is equivalent to the general education component of an associate's degree, colleges might consider using their institutional learning outcomes as metrics for determining if a faculty member's experience is equivalent to general education requirements. Another possibility is to use the outcomes listed on C-ID descriptors for general education courses. Prospective faculty seeking equivalency may be asked to provide documentation consisting of examples of work product or coursework to demonstrate proficiency in those outcomes. This practice may address the need for a candidate to show that he or she exemplifies the qualities of an educated person.

Determining Eminence

Some districts recognize eminence as a basis for granting equivalency. Although eminence is not specified in current law, it is not prohibited. The Chancellor's Office publication *An Analysis of Faculty Equivalency Policies* (December 1992, p. 43) found that 20 districts specified equivalency by eminence in their policies, and other districts seem to have added this avenue in the years since.

Common as eminence is in policy, this designation poses problems since districts may define the term differently. Equivalency committees must determine what should

constitute eminence and the degree of eminence required in the absence of a legal definition of the term.

The CTE Faculty MQ Toolkit defines eminence as follows: “Eminence is a recognized status of a well-qualified industry professional who has achieved recognized superiority in the industry or discipline content. Eminence can be defined by professional achievements that demonstrate the person is a leader and commonly recognized in [the applicant’s] industry in ways analogous to codified academic accomplishment.”

Historical analysis helps demonstrate how this term has been used. A Title 5 Regulation that has been repealed defined eminence as “superior knowledge and skill . . . in comparison with the generally accepted standard of achievement in the subject field.” Furthermore, this regulation indicated how eminence should be determined by stating, “[d]etermination of eminence should be based on a conviction that the applicant, if measured by recognized authorities in [the applicant’s] subject field, would be judged superior.” Other districts require that an applicant who claims eminence must be recognized beyond her or his geographic area. Still other districts have no clear criteria and make decisions on a case-by-case basis. Some might explain eminence by saying, “I don’t know how to describe it, but I know it when I see it.” If the concept of eminence can be known, it should be describable.

Another ~~problem~~ consideration with the concept of equivalency by eminence is that it does not include any reference to the broad educational background provided by a general education. Someone may be recognized by ~~his or her~~ their peers as having extraordinary skills and knowledge but may not possess the equivalent of completing a

general education program. For this reason, eminence has been used by some districts in combination with other criteria, such as an associate or bachelor's degree.

Finally, districts that choose to use eminence, especially on a case-by-case basis, risk exposing themselves to allegations that hiring criteria are not applied equally to all candidates. If candidate A is granted equivalency based on eminence while candidate B's appeal for equivalency based on eminence is denied, candidate B may charge that the decision involves bias if no pre-defined criteria exists. For this reason, some equally applied test or standard of eminence should be used.

A basic principle for addressing such scenarios could be enlisting the assistance of individuals in the field but not at the college and within some reasonably large area including the location of the candidate. These individuals could be asked who they would think of when asked to name top people in the field or if they consider a certain individual eminent. Once a person not connected with the college has named or has agreed with the naming of the candidate as eminent, the person could be asked to describe what makes the candidate eminent by explaining whether the candidate is someone to whom others in the field turn to ask for definitive answers to questions, for help in solving problems including those requiring a range of knowledge beyond narrow technical problems, or to critique their work or the work of students in the field. Answers pointing to broader knowledge and communication skills might meet descriptions offered by those who are asked what might be observed about a person having taken general education coursework.

Most equivalency committees or academic senates will not survey people working in a particular field, but the concept applies when trying to apply a consistent definition of what equivalency through eminence would look like and to document the process used to apply that definition. Some suggestions for senates as they craft or review a policy that includes equivalency through eminence may require any or all of the following:

- eminence should not be used as the sole criteria for granting equivalency (Senate Resolution 10.01, SP09)
- documented regional or national peer-reviewed publications authored by the applicant
- documented regional or national publications regarding the applicant's work product
- evidence of leadership in state or national professional organizations that are discipline specific
- national awards pertaining to the discipline
- formal action by the academic senate at large

Whatever the local criteria for establishing equivalency through eminence may be, it should be explicitly spelled out and documented. Equivalency is uncommon, as most applicants should meet the minimum qualifications listed, but equivalency through eminence should be particularly rare.

Equivalency Committees: Composition and Information Collection

Even though judging whether a specific candidate's experience is equivalent to the minimum qualifications can be difficult, equivalency discussions must involve faculty in the discipline in question to inform the academic senate's decision. Nonetheless, to ensure that colleagues in various disciplines function with some consistency across the campus, the academic senate should include faculty from a variety of the disciplines. An effective practice adopted by some academic senates is to create an equivalency committee that serves for an entire academic year to evaluate requests. In such a case, a mechanism that includes the discipline faculty voice should be written into the process as the standing committee may not have a representative from the discipline in question. Often, a faculty chair or discipline expert is invited to attend the meeting with the equivalency committee.

The benefits to having a breadth of discipline representatives on the equivalency committee include the following:

- The breadth or general education requirements equivalent to an earned degree may be more readily addressed when faculty from other disciplines are involved.
- Committee decisions are more easily communicated because the logic and credibility of a specific decision is more easily understood by any external agency or future senate leader when more faculty voices are involved.

- Decision-making is more consistent when committee representatives are constant rather than dependent on the discipline, and their decisions are made without bias.

To ensure that relevant information is available for the faculty charged with determining equivalency, the application for employment must provide the listed minimum qualifications and a place for candidates to indicate whether they possess the minimum qualifications or, if not, why they think they possess equivalent qualifications. The latter could be a separate page with some detailed inquiries. The public-facing information about the equivalency process should be as clear as possible so that an applicant unfamiliar with your district's equivalency process or the concept of equivalency can understand what evidence or artifacts to include with the application for equivalency. Remember when updating these documents that one of the benefits of equivalency is attracting a broader and potentially more diverse pool of applicants. The following are sample prompts for a supplement to the application:

1. Discipline for which you claim equivalency.
2. Indicate the educational preparation on which you base this claim.
3. Indicate the educational preparation and experience on which you base this claim for the general education requirement of this degree
4. If you are using courses to establish equivalency, please submit both an official transcript and copies of the appropriate pages from the college catalog.

5. If you are using publications or other work products, please submit them or links to online copies where appropriate and if possible.
6. Describe in detail work experience that you believe establishes equivalency to the minimum qualifications. If you are using work products or other items that cannot be submitted, provide detailed information from an objective source about the nature of this work product or experience along with contact or reference information about the source.

Faculty Responsibilities, Equivalency Committees, and the Role of the Human Resources Office

Determination of equivalency is a faculty responsibility through the academic senate. While the governing board provides the legal authority to determine equivalencies, academic senates are responsible for determining whether an applicant possesses the equivalent of the published minimum qualifications. Faculty in the discipline in question possess the academic expertise needed to understand qualifications in that discipline. Yet the urgent need to staff classes can sometimes lead to questionable judgment in equivalency determinations. Colleges should create an equivalency committee external to a hiring committee and external to the part-time faculty hiring process to evaluate applications where equivalency is in question and to determine equivalency.

Many local academic senates use an equivalency committee to ensure that the equivalency process is consistently and fairly applied for all requests for review from all disciplines. Effective practice includes making the equivalency committee a standing or sub-committees of the academic senate. Equivalency committees typically consist of three to five members, each member selected for a term of at least one year, with faculty members appointed by the academic senate. Often, as the committee meets to evaluate each request for equivalency from across the disciplines, a representative from the discipline in question is invited to participate. This ensures at least one discipline expert for each consideration of the committee. As with all appointments to committees, the academic senate should ensure that faculty appointed to the equivalency committee represent the diversity of the faculty and the community they serve. In some cases, equivalency committees may include administrators, but this practice should be discussed by the local senate to determine advantages and disadvantages. The equivalency committee should be trained on the role of the committee to determine only whether qualifications meet or exceed the minimum qualifications. Other parts of the hiring process will evaluate additional requirements such as teaching ability and content expertise; the equivalency process is only determining who may be considered as part of the pool of applicants.

The role of the Human Resources Office in determining equivalency should be limited to collecting and forwarding applications and other pertinent information to the senate or equivalency committee. Human Resources Office staff should not be the arbiter of equivalency. A college district that permits its Human Resources Office staff to establish equivalency risks hiring candidates that do not meet minimum qualifications

and is out of compliance with the Education Code and Title 5 Regulations (see Education Code §87359 (b) and Title 5 §53430 (b)). The Human Resources Office should ensure that the necessary information is collected from applicants at the time the application is submitted to support an effective equivalency process. Many districts use a supplemental form to the application to collect information should a determination of equivalency be necessary. The Human Resources Office should also keep a record of the outcomes of the equivalency process.

The hiring committee or a subset of the hiring committee charged with screening full-time faculty applicants should review applications to determine if an equivalency determination is needed before beginning the paper screening process. When a determination of equivalency is needed, the equivalency committee should meet after receiving materials provided by the applicant requesting equivalency or the Human Resources Office. At least one member of the hiring committee for a full-time faculty position should meet with the senate equivalency committee to provide background. If faculty in the discipline participate at the heart of the equivalency process, and if care is taken when collecting the necessary information to determine equivalency, the process can be done fairly and expeditiously while still maintaining the standards set in Title 5 Regulations. Lastly, a hiring process without an equivalency process is unlawful.

Determination of Equivalency for Part-time Hires

Minimum qualifications in a discipline—and, by extension, equivalency—are the same whether the position is full- or part-time. Title 5 Regulations do not allow for a different standard of equivalency for part-time faculty. An applicant is either qualified to teach the

full range of courses in a discipline or not, regardless of whether applying for a full- or part-time position.

One ~~problem~~ challenge that college instruction offices often face is how to provide a means by which the academic senate can make a determination of equivalency for part-time hires, especially during times when few faculty are on campus.

Ideally, the college should hire part-time faculty from a pool of available faculty whose minimum qualifications or equivalencies are established before classes are staffed.

Unfortunately, part-time faculty hiring is frequently done under a tight time schedule and a dean or department chair may seek equivalency to avoid closing a course section due to a lack of applicants that meet minimum qualifications. Faculty must act to ensure that all hires, including those granted equivalency, possess qualifications at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications, and equivalency committees, academic senate presidents, and others involved in the hiring process may feel pressure to act quickly or during a time that they are regularly off contract. Provisions in the local equivalency

Commented [6]: new to this read

process should attempt to strike a balance between minimum qualification requirements and the need to expedite the process. The equivalency committee should consider ways to be flexible and provide the faculty oversight needed when determining equivalency, even at times when full-time faculty tend to be off-contract. A mutual understanding between the administration, local bargaining unit and the academic senate should be reached regarding the work faculty do serving on an equivalency committee while technically off-contract.

However, the inability to convene the equivalency committee should not be seen as a reason for the Human Resources Office or administrator to circumvent the process to determine equivalency for an applicant who does not meet the minimum qualifications. When faculty are hired under equivalency but have not been granted equivalency by a process agreed to by the academic senate, those hires may be legally challenged and students may lose the units they have earned in those classes taught by the challenged faculty member, potentially putting the entire district at risk. Faculty who have been granted equivalency incorrectly may challenge the district if the district does not rehire them in the future, which could result in the district losing state apportionment and the students losing units earned.

The Single-course Equivalency Issue

Education Code §87359 (a) (see also Title 5 §53430) states, “No one may be hired to serve as a community college faculty ... unless the governing board determines that he or she possesses qualifications that are *at least equivalent* to the minimum qualifications specified” (italics added). In addition, minimum qualifications are determined for *disciplines*, not for courses or subject areas within disciplines. In short, Education Code and regulations do not allow for a faculty member to be granted a single course equivalency.

To verify this interpretation of relevant Education Code statutes, the ASCCC requested a legal opinion from the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office’s legal team in 2004. The response was Legal Opinion L 03-28 (R. Black, 2004) (see Appendix C), which supports the position that “a district is not authorized to establish a single course

equivalency as a substitute for meeting minimum qualifications in a discipline.” This opinion reaffirms the importance of the ASCCC’s Disciplines List Revision Process as the foundation of the minimum qualifications handbook (see Education Code §87357 (b)). L 03-28 also affirms that single-course provisional credentials are no longer valid. L 03-28 concludes firmly and simply that “a district is not authorized to establish a single course equivalency as a substitute for meeting minimum qualifications in a discipline.”

Some disciplines faced with a scarcity of faculty to teach courses have attempted the single-course equivalency solution. Although reasons for circumventing these regulations may stem from understandable difficulties, such problems are no excuse for hiring someone who is not qualified to teach in the discipline. Those hired as faculty members, both full- and part-time, are expected to have the expertise to teach the range of courses in the discipline for which they were hired. To require less from some faculty would be to develop a second class of less qualified faculty and thereby compromise the integrity of the entire faculty body. If a district hires a faculty member under an equivalency to teach one or two courses in the discipline, such as keyboarding in computer applications or basic firearms in administration of justice, that person has been granted equivalency to teach any course within the discipline and could request and be assigned to teach a course he or she is not prepared or qualified to teach.

Colleges can solve some of the hiring problems they face by creating more full-time positions to attract fully qualified applicants and creating mentorship opportunities and pathways to higher education degrees for industry professionals in CTE programs. The CTE Faculty Minimum Qualifications Toolkit includes examples of mentorship programs that can be applied as resources.

Commented [7]: new

Those responsible for staffing may attempt to craft special limitations related to equivalency to the minimum qualifications to justify hiring applicants who ~~are~~ may appear qualified to teach only a certain course or subject within a discipline. At first glance, such a solution may appear reasonable, but local senates and governing boards should not and legally cannot grant single-course equivalencies. For example, a department head of kinesiology might request that an equivalency committee grant equivalency to a person who has taught aerobics based on the applicant's experience in that specialty and bachelor's degree in exercise physiology, a related discipline. Even though this individual may seem to be very well qualified to teach aerobics, the applicant does not meet the minimum qualifications for physical education. Even if the department head assures all concerned that this individual would be assigned to teach only aerobics and no other course offered as physical education, a decision to grant such an equivalency would constitute a violation of Education Code §87359, which calls for "qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications." For the sake of maintaining the integrity of the teaching profession, the ASCCC urges local senates to resist attempts such as the above example and demand that their colleges' equivalency processes comply with code and regulation and not allow for any such adaptations. Misapplications of equivalency regulations clearly undermine the required standards of minimum qualifications. ~~"Equivalency"~~ Equivalency means that an applicant's preparation is equal to the published minimum qualifications for a particular discipline.

An alternate solution that is both expedient and appropriate is to assign a course to a range of disciplines based on the Disciplines List. This practice will increase the number

of qualified faculty to teach the course (see Academic Senate 1994 adopted paper *Placement of Courses in Disciplines*). For example, a college might appropriately assign a course associated with coaching soccer to the discipline of coaching as well as to the discipline of physical education, and if the individual were to be granted equivalency only in coaching, ~~he or she~~ they would not be able to claim equivalency to teach courses in physical education.

Likewise, a pedagogically sound and appropriate practice might be to assign a course such as word processing to a range of disciplines. Instead of assigning this course only to the discipline of business, it could also be assigned to computer service technology, computer information systems, and office technology. An instructor with minimum qualifications in office management who is hired to teach a word processing class could not then legitimately request assignment to other courses in business without meeting the minimum qualifications for business.

Determining Equivalency ~~in~~ in Multi-college Districts

~~When a faculty member is hired, he or she is hired by a district, not a college. Districts, not colleges, hire faculty members.~~ In most multi-college districts, faculty members can be assigned to any facility or combination of facilities in that district, although practice varies according to negotiated policies defining rights of assignment and transfer. A variety of possibilities exist for establishing and applying equivalency in multi-college districts.

Each college may have its own equivalency policy and procedures that the local board accepts, although the local board is likely to insist on consistency between or among the colleges in the district. If colleges have different policies and procedures, each college's faculty would have to accept the possibility that someone hired under the equivalency policy in a sister college may be assigned to their college, unless bargaining agreements or other policies preclude this possibility.

An alternative arrangement is to have a district-wide equivalency policy and set of procedures to which the academic senate of each college agrees. Hiring committees would submit the documentation of applicants who claim equivalency to an equivalency committee, which would make a decision based on the district-wide accepted procedures and standards of evidence. This arrangement has the advantage of allowing a part-time instructor whose equivalency has been established to work in any college in a district.

Some multi-college districts may create a district equivalency committee typically comprised of members from all colleges. Such a committee may have regular meetings to process applications for potential faculty as they are received by Human Resources.

A critical obligation of any equivalency policy in a multi-college district is to ensure to the extent feasible equal application among the colleges. The colleges are not well served if a person rejected at one college within the district is then accepted at another and then transferred or deemed automatically qualified at all the colleges in the district. On the other hand, having separate judgments at different colleges allows for periodic

discussions and norming activities that can help maintain rigor and broader perspectives concomitantly.

Conclusion

AB1725 provides the intent language of equivalency and is explicit concerning faculty responsibility: Faculty members derive their authority from their expertise as teachers and subject matter specialists and from their status as professionals. As a result, the faculty have an inherent professional responsibility in the development and implementation of policies and procedures governing the hiring process. Equivalency considered in this light will remind us that our guide must be the published minimum qualifications. Legal Opinion L 03-28 reiterates and supports adherence to minimum qualifications for a discipline. To maintain the academic integrity of the community colleges and their faculty, equivalency to those minimum qualifications for hire must be granted with careful consideration.

Recommendations

1. Every district must have an equivalency process.
2. Equivalency determinations should be made by an equivalency committee that is a subcommittee or standing committee of the academic senate.
3. The equivalency committee should include representatives appointed by the academic senate to ensure that the process is consistent and fair.

4. Equivalency should be determined with input from discipline faculty.
5. Equivalency processes for part-time faculty and “emergency hires” should be no different from equivalency for full-time faculty.
6. Local senates must ensure that their district and college policies and processes do not allow for single-course equivalencies.
7. Academic senates should assure consistency of the equivalency process.
8. Equivalency decisions should be based on direct evidence of claims (e.g., transcripts, publications, and work products).
9. The determination of equivalency should be documented and justifiable to an external review.
10. Claims of equivalence must include how both general education, specialization and experience are met.
11. Human resources offices should not screen for equivalency but should maintain records of the outcomes and documentation of equivalency requests.
12. Local senates must never allow equivalency to be delegated to administration or classified staff or to allow determinations to degenerate into becoming a gathering of signatures without discussion.
13. Equivalency policies should be reviewed regularly to ensure that the equivalency process aligns with the overall hiring process to promote faculty

diversification and affirms the college's commitment to equity,

diversification, and inclusion.

14. Tools in the *Career Technical Education Faculty Minimum Qualifications Toolkit* should be considered in reviews of equivalency policies.

15. Criteria for the acceptance of eminence as a means to establish equivalency must be clearly defined in hiring policy. Eminence must not be the sole basis for the determination of equivalency.

16. Once the local equivalency process has reached a recommendation regarding an individual applicant, Education Code §87359(a) requires that the governing board take action on the equivalency before hiring occurs.

Faculty equivalency to the minimum qualifications ~~should be an uncommon occurrence,~~ but it is an important mechanism to ensure a diverse group of qualified applicants is considered to engage and enhance student learning. Additional training materials may be obtained from the Academic Senate Office or at its website.

Appendix A: Sample Board Policy and Procedure

No. 7122 BP

Human Resources

Minimum Qualifications, and Equivalency

Reference: Education Code Sections 87355-87359.5; 86360

Title 5 California Code of Regulations Sections 53410 - 53417

The _____ Community College District shall establish procedures for determining faculty service areas that adhere to collective bargaining agreements.

In addition, the College District will establish procedures to determine minimum qualifications and equivalencies for minimum qualifications for hiring faculty that are compliant with relevant sections of the Education Code and Title 5 regulations and include reasonable procedures to ensure that the Governing Board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate to determine that each individual employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are “at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications” per Education Code Section 87359(b). These procedures will ensure the hiring of highly qualified faculty who are experts in their subject matter areas, who are skilled in teaching and serving the needs of a varied student population, who can foster overall college effectiveness, and who are sensitive to and themselves represent the racial and cultural diversity of the College District community. The academic senate will regularly review these procedures and make recommendations to update them to ensure that the procedures promote equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Commented [8]: new to second read

NEW PROCEDURE

No. 7211 AP

Human Resources

Minimum Qualifications and Equivalency

Reference: Education Code Sections 87001, 87003, 87355-87359.5; 86360, 87743.2

Title 5 California Code of Regulations Sections 53406, 53410 - 53417

THE ROLE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

The role of the Human Resources office is to collect, date-stamp, and forward applications and other pertinent information to the appropriate discipline selection committee (full-time) or discipline or department faculty and dean (part-time).

In addition, Human Resources ensures that the established minimum qualifications for the position will be listed in the job description/announcement. The District criteria for equivalency will be available at the Human Resources Department. A statement will be included in the application materials requiring all candidates who do not possess minimum qualifications to indicate in the application material how they meet the equivalent qualifications for the position and to provide supporting documentation. The burden of proof for minimum qualifications and equivalency is on the applicant.

Human Resources staff will verify that applicants have the appropriate credential, or that applicants claiming the required minimum qualifications show the appropriate degrees on their transcript. If there is an experience requirement, College District Human

Resource staff will verify that the applicant has the required number years of experience, but will not judge if the experience is appropriate.

If the applicant claims to possess the minimum qualifications, but the degree titles are significantly different from those listed in the “Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges,” that application shall be considered under the equivalency process even if the applicant did not claim equivalency. Human Resources will rely primarily on the Academic Senate, in consultation with administration, to determine equivalency of degree titles based on an examination of an applicant’s transcripts.

Human Resources forwards all applications which satisfy the credentials requirement, satisfy the minimum qualifications requirement, or are deemed to be equivalent to the college selection committee (full-time) or to the dean and chair in that department (part-time).

THE ROLE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

The Academic Senate will review and evaluate the equivalency process and this procedure every _____ year(s) to ensure that it adheres to appropriate regulatory requirements and that it functions as a component of the hiring process to promote equity, inclusion, and diversity.

Commented [9]: new to second read

Supplemental Equivalency Application

Human Resources is responsible for maintaining a “Supplemental Equivalency Application.” If a candidate’s degrees and qualifications differ from the minimum qualifications listed for the position, but the candidate possesses preparation that is at least the equivalent of the minimum qualification, the candidate should apply for equivalency. If a potential employee applies for a position and wishes to complete a “Supplemental Equivalency Application for Academic Employment”, the following information should be provided:

1. Degree for which the applicant claims equivalency.
2. The educational preparation on which the applicant bases this claim for the major of the minimum degree.
3. The educational preparation on which the applicant bases this claim for the general education requirement of the minimum degree.
4. The relevant courses the applicant has taken or other evidence that the applicant has the equivalent of the General Education portion of the minimum degree.

5. An official transcript and copies of the appropriate pages from the catalog of the institution that granted the degree upon which the applicant bases a claim of equivalency.
6. Publications or other work products that support a claim of equivalency.
7. A detailed description of work experience which the applicant believes establishes equivalency to the minimum qualifications. If the applicant is using work products or other items which cannot be submitted, provide detailed information from an objective source about the nature of this work product or experience.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS ⁽¹⁾_(SEP)

The goal of the _____ Community College District is to provide a faculty of highly qualified professional educators who are experts in their fields, skilled in teaching, and serve the needs of a varied student population. The District also seeks those who can promote overall college effectiveness and who are sensitive to the diversity of the District community. ⁽¹⁾_(SEP) The College District shall employ faculty who possess the minimum qualifications, as established by the California State Chancellor's Office (see publication, "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges").

Faculty are responsible for including a minimum qualification on all new curriculum or as part of a curriculum review process. All curriculum should be placed within a discipline that is identified as having a minimum qualification. It is best practice to place curriculum in the discipline that best matches the course content and for which the minimum qualifications of faculty best match the course content.

For departments that include courses with dual designators, deans and chairs from all relevant programs will collaborate to ensure the most qualified faculty teach these courses and minimum qualifications are met.

EQUIVALENCY

All community college faculty should exemplify the qualities of a college educated person.

Pursuant to Education Code Section 87359, the equivalency process "shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the Governing Board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate to determine that each individual employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications."

Equivalency may be recognized in three major ways: course work, work experience, and eminence in the field or a combination of the three.

Equivalency Committee

The Equivalency Committee is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. The committee is comprised of three faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate president and up to two administrators who are designated by the VPAA and are advisory to the process. The Equivalency Committee is not subject to the Brown Act for Public Meetings.

Process for Determination of Equivalency

In order to determine when an applicant for a faculty position who lacks the specific degree or experience specified in the “Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges” Handbook possesses qualifications that are equivalent, the following process has been established:

1. When Human Resources stipulates that a determination of equivalency is needed, the Equivalency Committee will be called to meet as soon as possible. Human Resources will provide the Equivalency Committee with the necessary information to determine equivalency no less than three working days prior to the meeting.
2. The dean, discipline faculty, and applicant may address the committee and provide additional information prior to the committee making a decision.
3. Determination of equivalency to the minimum qualifications for hire shall be decided, by majority vote in the Equivalency Committee and is final. The Equivalency Committee will document their determination in writing and send it to Human Resources within 5 working days.
4. If new information becomes available, a new request for equivalency may be submitted.
5. Human Resources will forward the written rationale from the Equivalency Committee explaining the equivalency decision to the applicant and dean.
6. The results of the Equivalency Committee decision shall be documented by Human Resources and records kept of all decisions. Individual voting by Committee members will not be recorded.
7. Education Code §87359(a) requires that the governing board take action on the equivalency before hiring occurs. Equivalencies shall be forward to the

Office of the Superintendent President to be placed on a Governing Board agenda.

Standards And Criteria Applicable For Determining Equivalency

The following standards and criteria apply when determining equivalency:

1. Minimum qualifications in a discipline—and, by extension, equivalency—are the same whether the position is for a full-time or part-time faculty member.
2. Equivalency is determined for an entire discipline, not on a course-by-course basis, per legal opinion I 03-28. The granting of equivalency is on a case-by-case basis and does not set precedence for future hires.
3. Past equivalency decisions in the discipline will be made available as needed to the Equivalency Committee or to the dean and chair in that department to aid in their deliberations and can be considered when determining equivalency, though they do not establish precedence.
4. Should an equivalency be granted, that decision shall not give the applicant any more or any less consideration than other applicants. In addition, granting an equivalency neither guarantees an interview nor a job.

5. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide all documentation in support of equivalency and to be available for questions. Applicants wishing to establish equivalency through work experience should provide objective, detailed information about those work experiences. Any applicant who fails to provide evidence to support ~~his/her~~ the claim of a credential, or of minimum qualifications, or of equivalency may be eliminated from the applicant pool.

6. Various occupational experiences may be combined to total the required number of years established by the minimum qualifications; all experience must have taken place within the ten years preceding the date of application with at least one year of qualified experience occurring within the three years immediately preceding the date of application.

7. For the Performing Arts, a bachelor's degree in the discipline plus advanced degree from an accredited institution specific to that art, or a bachelor's degree in the discipline and four years of professional experience in the discipline, is required to be considered for equivalency.

8. No candidate for a full-time position shall be recommended as a finalist to the President without meeting the minimum qualifications or having been verified as meeting the equivalency.

9. No candidate for part-time employment shall be hired without either meeting the minimum qualifications or having been verified as meeting equivalency per these procedures.

Provisional Equivalency

Effective beginning in fall 2015, the Equivalency Committee will not grant “provisional” or “temporary” equivalency. All faculty hires must possess the minimum qualifications or be determined to possess equivalency to the minimum qualifications to be employed by the college district.

Additional Criteria for the Equivalency Committee

In all cases in which equivalency is granted or denied, an officially signed form shall be filed with the Office of Human Resources and the Office of Academic Affairs. This form shall include a complete description of the Equivalency Committee's reasons for determining that a candidate does or does not have the equivalent of the minimum qualifications for the position. The Human Resources Office is responsible for creating and maintaining this documentation.

Minimum Standards for Consideration of Equivalency to Minimum Qualifications in
Disciplines Requiring a Master's Degree

In order to be considered for equivalency, In the case of disciplines normally requiring a
Master's degree, the minimum standard shall be any one of the following:

1. A Master's degree in a discipline which is not specifically named in
"Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community
Colleges" for the particular discipline in question, but which, when courses (and
course descriptions) are carefully reviewed, clearly constitutes parallel and/or
closely related coursework to the discipline which is specifically listed in
"Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community
Colleges".
2. In specific disciplines as named by the "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty
and Administrators in California Community Colleges", a bachelor's degree in the
discipline, plus licensure by an appropriate state agency, plus at least two years
of professional experience, verified in writing.

Minimum Standards for Consideration of Equivalency to Minimum Qualifications in
Disciplines That Do Not Require a Master's Degree

In order to be considered for equivalency in the case of disciplines not normally requiring a Master's degree, the minimum standards shall be one of the following:

1. An Associate degree plus six years of related experience
2. Bachelor's degree plus two years of related experience,
3. Associate degree plus graduation from an institution specific to that field, plus two years of professional experience in the discipline, verified in writing, plus appropriate certification to practice or licensure, if applicable.
4. Pursuant to Title 5 § 53406, all degrees and coursework must be from colleges/universities accredited by one of the intersegmental accrediting agencies: Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, New England Association of Schools and Colleges, North Central Associations of Colleges and Schools, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges.

Qualifications Established by Degrees and Coursework from Educational Institutions Outside of the United States

Applicants wishing to be granted equivalency based on coursework completed at an educational institution outside of the United States must provide the following:

1. A transcript assessment by a third party degree assessment service.
2. Proof that the institution is accredited in its country of operation or in the United States.

Local Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies

Disciplines wishing to add “local” qualifications for hiring to their discipline beyond the minimum qualifications established by the “Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges”) may do so with approval of the Academic Senate with a recommendation from the Equivalency Committee. Local requirements may not be added on a course-by-course basis. Equivalency for the local requirement will be determined through the equivalency process. Local requirements cannot exclude the consideration of equivalency.

Commented [10]: new

Eminence

Although no legal definition of eminence exists, eminence shall mean that qualifications which, as evidenced by prominence and celebrity, is established by the specific industry and/or community at large and may be deemed equivalent to minimum qualifications. This may include appropriate local, state, national and/or international associations, trade unions, guilds or communities comprised of experts, who are themselves renowned in the specific field, and who can attest, in writing, to the prominence and celebrity of the applicant.

Eminence alone is not sufficient to grant equivalency. An application of equivalency based on eminence must be accompanied by conclusive evidence that the applicant exemplifies qualities of a college-educated person and brings to the college district the knowledge and ability to expected at the college level. The applicant must provide documentation supporting the status of eminence.

Appendix B Relevant Education Code References

1. Assembly Bill 1725, Section 4 (p) (1) “The laws, regulations, directives, or guidelines should help the community colleges ensure that the faculty and administrators they hire and retain are people who are sympathetic and sensitive to the racial and cultural diversity in the colleges, are themselves representative of that diversity, and are well prepared by training and temperament to respond effectively to the educational needs of all the special populations served by community colleges.”
2. Assembly Bill 1725, Section 4 (s) (2) “The governing board of a community college district derives its authority from statute and from its status as the entity holding the institution in trust for the benefit of the public. As a result, the governing board and the administrators it appoints have the principal legal and public responsibility for ensuring an effective hiring process.”
3. Education Code, Section 87359 “No one may be hired to serve as a community college faculty member, instructional administrator, or student services administrator under the authority granted by the regulations unless the governing board determines that ~~he or she~~ the applicant possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications specified in regulations of the board adopted pursuant to Section 87356. The criteria used by the governing board in making the determination shall be reflected in the governing board’s actions employing the individual. The process, as well as criteria and

standards by which the governing board reaches its determinations, shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board. The agreed upon process shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate to determine that each individual employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualification specified in regulations adopted by the board of governors. The process shall further require that the governing board provide the academic senate with an opportunity to present its views to the governing board before the board makes a determination; and that the written record of the decision, including the views of the academic senate, shall be available for review pursuant to Section 87358."

4. Education Code, Section 87359(a) "No one may be hired to serve as a community college faculty member or educational administrator under the authority granted by the regulations unless the governing board determines that ~~he or she~~ [the applicant] possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications specified in regulations of the board of governors adopted pursuant to Section 87356. The criteria used by the governing board in making the determination shall be reflected in the governing board's action employing the individual."

5. Assembly Bill 1725, Section 4 (s) (3) “Faculty members derive their authority from their expertise as teachers and subject matter specialists and from their status as professionals. As a result, the faculty has an inherent professional responsibility in the development and implementation of policies and procedures governing the hiring process.”
6. Assembly Bill 1725, Section 4 (t) “While the precise nature of the hiring process for faculty should be subject to local definition and control, each community college should in a way that is appropriate to its circumstances, establish a hiring process that ensures that (1) Emphasis is placed on the responsibility of the faculty to ensure the quality of their faculty peers.”

Appendix C Legal Advisory Regarding Single Course Equivalency

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

California Community Colleges

Chancellor's Office

1102 Q street

Sacramento, Ca 95814-6511

(916) 445-8752

<http://www.cccco.edu>

December 23, 2003

Mark Snowwhite, Secretary

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

428 J Street, Suite 430

Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Single Course Equivalencies

Legal Opinion L 03-28

Dear Dr. Snowwhite:

You requested our assessment of the ability of a community college district to establish a single-course equivalency for hiring faculty. We understand your question to focus on whether a person may be considered to meet minimum qualifications for purposes of teaching a single class where that person does not possess the minimum qualifications (usually a master's degree or its equivalent) in the discipline under which the single course falls.

As you know, Education Code section 87356 requires the Board of Governors to adopt regulations to establish minimum qualifications for service as a community college faculty member. Education Code section 87357 requires the Board of Governors to engage in various activities in establishing those minimum qualifications. Subsection (b) of section 87357 requires the Board to issue a list of disciplines that is to be distributed to the districts "for their use in applying the minimum qualifications for service."

Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations ("title 5"), section 53407 reflects the Board's adoption of disciplines lists. Although the disciplines lists are not fully set out in the regulations, they are incorporated by reference. Section 53407 contemplates disciplines where a master's degree is required as a minimum qualification and disciplines where a master's degree is not generally expected or available as a minimum qualification.

Title 5, section 53410 sets the basic minimum qualifications for credit instructors which include either a master's degree "in the discipline of the faculty member's assignment" or a master's degree "in a discipline reasonably related" to the assignment and a bachelor's degree "in the discipline of the faculty member's assignment." We believe

that these Education Code and title 5 sections establish a firm relationship between the disciplines and minimum qualifications.

Education Code section 87359 requires the Board of Governors to adopt regulations setting forth a process to allow local districts to employ faculty members who do not meet the minimum qualifications adopted by the Board of Governors. The section provides that a person may be hired to serve as a faculty member if the district governing board determines that the individual “possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications specified in regulations of the board of governors adopted pursuant to Section 87356.” The section requires a process to ensure that “each individual faculty member employed under the authority granted by the [equivalency] regulations possesses . . . minimum qualifications specified in regulations adopted by the board of governors.” (Emphasis added.)

Title 5, section 53430 establishes the standards for hiring faculty based on equivalencies, and it echoes the language of Education Code section 87358 that each individual faculty member must possess minimum qualifications. As noted above, the regulations contemplate a relationship between minimum qualifications and disciplines.

Education Code section 87356 verifies that each individual faculty member is expected to possess minimum qualifications under the regulations. The regulations demonstrate that the focus of minimum qualifications for “teaching faculty” is on the qualifications of persons to teach in a discipline, not to teach individual courses.

The concept of expertise within a discipline is reflected elsewhere in the regulations.

Title 5 section 53403 allows persons who have been employed “to teach in a discipline” to continue teaching even if the minimum qualifications or disciplines list are amended after the person is initially hired.

It is likely that the concept of single course equivalencies grew out of the provisional credential that was available when a credentialing system was used to establish eligibility for community college district faculty employment. Under that system, a person could secure a “provisional” credential that listed a course that the individual could teach. The credential allowed its holder to teach the specific course, but the circumstances authorizing such services were very narrow. Former title 5, section 52223 provided the particulars, as follows:

“52223. A District shall establish the existence of the following facts:

(a) The district has made every reasonable effort to locate and to employ a person holding a credential other than a provisional credential to teach the particular course to be named on the credential.

(b) No such credentialed person is ready, able, and willing to accept such employment in the district.

(c) The district shall employ the applicant to teach the course to be named on the credential.”

Former section 52225 provided an alternative to the conditions of former section 52223. Under section 52225, a provisional credential could be issued if a local board made a finding that there was an inadequate number of credentialed persons available in the state who were qualified to instruct in a particular discipline or skill and the board found the discipline or skill to be an emergency area of instruction.

The services of a person who taught under a provisional credential did not count towards tenure. The initial term of the provisional credential was one calendar year from issuance, and reissuance of the credential could not result in employment to teach the same course in the same district for more than three calendar years. (Former title 5, section 52228.) Thus, even under the predecessor credentialing system, the norm was that districts would hire faculty who were qualified to hold “regular” credentials, and service only in specific courses was allowed in very narrow circumstances.

The current minimum qualifications closely resemble the former credential requirements in many areas. It is telling that no current regulations clearly carry over the standards of the provisional credential. If a person were able to produce a provisional credential that was reissued prior to the expiration of the credentialing system, and that person has not exhausted the maximum three calendar years of instruction authorized by the former regulations, that person may be eligible to serve under the terms of the provisional credential up to the maximum authorized three calendar years of service. (See Ed. Code, § 87355 that authorizes service under an unexpired credential notwithstanding the replacement of the credential system with the minimum qualifications system.) However, we believe that such a circumstance is highly unlikely, and we would need to

make a specific assessment of the credential and a fuller review of the former regulations in order to make a definitive determination regarding the continued viability of the provisional credential.

Based on the foregoing, we conclude that a district is not authorized to establish a single course equivalency as a substitute for meeting minimum qualifications in a discipline.

Sincerely,

Original signed by Ralph Black

Ralph Black

General Counsel

RB:VAR:sj

cc: Fusako Yokotobi, Human Resources

Bobbie Juzek, Human Resources

[1] The current Disciplines List can be found in the Chancellor's Office publication *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges* and can also be accessed through the ASCCC website (asccc.org).



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: 2020 Academic Academy Draft Program		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: IV. I.	
		Attachment: Yes (1)	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will consider for approval the draft of the Academic Academy Program.	Urgent: Yes	
		Time Requested: 20 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Action Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Michelle Pilati/Krystinne Mica	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	X
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

This year's Academic Academy was planned to be an OERI and OEI collaboration. With that in mind, and considering the current crisis, the goal is to provide an opportunity to look at what we have learned - and are learning - as we deal with COVID-19.

The Academy is prepared to be virtual, if necessary, and is being planned to have virtual keynotes in either online or in-person format. With this in mind, the Academy is also being planned with 3 breakouts in each session as opposed to 4.

The OERI team and CVC-OEI reviewed existing programs for the Career and Noncredit Education Institute as well as the Online Teaching Conference and may look to these for presenters and, possibly, different sessions. If the Academy is held virtually and can handle 4 sessions per breakout time, OERI and CVC-OEI may consider pulling breakouts from the programs to incorporate.

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the draft program outline of the Academic Academy.

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

Academic Academy: Redefining ~~Distance~~ Education

Virtual

OR

Embassy Suites by Hilton San Francisco Airport Waterfront

October 8-10, 2020

Interruptions in education are not new. California's students have always faced temporary school closures due to environmental circumstances ranging from storms to riots and the extended disruption and devastating impact of fires. But a global pandemic requiring social distancing and the sudden cessation of traditional classroom instruction for an undefined time period is a force so impactful that our evolution is forced – is it education's Big Bang, where we will emerge anew? Or is it our Ice Age, leading to the extinction of select species and the rapid evolution of the survivors? This year's ASCCC Academic Academy will explore the impact of our recent history on the future of education. Join us as we explore the use of open and online approaches to finding ways to do the impossible, redefining the classroom, creating more equitable learning environments, and improving the success of all students.

Thursday, October 8

1:00 – 2:00pm: Registration

2:00 – 4:30pm

Pre-Session: LibreTexts Bootcamp

5:00p - 6:00pm

Opening General Session/Keynote

Impact of COVID 19 on _____

(All keynotes will be planned as virtual. This is intended to be a look at the impact of COVID 19 on some general aspect of society. Keynotes may be modified as we explore potential presenters.)

Friday, October 9

8:30 – 9:30am: Registration and Continental Breakfast

9:30am – 10:45am: **Welcome and General Session 1**

Diving into the Divide I - An Examination of the Digital Divide

In March of 2020 our colleges were forced to take actions that presumed that our students, faculty, and curriculum was universally ready for a transition to “remote instruction”. Although today’s college-age student is likely to be a “digital native”, many of our students lack the technology and/or wireless access to participate in distance education. And many of our faculty have yet to embrace today’s techno-centric world. How pervasive is the digital divide in our colleges today? Why does the divide persist in today’s smartphone world? And what approaches have been effective in bridging the gap?

Potential Outline

- I. Timeline and expectations – colleges acting quickly with little preparation
- II. Data on challenges (researchers gathering data; DECs documenting lack of faculty preparedness)
- III. Approaches to prepping students
- IV. Approaches to prepping faculty
- V. Approaches to increasing connectivity
- VI. Lessons learned – thoughts for the future

Program Key

We’ve organized the breakouts into strands that are organized as follows:

- Risk-Averse (RA) – Sessions in this strand are designed for novices that are exploring a topic for the 1st time or seeking a refresher.
- Solution Seekers (SS) – New answers to old problems – or revisiting old answers to new problems – take your pick. Problem-solving will be the focus of these sessions.
- Thrill Seekers (TS) – Are you ready to try anything? Lose the safety net and the life jacket – join us for a walk on the educational wild side.

Given the diversity of our program, you are likely to find topics that inspire caution and others that compel you to throw that caution to the wind. In keeping with our theme, we hope you’ll both expand your knowledge of familiar topics and explore new ones.

11:00 – 12:15pm Breakout Session 1

1. **OER Basics Made Easy - Academic Freedom in Action (RA)**

OERI

As community college faculty, we are quick to view the use of Open Educational Resources (OER) as a means of reducing costs for our students. But OER is also a means of allowing faculty to teach what they want to teach when and how they want to. This session will provide an overview of the why and how of adopting OER.

2. Ready for Anything - The Flexible Classroom (SS)

???

“Flipping” the classroom - using classroom time for interaction and online time for content delivery - is an approach to teaching that is likely to see a resurgence as classroom teachers who never dreamed of using the online modality discover new ways of achieving course objectives. What does a flipped classroom look like - and what are some effective ways to structuring these learning environments?

3. Equitable Grading Practices: What are you really measuring? (TS)

???

Grades have been a part of our educational experience since kindergarten. But, what do they really measure? What is the difference between grading students and assessing learning? We will discuss 10 reasons grading doesn't measure learning - #3 will shock you! We will discuss assessment strategies that promote learning, are more flexible during times of crisis, and are particularly important for marginalized student populations.

12:30 – 2:00pm Lunch and General Session 2

Diving into the Divide II - Designing Distance Education Experiences with Access and Bandwidth in Mind

If distance education is to be the solution for all students for any period of time, how do you create distance learning environments that are sensitive to potential access issues that students may experience - from only having access via a mobile to device to only having limited access to the Internet?

2:15 – 3:30pm Breakout Session 2

1. UDL, SLO, OEP – The Alphabet Soup of Good Course Design (RA) (AT and SW)

How can we design courses that engage diverse students and provide mechanisms for students to accurately demonstrate their learning? Universal Design for Learning (UDL) helps us build courses accessible to all students and encourages us to focus on how students acquire information and demonstrate

learning. Open Educational Practices (OEP) can be a key strategy to help establish UDL in your courses. We will look at course designs that increase student choice, encourage critical thinking, and improve learning. When paired with Backwards Design, UDL and OEP strategies also help us build assignments that more accurately measure student learning outcomes (SLO). This session will demonstrate how these frameworks can be used to design effective and engaging learning activities and assessments.

2. Assessment Pandemomy – Lessons Learned (SS)

(Janet Fulks)

A sudden transition to remote instruction requires not only changes in teaching, but changes in how you measure learning. What can we learn from the unstructured experimentation that ensued in higher education as a consequence of COVID-19? How did faculty move away from worrying about academic integrity to focusing on effective ways to measure learning?

3. You Did What? Implementing a Team Approach to Course Design and Service Delivery (TS)

DD

In the post-pandemic world, how do we transition from overcoming challenges to turning identified solutions into lasting improvements? As we redesign our courses and services for students, how do we leverage the lessons learned into ways of improving the student experience and preventing our historical silos? prevent our design from being siloed? Join us for an exploration of how a team approach can result in more equitable outcomes and practices.

3:30 – 3:45pm

Coffee and Snack

3:45 – 5:00pm Breakout Session 3

1. Shouldn't Your Online Students See You? Moving Past the Fear of Filming (RA)

Tracy Schalen

A session on how easy it is to make short videos to share with students.

2. Preparing the Unprepared – Strategies for Addressing Online Inexperience (SS)

OEI

What can faculty do before the term starts to ensure students are truly ready for online learning? And how can effective course design increase the likelihood of success?

3. **Open Pedagogy – Who is Steering the Ship? And Where are You Going?** (TS)

5:15 - 6:15pm (unedited – something to think about)

Decompression and Reflection Activity: Each of these breakout rooms will be used for open dialog and sharing of information among the participants related to the topic listed. The facilitator is present to lead the dialog in a constructive fashion, not to present new information.

1. *Designing for the Student Experience*
2. *Institutional Culture Change in an Equity-Minded Framework*
3. *Technology to enhance the Student Experience*
4. *Local Senates as Agents of Change*

6:30 - 8:00 **Reception and Networking**

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges invites you to join us for a no-host bar with light refreshments.

Saturday, October 10

8:30 – 9:30am Breakfast

9:30 – 10:45am **Breakout Session 4**

1. **Equity Through Community: How Humanized Instruction Leads to Equity Online (RA)**

Tracy Schalen (shorten description – from OTC 2020)

Research shows that a caring, engaged instructor is key to supporting underserved students who learn online (Jaggars & Xu, 2016). But faculty who teach online don't always consider how important their presence is to their students. The majority of California's 2.1 million community college students are ethnic minorities (67%). Forty percent of students enrolled in California Community Colleges (CCCs) are first generation college students, nearly half experience food insecurity, and roughly one in three experience the threat of homelessness. Online classes are critical to the mission of community colleges. Today, more than 24% of CCC enrollments are generated through online courses. Through the OEI and the @ONE Project, the California Community

College system offers a robust suite of free and low-cost professional development options to prepare faculty to teach online, including online courses. The online courses place faculty in the role of an online learner with a cohort of peers. One of these courses, Humanizing Online Teaching and Learning, inspires faculty to become present, aware, and empathetic online instructors and dabble in tools that enable them to cultivate their presence in their own course. Within the course, they experience the social and emotional impact of human presence, and apply research-based practices to their own course.

2. Embracing Change - Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices (SS)

3. Equity and Distance Education – Synchronous Vs Asynchronous Instruction (SS)

“Traditional” distance education emphasizes a 24/7 educational experience with learning happening at the student’s convenience. “Temporary remote instruction” resulted in a new take on teaching at a distance – with many faculty choosing to teach synchronously. If your true goal is establishing an equitable learning environment, which modality should you choose? Join us for a robust discussion of the pros and cons of both approaches.

11:00 – 12:15pm: General Session 3 - TBD



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Model Hiring Processes and Guiding Principles Canvas Learning Module		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: IV. J.	
		Attachment: No	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will consider the recommendation from FLDC to publish the Hiring Canvas shell with a welcome video.	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 15 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Action Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Michelle Bean/Sam Foster	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	X
		Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

Recommendation 1:

Executive Committee approval of the [Model Hiring Processes and Guiding Principles Canvas](#) learning module for publication to the field through the ASCCC website.

Recommendation 2:

Executive Committee support in asking partner representatives (ACHRO, CEOs, CSSOs, CIOs, along with ASCCC) for collaboration on a short welcome video for the Canvas learning module (click the link above to view module).

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Chancellor’s Office Liaison Discussion		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: V. A.	
		Attachment: No	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	A liaison from the Chancellor’s Office will provide the Executive Committee with an update of system-wide issues and projects.	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 30 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Stankas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	
		Information	X

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.

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Board of Governors/Consultation Council		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: V. B.	
		Attachment: No	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will receive an update on the recent Board of Governors and Consultation Council Meetings.	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 15 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Stankas/Dolores Davison	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	
		Information	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

President Stankas and Vice President Davison will highlight the recent Board of Governors and Consultation meetings. 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:

<https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Board-of-Governors/Meeting-schedule-minutes-and-agenda>

<https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Consultation-Council/Agendas-and-Summaries>

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Online Community College District Board of Trustees Meeting		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: V. C.	
		Attachment: No	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will receive an update on the recent California Online Community College District Board of Trustees Meeting.	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 15 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Stankas/Dolores Davison	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	
		Information	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

President Stankas and Vice President Davison will highlight the California Online Community College District Board of Trustees Meeting. 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:

<https://go.boarddocs.com/ca/cccco/Board.nsf/Public>

<https://www.calbright.org/>

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Online Education— <i>outstanding</i> faculty/course recognition		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: V. D.	
		Attachment: No	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will consider a means to recognize faculty/online courses in collaboration with CVC-OEI.	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 15 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY	Geoffrey Dyer/Carrie Roberson	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	
		Discussion	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

At its January 14th, 2020 face-to face meeting, the Online Education Committee had liaisons from the CVC-OEI seek input regarding a means to recognize outstanding online education faulty/courses. At this time, the Online Education Committee is seeking Executive Committee input on the opportunity to collaborate with CVC-OEI to recognize the work of our faculty’s development and execution of outstanding online courses within the California Community College system. Discussion of how to facilitate and acknowledge a recognition may consider the following:

*Roles/responsibilities in determination of criteria for recognition of an outstanding online education faculty/course(s)**

Potential venue/date to recognize outstanding online education faculty

How or means to recognize outstanding online education faculty

Other considerations?

**Consider local peer online course review and other established quality measures in collaboration with CVC-OEI*

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



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Distance Education Guidelines		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: V. E.	
		Attachment: No	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will be updated on and discuss the status of the Distance Education Guidelines.	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 10 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY	Geoffrey Dyer/Cheryl Aschenbach	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	
		Discussion	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

Standing Order 409 of the California Community Colleges Board of Governors charges the Distance Education and Educational Technology Advisory Committee (DEETAC) to “identify best practices in the development and evaluation of distance education and other instructional offerings utilizing instructional technology, and recommend guidelines and regulatory changes.” Since prior to the adoption of the updated distance education title 5 regulations (§§55200-55210), DEETAC has been working on an update to the Distance Education Guidelines. Significantly, these draft DE Guidelines, as guidance for [§55200](#) recommend for inclusion in class schedules three classifications of types of online classes to indicate to students any expectation of an in-person component. The ASCCC approved the direction of these definitions through [Resolution 9.06 S19](#). Additionally, the draft guidelines present extensive guidance on accessibility, developed and refined with the assistance of the Accessibility Standards Workgroup.

The ASCCC Executive Committee reviewed the draft DE Guidelines in June of 2019. In January of 2020, DEETAC approved what it considered to be its final draft of the DE Guidelines, which also have benefitted from review by the Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Committee and the California Community Colleges Curriculum Committee. The Chancellor’s Office performed an internal review of the guidelines and returned them to DEETAC in March. The initial review from the Chancellor’s Office included the addition of language which related the guidelines to the *Vision for Success*. DEETAC implemented these edits during its March 4, 2020 meeting.

During the May 6, 2020 DEETAC Meeting, the chair reported that the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Educational Services Division had embarked on an additional review of the draft

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

DE guidelines. The review indicates that aspects of the draft DE Guidelines, including the proposed definitions of types of online courses and some of the accessibility recommendations, appear to be inappropriate for a document intended to provide regulatory guidance and that some of the recommendations exceed the scope of the guidelines.

DEETAC has convened a task force to address the recommendations from the Chancellor's Office's Educational Services Division. The task force currently contains representatives from ASCCC, the CEOs, CAPED, DECO, and CVC-OEI.



Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Year-End Debrief		Month: June	Year: 2020
		Item No: V. F.	
		Attachment: No	
DESIRED OUTCOME:	The Executive Committee will reflect-on and discuss successes and challenges of the committee work during the 2019-2020 academic year.	Urgent: No	
		Time Requested: 30 mins.	
CATEGORY:	Discussion	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Stanskas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW ¹ :	April Lonero	Action	
		Discussion	X

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

BACKGROUND:

As the 19-20 academic year draws to a close, this is an opportunity for the group to reflect on individual challenges and celebrate successes, as committee chairs and members of various work groups.

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



Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

ASCCC Accreditation Committee

April 29, 2020

10:00-11:00pm

ZOOM

Attendees: Stephanie Curry, Nate Donahue, Elizabeth Romero, Sheri Berger, Ekaterina Fuchs, Ted Blake, Roy Shahbazian

Minutes

I. Call to Order and Adoption of the Agenda

The committee reviewed the agenda, no changes were made

II. Selection of Minutes Taker and approval of last meetings minutes

Stephanie Curry will take minutes

III. Wellness Check in

Committee members each did a wellness check-in and discussed coping techniques used to address stress during the COVID-19 crisis

IV. 2020 Accreditation Institute debrief/ Review of survey

Committee discussed what worked well and what could be improved for future accreditation Institutes and discussed a review of the participant survey.

- Overall good institute, lots of participant engagement
- Theme of Accreditation, Equity and Guided Pathways very effective. Attendees liked the idea of using things we are already doing to address accreditation standards. “Ah Ha” moments for attendees on connections between Accreditation, Equity and Guided Pathways
- Special shout out to Panel by Grossmont College on Equity very effective and participants liked the practical application of equity work
- Some sessions were surprisingly popular such as the Enrollment Management/Scheduling breakout
- Set a good tone for relationship between California Community Colleges and ACCJC
- People liked the opportunities to share stories of what was happening at their campus and interacting and brainstorming with each other (crowdsourcing ideas)

What we learned/recommendations for future institutes

- Keep presenters limited to experts on the topics even if it's just one or two people
- More best practices options. Attendees were hungry for examples specifically as it relates to Guided Pathways
- Perhaps limit types of presentation to 2 types rather than 3 (Collaborative/Informational). The interactive was harder to define.
- Balance out intro to accreditation and application of standards in breakouts. Survey mentioned that some were looking for Accreditation 101 presentations

- Some Standard III presentations less attended so perhaps combine those rather than independent breakouts
- Do more presentations on DE (especially with COVID-19 crisis impact) include practical example of examples/innovations being done to support students and student learning including new definitions, policies and innovative practices
- Many attendees liked the conference app. Recommend having both paper and online app for events until attendees get used to the app. Some issues with the app not being up to date or consistent with what was in the paper agenda such as the reception.

V. Potential Rostrum Articles/Resolutions

None at this time

VI. Committee wrap up/ Recommendations for next years committee

Committee discussed some potential areas for the 2020-2021 ASCCC Accreditation Committee

1. Continue the discussion on Accreditation in a time of Emergency and provide support to colleges
2. Get feedback from the colleges in the new Summative/Comprehensive visits pilot and share that information with the field
3. Proactively work with ACCJC to identify the role of faculty/senates in future standards revisions

Committee Chair Stephanie Curry thanked the committee for all their hard work this year and the stellar job done on the 2020 Accreditation Institute.

VII. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 10:56am



ASCCC CTE LEADERSHIP COMMITTEE

May 5th 9:00am – 10:00am

ZOOM

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Select notetaker -Carrie will take notes
 - b. Roll call + 1 Minute UPDATE
 - i. Lynn Shaw (guest)
 - ii. Jimmie Bowen
 - iii. Christy Coobatis
 - iv. Manny Kang
 - v. LaTonya Parker
 - vi. Violeta Wenger
 - vii. DJ Singh

- II. Adoption of the Agenda- adopted by consensus

- III. Approval of Minutes
 - a. 4.6.2020 minutes approved via consensus (email)

- IV. ASCCC Information
 - a. [Application for Statewide Service](#)
 - b. [ASCCC CTE Leadership Committee](#)

- V. Announcements
 - a. [ASCCC EVENTS](#)

- VI. CTE Leadership Priorities/Tasks
 - i. CCCAOE Call for Proposal ideas?
 1. Data Driven CTE/ Resource allocation/decision making- barriers and bubbles for CTE faculty
 2. CTE Faculty Minimum Qualifications TOOLKIT (panel)
 3. Future of CTE C-ID
 4. Christy and Lynn provide descriptions/titles to Carrie by 5.15.2020 and Carrie will reach out to Manny/Lily about working with Christy
 - ii. MEMO- [CTE Liaisons](#)
 1. Determine content/date to launch
 - a. Resources
 - b. Reaching students/tracking- jobs of the future
 - iii. CTE Survey: DRAFT [HERE](#)
 1. Review content/date to launch?
 2. Determine is launch this semester is realistic
 3. Committee members will add to Google Drive document by May 8th

b. Professional Development

- i. See attached: [REPORT- ASCCC Trade Lab CTE Webinars](#)
- ii. Spring 2020 professional development and beyond
 1. Technology
 2. Andragogy/Pedagogy
 3. Discipline specific

VII. Adjournment

Status of Previous Action Items

A. In Progress

B. Completed



Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

EQUITY & DIVERSITY ACTION COMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 13, 2020

8:30 AM-10:00 AM

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/8370552669>

Basecamp log-in: <https://3.basecamp.com/4286309/projects/13688086>

Meeting Summary (DRAFT)

- I. In attendance: Mayra Cruz, Darcie McClelland, Cheryl Aschenbach, Juan Buriel, C. Kahalifa King
Absent: Karla Kirk, Jessica Ayo Alabi, Eileene Tejada
- II. The meeting began at 8:40am. The agenda was adopted by consensus.
- III. The April 8, 2020 Meeting Summary was approved by consensus.
- IV. Members spent time checking-in with each other. These are some words to describe our current state: concern, ethics, sound and strong grounding, challenges in the implementation of policies and practices during Covid-19 (please add)
- V. The following reports were provided (Cruz):
 - A. ASCCC May Report, [ASCCC COVID-19](#) Resources and other events
 - 1) Optimizing Community College Success White Paper Outline approved by the ASCCC Executive Committee
 - 2) EEO Anti-Racism in California Community College Paper was approved by the Executive Committee
 - 3) /DEI webinar 5/28
 - 4) CCCCCO DEI Statewide Implementation Workgroup
- VI. Members discuss the May/June Priorities
 1. Committee priorities discussed in February write up (resolutions)

Action: Prepare a write-up to be included in the June agenda. (Mayra)
 2. Update on Equity Assessment of the Implementation of AB705 Status (EDAC Lead: Juan; Members: Jessica, Kahalifa, Mayra and with the GP team)
Juan provided a short update. He held conversations with Ginni May, GPTF, and Mayra regarding this assignment and it's alignment to the white paper the GPTF is writing titled *Optimizing Community College Student Success*. Members received a copy of the paper outline.

Action: Meet with EDAC team members to review and update the *Equity Assessment of the Implementation of AB705*. The document listing ideas to develop an assessment would also include the focus on Distance/Online Education and the impact on students. (Juan)

3. Anti-Racism Education Paper – Outline (Goggle doc)
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1TdF6ESbJafKc0IKivEywUinsaIuXehFcwGfAnhXhceU/edit#>
The following EDAC members will be part of the writing team: Darcie, Kahalifa, Mayra & Cheryl.
Other team members: Dr. Luke Lara, Dr. La Tonya Parker. MSJC: Pamela Wright, Ryan Sullivan, Laticia Luna-Sims

Action: Schedule meeting to plan the approach. (Mayra)

4. Tools for Colleges to Engage in Dialogue (Goggle doc)
Meeting task: Review and approve to forward to ASCCC Executive Committee
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/12cRCW1oVfON2cQ8x3VfloVsNtQx1aqmj>
- a. Systemic bias dialogue tools
 - b. Cultural change and improvement tools
 - c. Benefits of multiple world view and lived experiences tools
- Due to the temporary loss of the Google folders, members agreed to meet once the tools folders are retrieved.

Action: Schedule a meeting to review the all the tools. (Mayra)

VII. Recommendations and focus for 20-21

- (1) The Committee recommends that the following priorities be address in 2020-21
Resolution F16 7.02 [Inclusion of English Learners in Equity and Scorecard Categories](#)
Resolution S17 3.02 [Support for Marginalized Students](#) (focus on undocumented students)
(EDI/Anti-bias and Anti-Racism module or webinar (Mayra, Darcie, Karla)
Resolution F17 3.02 [ESL Impact Cause by the Termination of Common Assessment Initiative](#)
Resolution F17 22.01 [Ensure Equal Access for All Qualified California Community College Students to College Promise Funds](#)
Resolution S19 3.02 [Address Privacy and Rights Violations](#)
Resolution S19 13.01 [In Support of All Gender Restrooms](#) *(Calls for all colleges to create gender inclusive building plans and campus maps; Resource handout)*
Discuss the referral from the RwLS committee, Resolution S19 13.01 In Support of All Gender Restrooms
- (2) Develop a series of webinars in Equity, Diversity and inclusion, in Anti-Racism Education.
Suggested Topics:
- Covid-19 illumination of racial disparities
 - Equity and disparities in technology and its impact in student success
 - Promoting learning during the pandemic crisis
 - Culturally responsive andragogy
- Collaborate with the Faculty Leadership Development Committee.
- (3) Integrate the CCCCO DEI Integration Plan ASCCC Assignments into EDAC’s work (doc)
- (4) Continue the “Celebrate successful collaborations to support equity and student achievement showcase” in 20-21. Review the applications submitted in 19-20 and encourage colleges to re-submit.
- (5) Pending the development before the end of June 2020, finalize the AB705 implementation assessment tool (Resolution S16 1903 Infusing Equity through College Processes Collaboration with GPTF)
- (6) Discuss next steps to support Undocumented Students

VIII. Announcements

- [Events](#)
- [ASCCC Faculty Application for Statewide Service](#)
- June 10th meeting

IX. Appreciations to all

Adjourn at 10:05am

Tasks in Progress (wrap-up by mid-June):

Committee priorities (resolutions) (criteria: actions no longer relevant, actions to be accomplished by June 30th, recommend action for 20-21)

Resolution S10 1.02 [Plan to Infuse Cultural Competence](#) (Mayra to post in summary of accomplishments)

Resolution S10 1.07 [Faculty Hiring Resources](#) (Mayra to follow up with 2020 EEO handbook updates to integrate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion statement and other revisions)

Resolution F14 7.04 [Student Safety: Sexual Assault](#) (Mayra to check back with CCCCO and Krystinne Mica)

Resolution S14 3.01 [Infuse Cultural Competence](#) (Mayra to review cultural competency plan to address this resolution and post a summary of accomplishments)

Resolution S15 3.01 [Systemwide Collaboration in Violence Prevention Programs](#) (Mayra to follow-up with CCCCO and Krystinne Mica)

Completed Tasks:

1. EDAC Work Plan (approved 10/9/19)
2. EDAC charge reviewed
3. Recommendation to Adopt the CCCCO Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Statement proposed and submitted to ASCCC
4. Rostrum article written:
 - [Subtle Support for Our Undocumented Students in the Classroom](#) by Juan Buriel
 - [Best Practices for Faculty Involvement in the Student Equity and Achievement Plan](#) by Eileene Tejada, Karla Kirk, Mayra Cruz
 - [Faculty Involvement in the Student Equity and Achievement Program](#) by Ayo-Alabi
 - [Best Practices for Student Involvement in the Student Equity and Achievement Plan and Implementation](#) by Mayra Cruz and Karla Kirk
5. Partnered with the Foundation CCC and CCCO Undocumented Students Week of Action Follow-up with Input To-Dos on Basecamp and assignments (Note: Incorporate resolutions in Action Plan)
6. 2019 Fall Plenary Resolutions submitted and adopted by the body.
 - Resolution 3.02 on anti-racism/no hate education was approved.
 - Resolution 3.03 on replacing the ASCCC Inclusion statement with a new Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement was approved by acclamation.
7. A2Mend Spring Conference workshops- titles & descriptions
8. Spring 2020 Plenary EDAC Proposed Topics/Activity
 - Implicit bias in faculty diversification
 - Anti-racism education (Related to the content of the 3.02 F19 Support Infusing Anti-Racism/No Hate Education in Community Colleges)
 - Identify how bias, stereotyping, and discrimination have limited the roles and contributions of individuals and groups, and how these limitations have challenged and continue to challenge our society, including faculty diversification
 - Examine assumptions and prejudices, including, but not limited to, racism, sexism, and homophobia, that might limit the opportunities and growth of students and employees
 - Explore inherent racism embedded in societal institutions, including the educational system and individually examine their personal role in the support of racist structures and the commitment to work to dismantle structural racism.
 - Effective practices to dismantle racism
 - Culturally responsive teaching and practice (ie. infusing cultural competence)

- How faculty are involved in advancing equity
 - Student services and instruction integration for student success
 - Assessment or evaluation of equity in the implementation of AB705 implementation (Rubric)
Equity Driven Systems Paper topics
 - Where is Equity in the 10+1?
 - Applying a Theory of Action framework to Equity: Nots and Bolts
 - Transforming the college into an equity driven institution: The Local Academic Senate Action Plan
 - Critical conversations: Shifting ideologies to foster an equity-driven institution to improve student outcomes
 - Hiring through an equity lens: Rethinking policies and procedures
 - Assessing racial equity
 - **Proposed Activity** Showcase: Celebrate successful collaborations to support equity and student achievement criteria and announcement
9. Discussed with the Executive Committee concern of committee members' financial ability to attend Plenary.
 10. Celebrate successful Collaborations in equity and student achievement announcement, criteria and application completed.
 11. A²Mend Conference (March 5) sessions (3) completed
 12. Followed-up with the EDAC previous chair to see if Committee Priorities comments were placed anywhere else. (Mayra)



Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

Faculty Leadership Development Committee

Thursday, April 23, 2020

3:00 p.m.—4:30 p.m.

ZOOM

Meeting Summary

The Faculty Leadership Development Committee creates resources to assist local academic senates in the development and implementation of policies that ensure faculty primacy in faculty leadership and professional development. The committee assesses the Academic Senate’s professional development offerings and makes recommendations to the Executive Committee on policies and practices for faculty professional and leadership development activities at a statewide level. The committee supports local faculty development and provides guidance to enhance faculty participation in the areas of faculty development policies; faculty professionalism and leadership development; innovations in teaching and learning; and other topics related to academic and professional matters. The committee advocates for funding, resource allocation, and a commitment to faculty development activities focused on equity-minded practices and student success.

- I. Roll call, call to order, and agenda adoption at 3:06 p.m.

Michelle Bean—Chair	Elizabeth Day (absent)	Luke Lara (absent)
Sam Foster—2 nd Chair	Elizabeth Imhof	Emilie Mitchell
	Christy Karau (absent)	

- II. Minutes Volunteer—Sam volunteered to take notes.

- III. [March Minutes](#) –approved via email.

- IV. Lean-In and Check-In—members checked-in sharing fun memes and also expressing concerns during crisis.

- V. Faculty Diversification Work
 - A. CCCCC Diversity Symposium was March 20—possibly rescheduled for October.
 - B. ASCCC Professional Development Series—webinar (April 8) and follow-up (April 10) on Hiring in Virtual Environment (Lara, Bean, Cruz, Raphael)—about 76 attendees and about 15 on follow-up. Program materials under ASCCC website under large group discussion.
 - C. Model Hiring Processes and Guiding Principles Zoom meeting with ACHRO, CIO, and CSSO Representatives recap (March 30.) Went well and received good feedback.
 - D. Reviewed missing components in our [Model Hiring grid](#).
 - 1. Added Equivalency #3b—updated guiding questions and equity components.
 - 2. Criteria for adding tools and resources—created a set of guidelines that each addition to a module must be: equity-minded—fit one or more of the equity framework, authoritative—experts with no bias, timely—published within last five years, and tools must have accountability measures or ways to demonstrate effectiveness, be student-centered, and data-driven.
 - E. [Canvas shell](#) –content will be public.
 - 1. Layout of content—chair will update the information and format for the next meeting. Recommendation to chuck pages for easier reading.
 - 2. Outcomes and assessments for PDC? Recommendation to forward to next year’s committee.
 - 3. CSU Credit? Badges? Forward to next year’s committee.

4. Other recommendations—none.

- VI. Anti-Racism Work
 - A. ASCCC Professional Development Series—webinar on Opportunities for Positive Structural Change in This Crisis (April 24 w/Imhof, Buul, Cruz, Lara). Chair will send registration link to support colleagues.
 - B. *Rostrum* article (Imhof and Buul) delayed until the fall.
- VII. Faculty Empowerment and Leadership Academy (FELA) Next Steps—recommendation next year’s committee to follow-up!
 - A. CSU Credit COR and Form (Imhof and Bean)—postponed until fall.
 - B. Mentor Handbook (Mitchell, Day, Bean)—paused and will forward to next year’s committee.
- VIII. Faculty of Color Leadership Opportunity Survey—due date extended to fall 2020. Data review and next steps to be finished by next year’s committee.
- IX. Umoja/A2MEND Leg Day
 - A. Wednesday, [April 22 Town Hall](#) #BlackStudentSuccess went well—a powerfully passionate message.
 - B. Webinar Series and Advocacy Letter—next week PD series. ASCCC approved to use logo as a partner on the letter to legislators.
- X. FLDC June Meeting
 - A. Faculty Leadership Institute—virtual webinar style.
 - B. FLDC meeting change to June 11? Committee agreed to hold just in case; chair to update calendar request.
- XI. Announcements
 - A. Check for upcoming events at <https://asccc.org/calendar/list/events>
 - 1. Electronic Elections—April 27 to May 15 (3 rounds in eBallots)
 - Full list of winners announced May 18
 - Special Elections if needed May 25
 - 2. President’s Report
 - PD Series: 3,500+ participants
 - Guidance Memos—14 w/CCCCO
 - Transfer focus for fair treatment w/system partners
 - Distancing until August—SCFF concerns
 - ASCCC finances good
 - Possible virtual Leadership Institute—virtual event fees
 - B. Ways to help during COVID-19
 - 1. Join Amazon Smile—find ASCCC Foundation
 - 2. Give to Relief and Recovery Campaign at [Foundation for CCC](#)
 - C. [Application for Statewide Service](#)
- XII. Closing Comments and Reflections
 - A. Next meeting: May 21 at 3:00—4:30 p.m.
 - B. In-Progress and Completed Tasks review
 - C. Any other final comments or suggestions?

1. Concerns resulting from COVID-19 crisis—equity with most vulnerable students; part-time and temporary staff possibly losing jobs (especially for programs like UndocuScholars and Pride Centers)—there was a need to move to more virtual services.

XIII. Adjournment at 4:38 p.m.

In Progress:

- Hiring Guiding Principles and Model Practices Canvas Shell
- Part 2: Anti-Racism Hiring Practices *Rostrum* article—postponed; to be completed in fall
- Umoja/A2MEND Virtual Town Hall Leg Day planning/communication
- FELA Course Outline of Record—postponed till fall

Completed Tasks:

- ASCCC Event Survey Questions on Gender, Race, Ethnicity
- Faculty Leadership Survey Questions for Faculty of Color (Reminder: Distribute in fall 2020)
- Faculty Empowerment and Leadership Academy (FELA) Framework and Applications (Reminder: Market in fall 2020 for spring 2021)
- *Rostrum* article: Womyn’s Survey
- *Rostrum* article: Anti-Racism
- *Rostrum* article: Caucus Structure
- *Rostrum* article: Sex, Gender, Race, and Economic Disadvantage: Courageous Conversations About Intersectionality
- *Rostrum* article: Equitizing Merit and Fit: Establishing a Baseline Understanding
- Collaborations—chair meet with Puente directors on October 30, attended Umoja Education Summit October 31, CCC LGBTQIA+ Summit 2019 panelist
- Updated the FLDC charge/description
- *Rostrum* article: Convergence of Diversity and Equity: Guiding Principles for Hiring Processes
- A2Mend Collaboration—A2Mend board members presented at 2019 ASCCC Academic Academy
- Umoja/A2Mend—chair completed workgroup meetings for Black Student Report Card for CCCs
- Womyn’s Leadership Survey distributed in September



Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

Faculty Leadership Development Committee

Thursday, May 21, 2020

3:00 p.m.—4:30 p.m.

ZOOM

Meeting Summary

The Faculty Leadership Development Committee creates resources to assist local academic senates in the development and implementation of policies that ensure faculty primacy in faculty leadership and professional development. The committee assesses the Academic Senate’s professional development offerings and makes recommendations to the Executive Committee on policies and practices for faculty professional and leadership development activities at a statewide level. The committee supports local faculty development and provides guidance to enhance faculty participation in the areas of faculty development policies; faculty professionalism and leadership development; innovations in teaching and learning; and other topics related to academic and professional matters. The committee advocates for funding, resource allocation, and a commitment to faculty development activities focused on equity-minded practices and student success.

- I. Roll call, call to order, and agenda adoption at 3:00 p.m.

Michelle Bean—Chair	Elizabeth Day (absent)	Luke Lara
Sam Foster—2 nd Chair	Elizabeth Imhof	Emilie Mitchell
	Christy Karau	

- II. Minutes volunteer—Emilie Mitchell agreed to take notes for 5/21 meeting.

- III. [April Minutes](#)—No additions or corrections added to April Minutes.

- IV. Lean-in and check-in—Members shared what shows to watch.

- V. Faculty Diversification Work
 - A. [CCCCO DEI Report 2020](#)—review when you get a chance.
 - 1. FON—no suspension, just no penalty. July Board of Governors meeting—will be discussing the FON to address next year’s requirements.
 - 2. There still needs to be hiring on campuses.
 - B. Prop 209 [ACA 5](#) (constitutional amendment)—Exec voted to support repeal of section 31 of ACA 5; Leg and Advocacy chair will craft and send letter to legislators.
 - 1. Amendment would repeal prop 209. Prop 209 disallowed the use of race as a factor in hiring and admissions (aka, affirmative action).
 - 2. Michelle sent letter/sample language to all of us to forward to folks on our campuses.
 - C. Model Hiring Processes and Guiding Principles Zoom meeting with ACHRO, CIO, and CSSO Representatives vet Canvas shell on May 27.
 - D. Review our [Model Hiring grid](#)
 - 1. [Canvas shell](#)—reviewed components of module.
 - 2. Missing tools and resources
 - a) Missing a tool/resource for forwarding the final candidates to final interview.
 - b) In general, more tools would be preferable. Next year’s committee is encouraged to continue culling together additional tools.
 - E. Other recommendations? Perhaps an intro video from President Stankas?
 - 1. Agreed to encourage next year’s committee to take up this issue, if they are

interested in having a video.

2. Christy brought up the issue of some of the ambiguity in these concepts for those who do equity work and most especially for those who are less steeped in the concepts of equity.
 - a) Ideas include discussing why it matters, a little more guidance for folks based on level of engagement/awareness, and tools from other partners (e.g., Human Resources, CIOs, ACRO). Concept should be on being a practitioner of equity and not a focus on “best practices” model, which is not a shift in mindset. To get to praxis, we must be reflective and assess our principles and practices.
 - b) Idea for video with our partners around issues as a welcome and intro to why it matters. Committee agreed.

VI. [End-of-Year Report](#)

- A. Reviewed the document to submit to next year’s committee as recommendations.
- B. Updated [Committees Priority sheet](#) with completed resolutions.

VII. Anti-Racism Work

- A. ASCCC Professional Development Series—webinar on Opportunities for Positive Structural Change in This Crisis
- B. African-American Student Success Week webinars and [Virtual Town Hall](#) with Umoja/A2MEND and legislators—1,114 attendees at Town Hall.
- C. Latinx Town Hall organized by Colegas and CCCCCO—790 attendees.
- D. *Rostrum* article (Imhof and Buul) to be finished soon.

VIII. Faculty Empowerment and Leadership Academy (FELA) Next Steps—paused till next year.

- A. [FELA webpage](#) went live (May 2020) and info shared in ASCCC newsletter
- B. Budget Line Item--\$10,000 for 2020/2021
- C. Still to complete:
 1. CSU Credit COR and Form
 2. Mentor Handbook
- D. Open questions:
 1. In-person: All agree that in person is preferable, that being said, Elizabeth expressed concerns about how long we might have to wait for the return to normalcy. Concerned that we might want to consider if waiting for face-to-face interactions to return we might lose momentum for FELA.
 - a) No ultimate decision was reached.
 2. Curriculum: Decided to allow the next committee members to develop curriculum (CSU COR and handbook).

IX. Faculty of Color Leadership Opportunity Survey

- A. Due date extended to fall 2020
- B. Survey sent in March to the following:
 - SP Listserv
 - Ethnic Studies Listserv
 - Women Studies Listserv
 - Puente - to EDs Allsopp and Vergara
 - Umoja - to their communications staffer
 - A2MEND - to Dr. Bush
 - APAHE - to President Ali
 - Latina Leadership Network - President Dr. Gomez de Torres
 - LGBTQIA+ Caucus Members
 - Liaison List
 - CCLC - to Agnes
 - Deputy Chancellor Dr. Gonzales

- X. Announcements
 - A. Check for upcoming events at <https://asccc.org/calendar/list/events>
 - 1. Electronic Elections—April 27 to May 15 (3 rounds in eBallots)
 - Full list of winners announced May 18
 - Special Elections if needed May 25
 - 2. [President’s Report](#)
 - B. Ways to help during COVID-19
 - 1. Join Amazon Smile—find ASCCC Foundation
 - 2. Give to Relief and Recovery Campaign at [Foundation for CCC](#)
 - C. [Application for Statewide Service](#)—complete by end of May and forward to colleagues!
- XI. Closing Comments and Reflections
 - A. June 11 meeting—canceled.
 - B. Any other final comments or suggestions? Thank you for a great year!
- XII. Adjournment at 4:33 p.m.

In Progress:

- *Rostrum* article: Part 2: Anti-Racism Hiring Practices
- Model Hiring Practices and Guiding Principles Canvas shell—needs more tools and resources in each section.
- FELA Course Outline of Record—paused till next year.
- Resolution for spring 2020 Plenary: Recommendation to Update Title 5 Language for Second Minimum Qualification—paused because of COVID-19 canceling Plenary.

Completed Tasks:

- Model Hiring Practices and Principles Canvas shell and tool/resources criteria
- Umoja/A2MEND Virtual Town Hall Leg Day planning/communication
- ASCCC Event Survey Questions on Gender, Race, Ethnicity
- Faculty Leadership Survey Questions for Faculty of Color (Reminder: Address results in fall 2020)
- Faculty Empowerment and Leadership Academy (FELA) Framework and Applications (Reminder: Market in fall 2020 for spring 2021)
- *Rostrum* article: Womyn's Survey
- *Rostrum* article: Anti-Racism
- *Rostrum* article: Caucus Structure
- Caucus Guidelines and Criteria updates
- *Rostrum* article: Sex, Gender, Race, and Economic Disadvantage: Courageous Conversations About Intersectionality
- *Rostrum* article: Equitizing Merit and Fit: Establishing a Baseline Understanding
- Collaborations—chair meet with Puente directors on October 30, attended Umoja Education Summit October 31, CCC LGBTQIA+ Summit 2019 panelist
- Updated the FLDC charge/description
- *Rostrum* article: Convergence of Diversity and Equity: Guiding Principles for Hiring Processes
- A2Mend Collaboration—A2Mend board members presented at 2019 ASCCC Academic Academy
- Umoja/A2Mend—chair completed workgroup meetings for Black Student Report Card for CCCs
- Womyn's Leadership Survey distributed in September



**Academic Senate
for California Community Colleges**

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

ASCCC ONLINE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

May 18TH, 2020

12:00PM – 1:00PM

ZOOM

SUMMARY

Present: Carrie Roberson, Geoffrey Dyer, Dan Barnett (guest), Marty Rudd, Ingrid Greenberg, Phylise Smith

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Select notetaker—Geoffrey Dyer volunteered to record the meeting summary
 - b. Welcome—Dan Barnett, Professor of Philosophy at Butte College, introduced himself and indicated his interest in statewide service
- II. Adoption of the Agenda—The agenda was adopted by unanimous consent
- III. Approval of Minutes
 - a. N/A 3.30.2020 meeting minutes approved via email
- IV. Links
 - a. [Application for Statewide Service](#)--The chair gave an overview of the committee assignment process and encouraged members to complete the application
 - b. [ASCCC Online Education Committee](#)--The committee discussed considerations for appointments and membership of the committee
 - i. Student Senate representation—The committee agreed that the student voice is important and should be added
 - ii. CalBright Representative—The chair and the past CalBright representative shared the value of having one of the ASCCC Online Education Committee members be one of the faculty appointed to work with CalBright in academic and professional matters
 - iii. CVC-OEI Liaison—The chair praised the work of CVC-OEI and asked if CVC-OEI should have an individual who regularly attends the committee. The committee reflected on the January meeting during which Autumn Bell and Michelle Pecansky-Brock attended and reported. The committee agreed that the flow of communication and information between the CVC-OEI and the ASCCC Online Education Committee is effective in the status quo.
- V. Action Items
 - a. Review Online Education Committee Charter/Membership:

*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 **instruction with 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 **the Academic Senate standing committees**, advocates for policies, and proposes resolutions.*

The chair pointed out that the landscape of online education may be changing and that next year's committee may need to revisit the charter as a result.

b. *Resolution S19 9.04: Ensure the Accessibility of Online Materials*

The committee discussed the importance of this paper and how COVID-19 has broadened and made more immediate its context. The committee agreed that faculty with relevant experience in accessibility should help co-author the paper.

- c. Online Instruction (CVC-OEI) exemplary faculty/course recognition—One member suggested a badge that could be used on Linked In and social media. Another pointed to means of recognizing the faculty who have mentored and supported faculty in online education.

The committee discussed what types of recognition were available and the possibility to acknowledge outstanding distance education faculty through the President's Update or Academic Academy as opposed to a formal award. One idea was to create a panelist showcase as part of Academic Academy for outstanding distance education faculty with a letter of recognition sent to the college president. The committee discussed how they might be involved in facilitating the selection and acknowledgment of such faculty.

d. Information Dissemination:

- i. Local POCR updates/changes information dissemination—The chair mentioned that the committee would need to keep the field alert to changes in the local POCR process
- ii. DE Guidelines- definitions, information dissemination—The chair reported that the DE Guidelines produced by DEETAC have been reviewed by the Chancellor's Office, which presented concerns about the scope of the document.
- iii. Ensuring Effective Practices—Phylise Smith pointed out the need in the field to share resources and support to the field

VI. Announcements

a. **ASCCC EVENTS:**

- i. Academic Academy- tentative focus is online education/distance learning—The committee discussed the planned theme for the next Academic Academy and possible breakout topics including information dissemination and sharing effective practices



Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

Standards & Practices Committee

April 20, 2020

1:00p.m.—2:30p.m.

Zoom

MEETING SUMMARY

- I. Welcome and Check-in
Geoffrey Dyer, Michelle Bean, Eric Thompson, Angela Escheveri, Roy Shahbazian, and Christopher Howerton were present and touched base.
 - A. Michelle taking notes
 - B. Committee shared about health and wellness
- II. Review and Approve Meeting Summaries from February and March—two changes noted.
- III. Disciplines List Revisions Process
 - A. Executive concerns:
 1. Could possibly limit debate
 2. Coordinating a date and time to get maximum participation
 3. Decided to bring it to fall Plenary with new S&P committee following up
 - B. Moorpark College was notified of decision
- IV. Diversity Award Winner Announcement—notification of winner sent out to ASCCC listservs and social media.
- V. Exemplary Program Award Theme
 - A. Two choices to submit:
 1. Equitable Practices in Virtual Educational Environments
 2. Hiring Practices for Faculty Diversification
 - B. Other awards will get suggested diversity language added as discussed at the February S&P meeting—to be submitted to June Exec meeting.
- VI. Equivalency Paper Update
 - A. Chair submitted outline with our suggestions: broaden pools, CTE Toolkit, and equity framework.
 - B. First draft going to May Exec meeting, second reading in June, and then to body approval at fall Plenary; chair has made the changes. Chair reviewed the addition/changes with committee.

- VII. Faculty Diversification Strategies Update
 - A. Chair added to the Model Hiring Principles and Practices spreadsheet—including guiding questions, model activity, and resources (CTE Toolkit); reviewed page 28-30 as key tools/rubrics for broaden pools and faculty diversification in addition to updating Equivalency paper.

- VIII. May Meeting
 - A. We have done great work and completed our priorities.
 - B. Do we need to meet in May? May 20 at 11:30 a.m.—12:30 p.m.—hold for S&P just in case.
 - C. Thank you, Geoffrey, for your leadership!

- IX. Adjournment at 2:20 p.m.



Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

Transfer, Articulation and Student Services Committee

24 March 2020, 5 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

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order and Adoption of the Agenda
- II. Volunteer note taker
- III. Check in
- IV. Planning for future meetings
- V. COVID-19 and Transfer
 - a. Students
 - b. Transfer Centers
 - c. Transfer Institutions
 - d. Recommendations
- VI. Update on CTE/ Noncredit institute
- VII. Update on Transfer Paper (attached)
 - a. Feedback from Exec
 - b. Completion by May
- VIII. Update on Resolution 7.01 F17 [Creating Guidelines for Veteran Resource Centers](#)
- IX. Update on Survey on Open Educational Resources (OER)
- X. Update on Fall Resolutions Assigned to TASSC
 - a. [9.01 F19](#) Local Determination of International Baccalaureate Credit at California Community Colleges
 - b. [16.01 F19](#) Develop Standards of Practice Resource for Learning Assistance and Tutoring in the California Community Colleges, including the role of Learning Skills Coordinators or Instructors, and Tutoring Coordinators

XII. Adjournment



Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

Transfer, Articulation and Student Services Committee

9 April 2020, 5 p.m.

Zoom

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order and Adoption of the Agenda
At 5 p.m. Sam Foster (chair) welcomed the committee members participating in today's meeting: Anna Bruzzese, Jose Lara, Lorraine Burnham-Levy, Mark Osea and Miles Vega.
- II. Volunteer note taker
Anna volunteered to take notes.
- III. Check in - committee members checked in with one another.
- IV. Update on COVID-19 impact on Transfer, Counseling, Other areas – Bakersfield College is holding virtual transfer fairs. Rio Hondo College is offering virtual counseling and communicating information regarding COVID-19 response at transfer institutions. Porterville College is offering mental health services for students. Colleges are also offering EW, Pass/No Pass and other options in order to minimize the impact of this pandemic on students' ability to reach their educational goals.
- V. Update on Transfer Paper (attached) – Sam sent out the most recent version of the paper (version 4) to committee members before today's meeting. Committee members discussed proposed changes. The goal is to have the revised draft by next Thursday to submit it for the May Exec agenda. Sam will send out the outline the committee revised today to everyone shortly.
- VI. Update on Fall Resolutions Assigned to TASSC - We will look at these at the end of the semester to make recommendations for next year's committee.
 - a. [9.01 F19](#) Local Determination of International Baccalaureate Credit at California Community Colleges
 - b. [16.01 F19](#) Develop Standards of Practice Resource for Learning Assistance and Tutoring in the California Community Colleges, including the role of Learning Skills Coordinators or Instructors, and Tutoring Coordinators
- VII. Other Items for Discussion
- VIII. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.
Minutes respectfully submitted by Anna Bruzzese.



Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

Transfer, Articulation and Student Services Committee

21 May 2020, 5 p.m.

Zoom

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order and Adoption of the Agenda
At 5 p.m. Sam Foster (chair) welcomed the committee members participating in today's meeting: Anna Bruzzese, Jose Lara, Lorraine Burnham-Levy, Mark Osea, Miles Vega.
- II. Volunteer note taker
Anna volunteered to take notes.
- III. Check in
Committee members checked in with one another.
- IV. Update on Transfer Paper
The most recent revised draft was submitted for the May Exec agenda. Our work on the paper is done. The paper will go to the editor before the paper gets final approval from the Executive Committee to go before the entire Academic Senate body for approval, hopefully at the Fall plenary.
- V. Update on Survey on Open Educational Resources (OER)
At this point this survey appears to be moot. Sam reached out to Michelle Pilati and she said the use of OER has increased.
- VI. Update on Fall Resolutions Assigned to TASSC
The committee was unable to address the following resolutions, as we focused primarily on the transfer paper, so these would need to be addressed by next year's committee.
 - a. **9.01 F19** Local Determination of International Baccalaureate Credit at California Community Colleges
 - b. **16.01 F19** Develop Standards of Practice Resource for Learning Assistance and Tutoring in the California Community Colleges, including the role of Learning Skills Coordinators or Instructors, and Tutoring Coordinators - The committee felt that it would be best to develop resources rather than a paper but we will discuss this further next time.
- VII. End of Year Report (see attached form)
The committee discussed the assigned priorities to determine which ones were completed, which ones are in progress and which ones have not been completed. Sam will submit the End of Year Report to the Executive Director Krystinne Mica on the committee's behalf.

One of the suggestions for next year's committee is to evaluate the effectiveness of wrap-around services in the wake of COVID-19, and to look for best practices since all colleges are now offering them. Another suggestion was to look at innovations at transfer centers to

continue to provide transfer and counseling services and report them to the field.

VIII. Acknowledgements!

The committee members expressed their appreciation for each other and everyone's significant contributions throughout this academic year. Serving on this committee was a very positive experience for us all. Sam also reminded everyone to submit their application for statewide service for next year.

IX. Other Items for Discussion

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Anna Bruzzese.

African American Student Virtual Town Hall and Success Week



African American Student Success Week April 27 - May 1, 2020

Submitted by Michelle Bean and Mayra Cruz in collaboration with A2MEND, the Umoja Community, and other partners

April 22, 2020 Virtual Townhall

Total clicks for the registration page 1461

Total [YouTube](#) views 122

Zoom:# of people registered 1314

Panelists + Attendees attended **1114**

Attendees joined via computer 810

Max # of viewers at the same time (exclude panelists) 720

503 people responded to the poll

Please select the position/role that best describes you. (Select one)

- 1 State Legislator
- 7 California Community College Trustee
- 14 Legislative Staff
- 15 California Community College Student
- 33 Association/Organization Supporting California Community Colleges
- 36 California Higher Education Advocate
- 41 Business/Non-Profit
- 112 California Community College Staff
- 120 California Community College Administrator
- 124 California Community College Faculty

Student Success Week: [CCLC Youtube Channel](#)

Date	Webinar	Total registrants	Total attendees (including panelists)
27-Apr-20	Recommendations to Improve the Success of African American Students	316	326
28-Apr-20	Housing Insecurity of African American Students	290	255
29-Apr-20	Making the Case for African American Student Success	1053	830
30-Apr-20	Meeting the Educational Needs of Black Students During and After COVID-19	435	315
	TOTAL	2094	1726

CCLA19 Meeting

April 30, 2020

Submitted by Michelle Velasquez Bean

Background:

Faculty leaders (CE AND GE) from 15 colleges in the Los Angeles region developed a conceptual idea to provide the sustained supports for the faculty to develop appropriate and effective new curriculum, and build collaborative networks needed to identify, test, spread and scale successful local and regional projects across the 19 LA area colleges.

One major outcome of these faculty convenings is to inspire discipline faculty to innovate programmatically across discipline with contextualized learning, so that community colleges stay competitive with the increase of competition for students. This initiative has been funded by Strong Workforce funds thus far.

Meeting:

Bean shared the following with the group of faculty in attendance on the Zoom call: Hiring Toolkit Canvas shell soon to be launched and the updating the Equivalency paper with intentional inclusion of the CTE MQ Toolkit references. Also, described how to submit for service and shared the link to the application for ASCCC committees.

Committee recapped tools for student engagement for CTE courses and meeting the challenges.

They are looking for regional level innovation and online transition—a pilot program based on the following:

- Goal to help bridge relationships between industry and education; a pipeline to the labor market.
- SWP—fiscal agents for the money to stop for-profits from taking CC students.
- Strategy, Innovation, Marketing (this group started this campaign for transformative change).

Aha for them was conversations to change product from individual faculty (GE and CE classes) to a shared Academic Resource Innovation Hub, focusing on the skills that employers want (especially soft skills); creating cross-representational local campus groups to discuss barriers. With communication with college presidents starting with CE deans and engage with ASCCC for state support.

- Funding—will SWP money still be available as priority without competition between area schools? Perkins funds often spent on marketing and not checking effectiveness of marketing.
- Ask—spend the resources on ONE hub for all to access; so we need funds. One hub with all Area C CE programs and then frees up Perkins funding (away from marketing).
- Ask—do we need an academic senate resolution for priorities of funding and for PD needs? Bean shared info about next Plenary and guidance on how to submit a resolution.

GEAC Meeting Summary Notes

May 5, 2020

Submitted by Michelle Bean

Reports:

CSUCO

- Wrapping up GE Review; moving to UCOP; and **beginning new GE Appeals Process** and working with resubmissions in ASSIST. (Response to ASCCC Resolution 15.03 from Spring 2019 “Encourage Accelerating Timeline for General Education Articulation”)
- Working on Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) approval process; updating EO 1036 with elements for military credit, external exams, and CPL modifications.

CCC AOs

- April—seeing positive increase in ASSIST.

ASCCC

- Shared Guided Pathways report from Ginni May and answered questions on pathways framework, co-curricular activities in pathways, and GEs in the mapping process.
- Highlighted our PD series and COVID response resources and shared *Rostrum* link.

Discussion:

- **AP Exams**—CSU will accept scores of 2020 modified versions of the tests.
- **CLEP**—can be accepted for GE, but during COVID no testing is available.
- **FAQs for GE**—chair would like to recommend that next year we work on creating a webpage or document with Frequently Asked Questions on things like word counts and other permissibles; committee had some discussion and concerns—no conclusion or action taken.
- **CPL**—CSUCO reviewing criteria for accepting GE credit; committee discussed need for additional criteria; concern about needing to “unbundle” what CCs provide as accepted GE package already—no conclusion or action taken.
- **Lab Modalities (B3)**—question arose on whether there needs additional outcomes to the Guiding Notes in light of COVID with labs online—no conclusion or action taken.
- **Ethnic Studies**—Alison Wynn presented CSUCO option ([document to CSU Board of Trustees](#) provided with detail and comparison grid—CSUCO, ASCSU, proposed legislation--Weber).
 - **Proposing the Ethnic Studies requirement to be in lower-division GE.** Bean expressed the need for collaboration with ASCCC. Committee members discussed viability of overlay or substitution—no consensus.
 - Discussed proposal to take 3 units from Area D for Ethnic Studies to be a stand alone requirement without adding to lower division GE cap.
 - Proposing standards/outcomes be determined by local campuses; some discussion about system-level outcomes.
 - To begin implementation in 2023-2024.
 - Discussed if there is a need for FDG to revisit TMC compliance.
 - CSU Board of Trustees will review proposal at May 2020 meeting and begin writing new Executive Order and updating title 5 language.



MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, February 5, 2020

8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

[Link to Recording](#)

A. Welcome

a. Attendance:

✓	Abbrev	Designee	College
	CCCCIO	Vacant	
✓	CEOCCC	Tammeil Gilkerson	Laney College
	CCCCSSAA	Vacant	Modesto Junior College
✓	ASCCC	Kathy O'Connor	Santa Barbara City College
✓	ASCCC	Deborah Nolan	College of Sequoias
✓	ASCCC	Geoffrey Dyer	Taft College
✓	CCCDECO	Lisa Beach	Santa Rosa Junior College
✓	CCCDECO	Joanna Miller	Contra Costa CCD
	CCL	Susan Hines	San Jose City College
✓	CVC-OEI	Jodie Steeley	Fresno City College
✓	CAPED	Thad Selmants	Sierra College
	RP Group	Vacant	Modesto Junior College
✓	CISOA	Joe Moreau	Foothill DeAnza CCD
	Student Senate	VACANT	
✓	CCLC	Laura Casas	Board of Trustees
✓	CCCTechConnect	Heather Schmidt	Palomar
✓	CCCCO	Erin Larson	--

B. Standing reports from constituent groups

- ASCCC (Kathy O'Connor, Geoffrey Dyer, Deborah Nolan) – Spring Plenary is April 16-18 in Oakland – Topics include DE Guidelines, Local Peer Online Course Review (POCR), CVC-OEI, Competency-Based Education, and Noncredit and Guided Pathways. CVC-OEI met with ASCCC Online Education Committee to discuss scaling local POCR. The ASCCC Executive Team will hear the CVC-OEI proposal that the lead faculty POCR reviewer need not be external to the college.
- CAPED (Thad Selmants) – Nothing to report



- CCC TechConnect (Heather Schmidt) – CCC TechConnect is working on OTC and reviewing session proposals. Twenty-one colleges are interested in and piloting PlayPosit. There will be a webinar through CCC TechConnect on Playposit. Registration is required. TechConnect chose Playposit after vetting other tools (like Panopto and TechSmith Relay). They considered cost, service, functionality and input from groups already using Playposit.
- CCL (Susan Hines) – Absent
- CCLC BOT (Laura Casas) – CCCT Board met at the Legislative Conference last weekend. They shared that the President of Calbright resigned. Laura shared some of the work of DEETAC to the CCCT Board.
- CEOs (Tammeil Gilkerson) – The CEO Symposium is at the end of February. They are working on a housing survey. Laney received an Improving Online CTE Pathways grant to engage English for Speakers of Other Languages in online programs in CTE.
- CIOs (vacant)
- CISOA (Joe Moreau) – CISOA’s conference is four weeks away. Exhibitor space is sold out and there is a waiting list. This year, a post-conference session exclusively for Chief Technology Officers and/or Chief Information Officers will provide them the opportunity to have a frank discussion about what should be done differently as a system and what leadership they can provide.
- CSSO (vacant)
- CVC-OEI (Jodie Steeley) – CVC-OEI expects to have all colleges in cross-enrollment by 2023. The loss of Proctorio was difficult for some colleges. Though the Foundation negotiated rates for individual colleges to continue with Proctorio, the cost is still relatively high. Name Coach was also cut based on low usage. NetTutor is scaling back to 500 hours per college because of inconsistent usage. Quest for Success will continue without Smarter Measures. Local POCR is picking up steam. The Online Course Quality Rubric will incorporate ADA compliance standards throughout the document instead of at the end. This will allow colleges to address accessibility while they are developing their course. Thus far, through the “Improving Online CTE Pathways” grants, 130 new online CTE courses were improved or converted. About 99,000 students will be served in 2020-2021. [Here is a link to the Key Findings from the CVC-OEI Advisory Committee meeting.](#) The next Advisory Committee meeting will be in March and the next Consortium Meeting will be on February 21.
- DECO (Lisa Beach / Joanna Miller) – DECO is preparing for a full-day retreat at the Online Teaching Conference. Sakari Morrison, Vice President of External Affairs from Calbright, talked with DECO about collaborating with the 114. Calbright is looking to



reach out to the counselors at the 114 colleges to share information about their colleges and help students find pathways to back to the 114 colleges.

Jodie Steeley posted a [link to the article “Students Worry as California Online Community College Confronts Offline Woes”](#) to highlight student concerns with the curriculum. There is a [Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee Hearing on February 13 to talk about Calbright](#). There will be faculty union members who will be advocating that Calbright roll into CVC-OEI.

- RP Group (vacant)
- Student Senate (vacant)
- CCCCCO

Educational Services (Erin Larson) – Staff changes in the Chancellor’s office include a [new Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, Valerie Lundy-Wagner](#). There will be some restructuring to include more researchers in this new unit. Laura Metune, Director of Governmental Relations is returning to the Senate.

Follow-up research on a question about the open Vice Chancellor position in Educational Services (formerly Alice Perez): The position notice is closed and interviews will be scheduled soon.

Joe Moreau shared that Interim Calbright CEO is Michael Cohen, former Finance Director under Jerry Brown. However, the appointment may not be official yet.

- C. Update on Competency Based Education from 5C – Cheryl Aschenbach, Chair of 5C, shared that in the first meeting of the year they are setting the foundation for CBE with an equity lens. Their next meeting will look at what CBE looks like in practice. The intention of the conversations is to provide flexibility for all colleges to offer CBE across the system. Ultimately, 5C will recommend updates of policies and processes in June. The CBE expert working with 5C was previously very connected with [Competency-Based Education Network](#). The minutes and readings will be shared with DEETAC.
- D. Informational – [Link to the Final Charter was provided](#)
- E. Approved January Meeting Notes ([Link to January Meeting Notes](#))
 - a. Correction of college affiliation for Deborah Nolan.
 - b. Vote: Move – none, Second – none, Yes - 10, No – 0, Abstain – Lisa Beach
- F. DEETAC re-ordered the list of 2019-2020 goals ([Link to DEETAC Goals](#))
- G. Informational – [Link to the DE Guidelines was provided](#) – Next steps will be to present changes to 5C.
- H. Process for Adoption of System-wide Educational Technology



Members heard about the Chancellor’s Office effort to establish an organizing framework for technology investments relative to student impact. DEETAC identified areas of improvement for the document as part of their “advise and consult” role.

[Link to Board of Governors Item 5.7 from January 13](#)

[Link to the Student Digital Touchpoints Graphic](#)

[Link to the Technology and Data Tool Descriptions](#)

- I. Public Comment - No members of the public were present and no comments were made.
- J. Adjourn

Upcoming Meeting Dates

Time	Date	Mode
10 a.m. to 3 p.m.	UPDATED	In-person
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	March 4, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	April 1, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044
10 a.m. to 3 p.m.	May 6, 2020	In-person
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	June 3, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	August 5, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044

Summary of DEETAC Goals

These goals are not all inclusive and DEETAC reserves the right to amend them at any time. They are in no particular order.

- Update the DE MIS data elements
- Endorse a SARA information event and revisit a letter of support
- Explore inclusion of a new MIS data element for Zero Textbook Cost degree programs
- Develop guidance for DE audit tests for the field
- Establish DEETAC as an “advise and consult” body for system wide educational technology procurement
- Collaborate with 5C to develop guidelines for competency-based education
- Recommend change for noncredit DE funding



MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, March 4, 2020

8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

[Link to Recording](#)

A. Welcome

a. Attendance:

✓	Abbrev	Designee	College
	CCCCIO	Vacant	
	CEOCCC	Tammeil Gilkerson	Laney College
	CCCCSSAA	Vacant	
✓	ASCCC	Kathy O'Connor	Santa Barbara City College
✓	ASCCC	Deborah Nolan	College of Sequoias
✓	ASCCC	Geoffrey Dyer	Taft College
✓	CCCDECO	Lisa Beach	Santa Rosa Junior College
✓	CCCDECO	Joanna Miller	Contra Costa CCD
	CCL	Susan Hines	San Jose City College
✓	CVC-OEI	Jodie Steeley	Fresno City College
✓	CAPED	Thad Selmants	Sierra College
	RP Group	Vacant	
	CISOA	Joe Moreau	College of the Canyons
	Student Senate	Vacant	
✓	CCLC	Laura Casas	Board of Trustees
✓	CCCTechConnect	Heather Schmidt	Palomar
✓	CCCCO	Erin Larson	--
✓	CCCCO	Linda Vann	

B. Standing reports from constituent groups

- ASCCC (Kathy O'Connor, Geoffrey Dyer, Deborah Nolan) – The President of ASCCC attended the Senate Hearing on Calbright, shared their perspective on issues, and expressed their support for the work of CVC-OEI. ASCCC Legislative Advocacy day is today. They are pursuing increased funding for faculty diversity and consolidated funding for ASCCC. Area meetings are on March 27 and 28. Plenary sessions with a focus on equity will be on April 16-18. Anyone can attend plenary, register at ASCCC.org.



- CAPED (Thad Selmants) – No report
- CCC TechConnect (Heather Schmidt) – Captioning funds have run out for the rest of the semester but they are seeking new sources of funding. They are referring CVC-OEI grantees directly to DECT for captioning needs instead of 3C Media. There seems to be a higher demand this year than in previous years. CCC TechConnect is considering limiting caption request by schools and are exploring different captioning options, like AI tools. They recently returned from CISOA where they presented on PlayPosit.
- CCL (Susan Hines) – Absent
- CCLC BOT (Laura Casas) – Absent
- CEOs (Tammeil Gilkerson) – Absent
- CIOs (vacant)
- CISOA (Joe Moreau) – Absent
- CSSO (vacant)
- CVC-OEI (Jodie Steeley) – CVC-OEI is awaiting master agreements from the colleges. Changes to the agreements include limitations on the hours for NetTutor, the Peer Online Course Review process and a new goal of 20% of courses be peer reviewed. The LTI sub-workgroup of the CMS workgroup found that with the past leniency in implementing LTIs, there is a need to assess for accessibility, security and privacy. They are proposing a repository of all tools to include that information and method of installation.
- DECO (Lisa Beach / Joanna Miller) –Colleges are preparing for interruption of instruction in response to COVID-19. A list of resources is posted on DECO websites. Several colleges are using Canvas and Zoom and are talking about adopting a process for all classes to be approved for hybrid instruction. OTC registration and DECO meeting is still on unless the decision is made to go virtual. DECO is looking to feature a speaker from Georgetown to talk about continuity of instruction.
- RP Group (vacant)
- Student Senate (vacant)
- CCCCCO

Educational Services (Erin Larson) – In emergency situations, colleges determine how to ensure the curriculum is maintained for students. The Chancellor’s Office can reissue the guidance for ensuring compliance with title 5 but does not determine local processes for approving curriculum.

DEETAC members indicated that colleges are seeking a blanket enabling of hybrid courses for a short term, such as a waiver or enactment of an emergency provision. Some concern was expressed about a mass approval of courses in an emergency.



Specifically, classes adapted to be taught in some other method might never return to the intended method of instruction. Added concern focused on how to get instruction to students who do not have the tools. While disrupting instruction in an emergency should not be at the expense of student credit, some districts are unable to move instruction to a virtual method are cancelling courses. DEETAC members suggested guidance from the Chancellor's Office and the ASCCC would be helpful.

DEETAC members reported that ASCCC is coordinating with 5C on emergency guidance for curriculum and will seek feedback from DEETAC.

Educational Services (Michael Quiaoit) – Conversations are happening about emergency provisions but until the State Department of Health issues a statement, the Chancellor's Office is talking about preparation.

C. Approval of February Meeting Notes ([Link to February Meeting Notes](#))

- a. Correction of Joe Moreau's college affiliation.
- b. Members indicated that there was an omitted discussion about a new CIO representative, more specifically Jerry Buckley. Upon review of the transcript and recording, no mention of a new representative took place at the February Meeting.
- c. Vote: None – return to the next meeting with corrections.

D. DEETAC was updated on the Recommended Changes to the DE Data Elements in MIS – ([Link to the proposed changes documents](#))

The Chancellors Office submitted to MIS the proposed referential changes to XF01: Session Instruction Method. They were approved and will go into effect for Spring data submission. All of the codes are still in effect but the Distance Education category is no longer attached to Passive Medium.

The Rising Scholars Program (previously known as the Currently and Formerly Incarcerated Students program) is working with 5C on establishing their own specific method of instruction code and standards.

Erin will check with 5C and the Rising Scholars program on their status.

E. DEETAC reviewed the [proposed ZTC budget language](#) to inform their exploration into the development of a new data element for ZTC. Discussions centered on gaps in the proposed legislation, lack of clarity on the meaning of “zero cost”, whether this item is beyond the scope of the committee and the potential benefits of having an identifier in MIS. The issue was tabled for future discussion.

Some main points of the discussion included:



- a. Clarity is needed in the proposed ZTC budget language: consistency in the terms “pathway” vs “degree or certificate”, specific reference to “Certificate of Achievement” as opposed to just “certificate, and the need to emphasize sustainability and open educational resources.
 - b. A definition of “zero” that included a distinction between a course using open educational resources and one that never had a textbook is needed. Likewise, excluding course fees for supplies and use of sets of textbooks available as publisher files would have to be clarified. The ASCCC OERI grant is working to Identify, improve, and in some cases create open educational resources by discipline.
 - c. This is potentially a TTAC issue and tied to the broader ZTC symbol policies.
 - d. A new MIS code would tie the data already collected for the system and potentially inform future equity and student success policies, as well as institutionalize the practice of ZTC program pathways.
- F. DEETAC intended to reviewed a Google doc for talking points for DE Guidelines ([Link to the DE Guidelines](#))([Link to draft talking points for the work group](#)) –
- Discussions turned to concerns about the delay in the Chancellor’s Office release of the DE Guidelines. The document is in Executive review with no estimated timeline for release. DEETAC members indicated they were running out of patience and expressed disappointment that their credibility as statewide leaders is in question. With catalogs finalizing, there is a missed opportunity to provide guidance to the field. Delays are impairing and impeding the progress for DE. DEETACs concerns were communicated to the Chancellor’s Office leadership.
- Vote: DEETAC Chair will send a letter to Rhonda Mohr, requesting immediate resolution on the DE Guidelines so that colleges and the field can move forward on distance education.
- Move – none, Second – none, Yes – 7, No – 0, Abstain – 0
- G. Update on Competency Based Education from 5C – No update provided
 - H. Public Comment - No members of the public were present and no comments were made.
 - I. Adjourn



Upcoming Meeting Dates

Time	Date	Mode
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	April 1, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044
10 a.m. to 3 p.m.	May 6, 2020	In-person
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	June 3, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	August 5, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044

Summary of DEETAC Goals

These goals are not all inclusive and DEETAC reserves the right to amend them at any time. They are in no particular order.

- ~~1. Update the DE MIS data elements~~
2. Explore inclusion of a new MIS data element for Zero Textbook Cost degree programs
3. Collaborate with 5C to develop guidelines for competency-based education
4. Recommend change for noncredit DE funding
5. Develop guidance for DE audit tests for the field
6. Establish DEETAC as an “advise and consult” body for system wide educational technology procurement
7. Endorse a SARA information event and revisit a letter of support



MEETING NOTES

Friday, March 13, 2020

8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

[Link to Recording](#)

A. Welcome

a. Attendance:

✓ Abbrev	Designee	College
CCCCIO	Vacant	
✓ CEOCCC	Tammeil Gilkerson	Laney College
CCCCSSAA	Vacant	
✓ ASCCC	Kathy O'Connor	Santa Barbara City College
✓ ASCCC	Deborah Nolan	College of Sequoias
✓ ASCCC	Geoffrey Dyer	Taft College
✓ CCCDECO	Lisa Beach	Santa Rosa Junior College
✓ CCCDECO	Joanna Miller	Contra Costa CCD
CCL	Susan Hines	San Jose City College
✓ CVC-OEI	Jodie Steeley	Fresno City College
✓ CAPED	Thad Selmants	Sierra College
RP Group	Vacant	
✓ CISOA	Joe Moreau	College of the Canyons
Student Senate	Vacant	
✓ CCLC	Laura Casas	Board of Trustees
✓ CCCTechConnect	Heather Schmidt	Palomar
✓ CCCCCO	Erin Larson	--
✓ CCCCCO	Michael Quiaoit	

- A. DEETAC discussed the development of a recommendation to the Chancellor’s Office in the form of guidelines for instructional continuity in event of declared emergency. They viewed and edited a shared document: [Temporary Emergency Approval for Remote Course Delivery Google Doc](#). The direction of the guidance pivoted to a statement that distinguishes temporary remote instruction from distance education. VOTE: Recommend to the Chancellor’s Office guidance on the difference between distance education and temporary emergency remote delivery.



Move: Tammeil, Second: Joe, Yes: 11, No: 0, Abstain: 0

Geoffrey, Lisa, Tammeil, Joanna, Jodie will work on the document

Highlight from the discussion:

- a. To inform the discussion, DEETAC reviewed guidance issued from ACCJC
 - i. The ACCJC is waiving review and technology requirements for distance learning and correspondence education at institutions effected by the COVID-19 Outbreak. [Link to the ACCJC Support of Member Institutions Responding to COVID-19](#)
 - ii. ACCJC document mentions that regular effective contact and the code of federal regulations. They list the details what types of contact is included. [Link to ACCJC Guidance for Interruptions of Study Related to Coronavirus \(COVID-19\)](#)
 - iii. It appears that ACCJC is still requiring regular and substantive interaction.

b. Students and faculty are experiencing confusion and fear to transitioning to distance education. Clear messages about available student and faculty supports is needed.

c. DEETAC members discussed that the continuity of instruction in an emergency is remote teaching and/or learning and distinct from distance education and online learning.

In an emergency, multiple modalities for instruction may be employed, not specifically online learning. Virtual is just replacing face-to-face interaction and must still be regular effective contact. [Link to the Department of Education Federal Student Aid Guidance \(March 5, 2020\)](#) shares other methods of instruction in emergencies.

d. Colleges have already submitted their DE Addenda Requests to the Chancellor's Office.

Thus far, the Chancellor's Office received more than 40 requests and some were approved. Submissions include comprehensive communication plans and supports for students and faculty. Some colleges are closing to train faculty and prepare transition plans while others are keeping labs open. Several courses will be hybrid but colleges are limiting access to the campus. Some colleges are not converting because they do not have the capacity.



Campuses that are uncertain about their mobilization efforts and lack capacity need guidance not administrative burden. Several questions were posed to the group to consider: What sort of resources do our institutions need right now to enhance their thoughtfulness to get them through this term and future terms? What should campus leadership be mindful of, even post-emergency? What needs to be communicated? What does the Chancellor's Office need to ask of the federal government? What flexibility and latitude can we provide to colleges and how to bring it together post-emergency? Is this group prepared to be proactive to the current crisis or future crisis? Avoid spinning and move to action.

- e. CVC-OEI has done work to assist colleges through this transition. [Link to CVC-OEI Online Instruction and Services Resources](#).

They recommend DEETAC review CVC-OEI materials to see how they are lacking. Some feedback provided to them include:

- i. Focused training might be more helpful for faculty (@ONE working on some resources)
- ii. If developing resources locally, CVC-OEI will share information
- iii. Activity classes are challenging for DE. Specific resources – research quizzes, what are we missing? Not video dependent to send files.

B. Public Comment – Some members of the public made statements during the comment period.

- a. Jory Hadsell - CVC-OEI can do will be happy to share any resources provided to them.
- b. Karen from the CVC-OEI Advisory committee – Students and faculty are expressing fear about transitioning to online instruction. We should be reassuring them.

C. Adjourn 9:30 AM



Upcoming Meeting Dates

Time	Date	Mode
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	April 1, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044
10 a.m. to 3 p.m.	May 6, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	June 3, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	August 5, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044

Summary of DEETAC Goals

These goals are not all inclusive and DEETAC reserves the right to amend them at any time. They are in no particular order.

1. Explore inclusion of a new MIS data element for Zero Textbook Cost degree programs
2. Collaborate with 5C to develop guidelines for competency-based education
3. Recommend change for noncredit DE funding
4. Develop guidance for DE audit tests for the field
5. Establish DEETAC as an “advise and consult” body for system wide educational technology procurement
6. Endorse a SARA information event and revisit a letter of support



MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, April 1, 2020

8:30 AM – 10:00 AM

[Link to Recording](#)

A. Welcome

a. Attendance:

✓	Abbrev	Designee	College
	CCCCIO	Vacant	
✓	CEOCCC	Tammeil Gilkerson	Laney College
	CCCCSSAA	Vacant	
✓	ASCCC	Kathy O'Connor	Santa Barbara City College
✓	ASCCC	Deborah Nolan	College of Sequoias
✓	ASCCC	Geoffrey Dyer	Taft College
✓	CCCDECO	Lisa Beach	Santa Rosa Junior College
✓	CCCDECO	Joanna Miller	Contra Costa CCD
✓	CCL	Susan Hines	San Jose City College
✓	CVC-OEI	Jodie Steeley	Fresno City College
✓	CAPED	Thad Selmants	Sierra College
	RP Group	Vacant	
✓	CISOA	Joe Moreau	Foothill De Anza CCD
	Student Senate	Vacant	
✓	CCLC	Laura Casas	Board of Trustees
✓	CCCTechConnect	Heather Schmidt	Palomar
✓	CCCCO	Erin Larson	--

B. Standing reports from constituent groups (including needs)

- ASCCC (Kathy O'Connor, Geoffrey Dyer, Deborah Nolan) – [Link to ASCCC faculty resources on COVID-19](#) which includes links to webinars that will be recorded and archived. The professional development links were also shared with districts. Elections will be conducted electronically.
- CAPED (Thad Selmants) – CAPED is working on legislative advocacy and will be shifting to emergency-specific priorities.
- CCC TechConnect (Heather Schmidt) – Providing zoom accounts for the entire system and are at about 500% of normal operation. DECT funds were used on backlogged



requests for captioning and are reserved for services in the classroom. Chancellor's Office is working on finding more funds. \$150,000 would get captioning through the end of the year. Live streaming will need captioning. CCCTechConnect Zoom is cloud based and some users were receiving messages that recordings can't be saved. While there was a known Zoom issue, there is still storage space left. Zoom accounts outside of CCCTechConnect experience more problems. Free basic accounts do not come with cloud storage.

Link to information about free cloud storage for faculty and staff:

<https://www.3cm mediasolutions.org/>

Link to information when signing up for a new account go to

<http://www.conferzoom.org/ConferZoom/SignUp> not zoom.us

- CCL (Susan Hines) – Absent
- CCLC BOT (Laura Casas) – Meeting on a weekly basis to get legislative and statewide updates.
- CEOs (Tammeil Gilkerson) – Thanks to colleagues, as colleges are transitioning to remote instruction. Everyone is working every day at the response to the situation including Federal relief, how to keep essential functions that cannot transition to remote instruction, different stay in place orders across counties, and nuances based on type of programs. They are engaging in systemwide advocacy for clarification, on DE addendum, grading, student refunds, categorical funding relief and flexibility. DEETAC can focus on how to plan for the future with technology tools like Proctorio including how these tools will be maintained and the wide spread need for training. Distinction is needed between remote instruction and contact hours, what that means for remote instruction. Contact hours and content, meeting the requirements for quality instruction.

DEETAC's statement drafted from the emergency meeting was not distributed. Laney College distinguishes between remote instruction and distance education. Created Remote Instruction Coaches for disciplines to assist faculty with transitioning. Training faculty to get them prepared to teach in distance education. Advocating for a level of support.

Laney's has faculty trained in the @ONE course and are training other faculty in house, therefore not using @ONE. Their basics training will be followed by the longer course of humanizing online courses. They won't get the certification that @ONE offers but it will meet their local requirements.

- CIOs (vacant)
- CISOA (Joe Moreau) – Chancellor's Office has worked to support and accommodate needs of students and colleges but CISOA is concerned with the consistent and



equitable application of rules and exceptions, like the emergency withdraw code, properly coding classes moved to remote instruction, and leaving no one out to optimize revenue. Banner, Colleague and Ellucian are working towards a standardized approach for the coding changes. Other issues that every campus is dealing with include laptop support, remote support, and internet connectivity for all.

- CSSO (vacant)
- CVC-OEI (Jodie Steeley) – CVC-OEI has ramped up tools and resources. Consortium and Advisory committees have not yet met. There is a need for additional support for @ONE’s certification courses and peer online course reviewer training. As long term issues arise from the widespread transition to distance education, more discussion and planning are needed on what is expected of colleges and how they respond. @ONE is aware of the need for more courses but they are awaiting direction from leadership on how to respond.

While some technology tools (like Proctorio, Ally and Labster) are supported through the end of the year, continued use and support is expensive for colleges, may not meet the need, and are at risk of not continuing through Fall. How tools are chosen are efficacy-based and should include faculty and administrative weigh in on their use.

- DECO (Lisa Beach / Joanna Miller) – Most urgent is need now is captioning and coordinating the effort. CCCTechConnect needs those funds now to ensure students have what they need.

ACCJC has indicated that a substantial change report is required for courses that transitioned to distance education but details and definitions are unclear. Colleges are concerned about this potential barrier. The Chancellor’s Office is working with ACCJC to eliminate duplication of reporting. The revised blanket distance education addendum memo does reference the substantive change.

Professional development needs are different at all colleges. Some needs are specific by discipline or pedagogical, not just how to use the tool. While Instructure’s helpdesk support is available, system wide relief would be beneficial

Purchasing Proctorio for the system is necessary because there is no other proctoring service.

Campuses do not have the funding to support professional development and may be opening themselves up to ADA-compliance lawsuits.

- RP Group (vacant)
- Student Senate (vacant)

CCCCO (Erin) – Labster contract is signed and will be rolled out this week. Official communications from the Chancellor’s Office are available on the website through the links on the COVID-19 banner. Dr. Aisha Lowe is the new Vice Chancellor in Educational



Services and Support over Academic Affairs. David O'Brien is the new Vice Chancellor of Governmental Relations.

C. DEETAC members discussed recommendations for system-wide advocacy.

The Chancellor's Office should make a distinction between emergency remote delivery and distance education. More specifically, the term "blanket DE addendum" should be replaced with "blanket emergency remote delivery". More time should be given to remote instruction to ramp up to the DE. Thoughtful development of DE does not happen overnight. Curriculum committees and faculty cannot meet or train over the summer.

Motion: We want to reassert our recommendation to the Chancellor's Office that in its communications, including those about DE addenda, we want to switch to "emergency permission for remote delivery of instruction".

Move - Tammieil, **Second** - Kathy, **Yes** - 8, **No** - 1, **Abstain** - 0

While there is no official appointment from the Student Senate on DEETAC, public comment was made from Student Senate representatives that support recommendation of additional clarity from the Chancellor's Office on the distinction.

Other recommendations:

- Release the DE Guidelines
- Provide greater guidance on what is required of colleges
- More communication about a central repository for professional development resources
- DEETAC can serve as the subgroup to advise on critical resources for distance education to benefit the system and ensure equity and the vision for success
- Chancellor's Office should do a full webinar on the blanket DE addenda and/or emergency remote instruction.

Action Item: Joanna will draft the recommendations and send to DEETAC members for feedback before forwarding them to Marty.

D. Discussion on emergency guidance for accessibility was cut short.

The federal requirements are the requirements that must be followed. Campuses are struggling with accessibility and resources for training faculty.

E. Public Comment – Michelle Pacansky-Brock – With 62,000 faculty members, professional development can be a grassroots effort. In making recommendations for professional development, DEETAC can advocate for connecting faculty to other



faculty who are already doing the work. There are many webinars available but centralized links and a means to spread the word would reach more faculty.

F. Adjourn – 10:06AM

Upcoming Meeting Dates

Time	Date	Mode
10 a.m. to 12 p.m.	May 6, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	June 3, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	August 5, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044

Summary of DEETAC Goals

These goals are not all inclusive and DEETAC reserves the right to amend them at any time. They are in no particular order.

1. Explore inclusion of a new MIS data element for Zero Textbook Cost degree programs
2. Collaborate with 5C to develop guidelines for competency-based education
3. Recommend change for noncredit DE funding
4. Develop guidance for DE audit tests for the field
5. Establish DEETAC as an “advise and consult” body for system wide educational technology procurement
6. Endorse a SARA information event and revisit a letter of support



MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, May 6, 2020

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

[Link to Recording](#)

A. Welcome

a. Attendance:

✓	Abbrev	Designee	College
	CCCCIO	Vacant	
✓	CEOCCC	Tammeil Gilkerson	Laney College
	CCCCSSAA	Vacant	
✓	ASCCC	Kathy O'Connor	Santa Barbara City College
✓	ASCCC	Deborah Nolan	College of Sequoias
✓	ASCCC	Geoffrey Dyer	Taft College
✓	CCCDECO	Lisa Beach	Santa Rosa Junior College
✓	CCCDECO	Joanna Miller	Contra Costa CCD
	CCL	Susan Hines	San Jose City College
✓	CVC-OEI	Jodie Steeley	Fresno City College
✓	CAPED	Thad Selmants	Sierra College
	RP Group	Vacant	
✓	CISOA	Joe Moreau	Foothill De Anza CCD
	Student Senate	Vacant	
✓	CCLC	Laura Casas	Board of Trustees
✓	CCCTechConnect	Heather Schmidt	Palomar
✓	CCCCO	Erin Larson	--

B. Standing reports from constituent groups (including needs)

- ASCCC (Kathy O'Connor, Geoffrey Dyer, Deborah Nolan) –
 - Holding webinars and small group discussions since the shelter in place order. [Link to ASCCC's professional development series.](#)
 - Wednesday, May 13, 9AM – Small group discussion on DE planning and approvals for Fall 2020 and beyond.
 - ASCCC Executive Committee meeting is Friday
 - Faculty Leadership Institute is shifted to virtual formats



- CAPED (Thad Selmants) – Hosting webinars for their groups to ease transition to online learning. Eager to get an update on the DE Guidelines. Many districts are going online in Fall. CAPED are ahead of other branches in their efforts to transition.
- CCC TechConnect (Heather Schmidt) – OTC is going virtual. The many changes Zoom was making were not compatible with Canvas unless the settings were reconfigures. Zoom will be communicating more with TechConnect when changes are implemented so the message will carry forward to colleges.
- CCL (Susan Hines) – Absent
- CCLC BOT (Laura Casas) – Holding weekly webinars in response to the COVID crisis. There is a new CCCT president, Adrienne Grey from West Valley-Mission CCD. State budget will pass by the Constitutional date but it will have an August-revise.
- CEOs (Tammeil Gilkerson) – Holding weekly meetings to discuss current issues. Some concern regarding the recent request for a DE Addendum for Fall and Summer. The instructions are causing coding difficulties on the back end and confusion for schedulers.
- CIOs (vacant)
- CISOA (Joe Moreau) – Considering whether or not they will hold another in-person conference next February. Working with TTAC on surveying districts about their current ERP system (student, HR, Finance, etc.) to gather data about systemwide cost. Ultimately they are looking at a common ERP. Responses are expected by the end of May. The survey was sent to the CTO's listserv.
- CSSO (vacant) –
- CVC-OEI (Jodie Steele) – Automated cross-enrollment is still a priority and are expecting progress by the end of June.

The CCMS group – In conjunction with the CCC Foundation, an archive of technology tools was developed and includes details like how long tools are funded, the VPAT, security, and equipment specs. This information is designed to assist districts and colleges on making technology investment decisions including accessibility, privacy, security, etc. [Links to the tools and contracts through the CCC Foundation.](#)

The CCMS group reviewed Pope Tech, an accessibility checker that works in conjunction with Canvas. Ally is for student remediation of documents, while Pope Tech is for instructor remediation and awareness. [Link to Pope Tech.](#)

CVC-OEI is working with ASCCC on disciplines with challenges converting instruction. May 15 there will hold its first joint Consortium and Advisory committee meeting.



- DECO (Lisa Beach / Joanna Miller) – Moving to a virtual retreat (instead of the in-person meeting at OTC). Revising fee structures for membership. Joanna and Lisa are working with LeBaron on Q & A from the DE Addendum webinar.
 - RP Group (vacant)
 - Student Senate (vacant)
 - CCCCCO (Erin) – The Chancellor’s State of the System address will be at the May 18 BOG Meeting.
- C. 10:20 – 10:30 Approval of Meeting Notes:
- February 5 ([Link to February Meeting Notes](#)) – No action
- March 4, ([Link to March 4 Meeting Notes](#))
- Move: Jodie, Second: Lisa, Yes: 8, No: 0, Abstain: Tammeil
- March 13 – Urgent Meeting ([Link to March 13 Urgent Meeting Notes](#))
- Move: Kathy, Second: Jodie, Yes: 7, No: 0, Abstain: 0
- April 1 Meeting Notes ([Link to April 1 Meeting Notes](#)) - Bring back for next month
- D. Update on Correspondence Data Element
- The data element cannot be added until the title 5 changes are approved. First review was completed in May. The goal is to advance to Consultation in June for BOG first read in July.
- E. Update on Competency Based Education from 5C
- Delays from COVID-related interruption has slowed progress but they are speeding up their timeline. 5C met April 22 and made progress in regulatory development. The workgroup is identifying the need, distinguishing CBE from traditional instruction, and establishing definitions and approval processes. While the group is in phase one of three phases, ancillary conversations about apportionment and load are occurring. Expect full set of terms and definitions at the June 5C meeting.
- Members of the work group include two from the Success Center, a CIO, faculty, classified professionals, and other members from 5C. Calbright does not have a seat on 5C so they are not currently involved. 5C’s focus is on credit not noncredit. CVC-OEI will be engaged regarding the technology piece. There will be CBE webinar series:
- May 14 – What is CBE and how different from what we do now
- May 21 – What is 5C working building for the system
- Early June – more specifics around a pilot.
- There may be opportunities to connect with CVC-OEI’s Improving Online CTE projects.



In response to a question in the chat, there is no decision yet on COCI.

F. Developing guidelines for transitioning to online education

While DEETAC developed “remote delivery” recommendation following the March 13 urgent meeting, the Chancellor’s Office did not release the statement. Instead, the Chancellor’s Office continues to share that there are only two types of instruction: distance education and correspondence. Remote instruction is not a method of instruction. Summer and Fall courses that are offered via distance education will need to have a DE addendum either in a blanket or through local separate course approval processes.

There is still value in recognizing that during an emergency the type of instruction that will be offered may not meet the title 5 requirements for distance education. For Summer and Fall, colleges are still operating in an emergency capacity. There is confusion and concern among faculty and curriculum committees with meeting requirements. In response, some colleges are pushing through all DE addenda for all scheduled courses. Alternatively, for difficult to convert courses or those that do not want to be offered online forever, DE addenda say they are for emergency circumstances only. Regulators gave community colleges a pass for Spring but not for Summer and Fall. To meet the requirements to transition to online, cash-strapped colleges are having to pay faculty to work on addenda.

Coding confusion also persists. SISs do not allow alternative coding.

DEETAC has maintained that the quality of courses is important and that courses that do not meet the quality should not be approved permanently.

Colleges are concerned with the funding differences between face-to-face and online, as well as DE and noncredit DE. There is conflicting information coming from the Chancellor’s Office regarding attendance accounting and DE. Guidance for informing students on synchronous and asynchronous instruction is needed to address potential time and connectivity issues.

G. Revised DE Guidelines with comments from CO ([Link to the Draft DE Guidelines with Marty’s Comments](#))

Communications between Joanna and Executive Vice Chancellor Marty Alvarado clarified that the Draft DE Guidelines must be reviewed in full, not just for formatting. Marty conducted a brief review of a few sections and provided some feedback. Of concern are some sections under accessibility, definitions and the potential for the recommendations to appear as requirements.



Historically, the guidelines were viewed as recommendations. While some interpretations of the title “Guidelines” implies “not required”, [title 5, section 55204\(b\)](#) indicates that courses provided through distance education are conducted consistent with the guidelines that are released by the Chancellor’s Office. Clear distinction between what is required and what is recommended or suggested is a needed.

DEETAC reviewed comments and agreed that the three-tiered definition should remain intact. As a reference guide, the recommendations could be pulled out and highlighted either in its own section or in a text box.

DEETAC agreed that they would like to invite Marty to the next meeting.

DEETAC formed a workgroup to address Marty’s comments: Tammeil, Jodie, Lisa, Joanna, Geoffrey and Thad.

- H. Not addressed during this meeting -- What issues are DEETAC’s purview related to DEETAC’s goal to serve as an “advise and consult” body for system-wide educational technology procurement?
- I. No Public Comments were made.
- J. Adjourned 12:00 PM

Upcoming Meeting Dates

Time	Date	Mode
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	June 3, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044
8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.	August 5, 2020	https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/691652044

Summary of DEETAC Goals

These goals are not all inclusive and DEETAC reserves the right to amend them at any time. They are in no particular order.

1. Explore inclusion of a new MIS data element for Zero Textbook Cost degree programs
2. Collaborate with 5C to develop guidelines for competency-based education
3. Recommend change for noncredit DE funding
4. Develop guidance for DE audit tests for the field
5. Establish DEETAC as an “advise and consult” body for system wide educational technology procurement
6. Endorse a SARA information event and revisit a letter of support

Latinx Student Success and COVID-19 Virtual Town Hall

Submitted by Michelle Bean and Mayra Cruz in collaboration with Colegas and other partners

Date: May 7, 2020

Registered: 1,098

Logged in: 780

Recording: [Click Here](#)



Latinx Student Success & COVID-19 Virtual Town Hall

tinyurl.com/ycxlmcvu

Educational leaders from across California will address the needs of Latinx students in this pandemic period from an instructional and services perspective.

**Thursday
May 7
2:30-4 p.m.**

Presenters

 Chancellor Eloy Ortiz Oakley	 Deputy Chancellor Dr. Daisy Gonzales	Dr. Cynthia Olivo COLEGAS & CSSO Organization	Dr. Mark Sanchez Vice President, Student Services of Cuesta College
		Dr. Angélica García President of Berkeley City College	Michelo Siqueiros President of Campaign for College Opportunity
		Dr. Martha García Superintendent-President of Imperial Valley College	Dr. Michaela Mares Tamayo Student Equity Director of Pasadena City College
		Dr. Mike Muñoz Vice President, Student Services of Long Beach City College	

Artwork courtesy of Simon Siles

COLEGAS | CLP Center for Latinx Project | Academic Services for California Community Colleges | College Opportunity | PASADENA CITY COLLEGE



**C-ID Advisory Committee Minutes Draft
October 8, 2019
Embassy Suites – Sacramento Riverfront Promenade
Schoolhouse Room
100 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814
10:00 am – 3:00 pm**

In Attendance:

Cheryl Aschenbach, C-ID Advisory Chair, ASCCC
Sam Foster, South Representative, ASCCC
Lynn Fowler, Articulation Officer, American River College
Roger Gerard, Culinary Arts Faculty, Shasta College
Njeri Griffin, Project Monitor, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Tracy Hamilton, Associate Professor of Natural Sciences & Math, CSU Sacramento
Krystinne Mica, Executive Director, ASCCC
Kevin Olson, Specialist, Academic Planning & Development, CCCCCO
Carolyn Reisner, Articulation Officer, Folsom Lake College
Craig Rutan, Data Specialist, ASCCC
Erik Shearer, Professor of Art, Napa Valley College
Karen Simpson-Alisca, Assistant Director for Undergraduate Transfer Programs & Policy, CCCCCO
Mark Van Selst, Professor of Cognitive Psychology, CSU San Jose
Eric Wada, Incoming C-ID Curriculum Director, ASCCC

Via Telephone:

Amanda Paskey, C-ID Curriculum Director, ASCCC
Michelle Pilati, C-ID Special Projects Director, ASCCC
Nancy Purcille, Transfer Articulation Coordinator, UCOP

Staff:

Miguel Rother, Director of Grants and Initiatives, ASCCC
Megan Trader, C-ID Program Coordinator, ASCCC

Guests in Attendance:

Vivian Lee Martinez, Student Assistant, CCCCCO
Lynn Shaw, C-ID CTE Curriculum Director, ASCCC
Dolores Davison, Vice President, ASCCC

I. Introductions and Announcements

Chair Aschenbach welcomed committee members and introductions were made around the room.

II. Approval of the Agenda

Pilati requested moving the topic “C-ID and OER” to item VII. By consensus, the agenda was approved with the recommended changes.

III. Approval of May 9, 2019 Meeting Minutes

The May 9, 2019 minutes were approved by consensus.

IV. Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) Version Process

Simpson-Alisca stated that there is concern regarding upcoming changes to TMCs that are considered substantive. The CSU Chancellor’s Office is unsure how to communicate to colleges that there are changes to a TMC, and is recommending creating a versioning process that will clearly indicate that the TMCs differ. This will be particularly important in instances where a college deemed one of the TMCs similar and not the other. The group discussed how a versioning process would need to be implemented and provided several suggestions such as changing the title of the TMC. A question was raised in relation to catalog rights for students completing an Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT). It was stated that under SB 1440 students are guaranteed admission into the CSU system, but they are not guaranteed admission to a specific CSU campus.

Chair Aschenbach suggested bringing this topic to the California Community College Curriculum Committee (5C) and the Chancellor’s Office (CO), as well as to the Academic Senate for California State University and the Academic Senate for the University of California to see if something may work for both system offices before bringing the findings back to the next C-ID Advisory meeting.

It was stated that the C-ID Advisory Committee is not empowered to make a recommendation regarding the TMCs and ADTs and enforce it, with the exception of C-ID course approval. Such recommendations would be the purview of the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW). ICW Chair Davison stated that the topic can be brought back to ICW for further discussion.

V. C-ID Website Request

Reisner discussed several issues with the C-ID website that are problematic for colleges, including the lack of automated notifications to Articulation Officers and C-ID Course Reviewers. Reisner asked whether the web developers have given Rother any update on the progress of fixing the functions. Rother stated that

these fixes were requested in 2017 and have been in development since. Rother added that the web developers have a version of the website fix in testing but it is still not ready to be shared and needs more testing.

Mica suggested that if the C-ID Advisory Group submits these priorities to the CCC Technology Center (CCCTC), they may be more likely to adhere to the list of priorities submitted rather than if Mica and Rother submitted a list to the CCCTC instead. Rother added that users would like to get the following areas of the site fixed:

- Articulation Officer (AO) Notifications
- C-ID Decision Date for AOs
- Resubmissions
- Primary Reviewer Queue
- Reporting Functions

Mica added that the Chancellor's Office is working this year to ensure the CCCTC meets the work plan objectives. By including the priorities in the work plan, the CCCTC will be required to fulfill the priorities. If the priorities are unfulfilled a year from submitting the work plan, the C-ID Advisory Committee can bring the work plan list of priorities to the Chancellor's Office to pursue the next steps.

Motion to submit the C-ID Advisory Committee's list of website priorities to the CCCTC (Reisner, Fowler) MSC.

VI. C-ID Review Process

Reisner stated that some parts of the C-ID review process are slower than others. Reisner asked what will happen to courses that receive a determination of "Conditionally Approved" or "Not Approved" if those courses were submitted to C-ID for more than 45 days and included an ADT submission. It was stated that colleges currently have up to 18 months to update their Course Outline of Record (COR) and resubmit their course to C-ID when it receives a determination of "Conditional Approval".

Rother provided an update on eight disciplines that currently have no CSU faculty reviewers appointed, and informed the group of the number of courses in the system awaiting review as a result. A question was asked whether the technological limitations of the new website could be contributing to the backlog of reviews in the system and it was stated that the backlog is only present in disciplines without adequate reviewers appointed.

Simpson-Alisca noted that the CSU does not receive funding for C-ID work, and that resources for CSU faculty recruitment are limited. However, the CSU is beginning to make progress but will need more time to see favorable results. Additionally, in the next budget cycle the CSU office may reinstate the position of

faculty consultant, formerly held by Barbara Swerkes, to help make headway on recruiting CSU reviewers.

The group provided several suggestions to help alleviate the backlog of courses awaiting review, including:

- allowing for 3 CCC faculty to complete the review process in the absence of CSU faculty
- asking that the Academic Senate for California State Universities (ASCSU) revisit the qualifications for CSU reviewers
- reaching out and having in person meetings with CSU faculty from campuses that have greater course to course articulations with CCCs
- arranging reviews at regional conferences that CSU faculty are present for the disciplines

In addition, it was suggested to hold a “roadshow” at various CSU campuses, where CSU faculty can convene and review the backlog of courses in the system for their discipline. The group discussed how this would work logistically and agreed that this is worth exploring more.

Motion to explore holding meetings at CSU campuses to convene faculty and complete reviews in disciplines with a backlog (Simpson-Alisca, Van Selst) MSC.

VII. C-ID and OER

Pilati discussed work being done by the ASCCC Open Educational Resources Initiative (OERI). When developing OER for courses without a C-ID descriptor, it would be beneficial to have an available descriptor to use as a resource. The group discussed the possibility of developing a different type of descriptor that can be used in these instances as a resource only, and would not undergo the C-ID submission and review process. A concern was expressed that C-ID may start to become something not intended by the legislation that created it, resulting in unnecessary confusion. A suggestion was made to include an OER designation on C-ID descriptors, and it was clarified that this would pertain to courses that do not currently have a C-ID descriptor.

VIII. C-ID Resubmission Timelines

Reisner discussed the current 45-day submission process in relation to the CCCCO memo AA 19-33, which outlines a process for reviewing ADT degrees. Reisner is concerned that degrees could potentially be deactivated in the Chancellor’s Office Curriculum Inventory (COCI) if they are reviewed and one of the courses on the degree received a determination of conditionally approved or not-approved after 45-days. It was stated that the intent of the memo is to ensure that colleges are compliant, but it is unlikely a degree would be deactivated if the college were to work with the CCCCO to correct the issue and resubmit the course for C-ID review.

Fowler discussed instances where the CCCCCO ADT Template differs from that of the TMC, and expressed concern that issues could arise during ADT reviews due to this. Several examples were given where the intention of the TMC was not clear in the CCCCCO Template, and a suggestion was made to develop a list of TMC/Template discrepancies to be forwarded to 5C for discussion.

IX. CSU Catalog Rights

This item was discussed during agenda item IV, TMC Version Process.

X. Model Curriculum

Simpson-Alisca introduced the topic of offering guarantees similar to that of ADTs for Intersegmental Model Curriculum (ISMC). The CSU Board of Trustees recently discussed supporting these in specific disciplines that cannot meet the 60/60-unit limitations of SB 1440, such as Engineering, and Integrated Teacher Education Programs (ITEP). A suggestion was made to request that ICW should discuss identifying disciplines that need more than 60 units in lower-division requirements for students to achieve the level of proficiency required for their degree.

Follow up: Simpson-Alisca will request this topic as an agenda item at the next ICW meeting.

XI. UC Transfer Pathways/ ADT Alignment

Chair Aschenbach discussed the recent Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) meeting, where the ASCCC was directed to bring faculty groups together to look at the seven disciplines with ADTs that align well with UC Transfer Pathways to see if faculty agrees with merging the two pathways together to complete alignment. Simpson-Alisca commented that if adjustments to the ADTs are required, that would mean another degree has been created and there are going to be catalog rights to consider. Fowler suggested reviewing the original language in SB 1440 to decide if clarifying legislation is needed to address the issue of disciplines that may need more than 60 lower division units to prepare students for upper division course work. Simpson-Alisca suggested supporting the creation of a piece of legislation that might loosen the requirements of the 60/60-unit cap.

The group agreed to table this item while work is done to explore alignment in the seven disciplines.

XII. Adjournment

Respectfully Submitted by Megan Trader, C-ID Program Coordinator, ASCCC



Guided Pathways Task Force Meeting

Minutes

Friday, February 28, 2020

10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Residence Inn Sacramento Capitol Park

In Attendance

- Jessica Ayo Alabi, Lead, Orange Coast College
- Julie Bruno, Lead, ASCCC Past-President, Sierra College
- Mayra Cruz, Area B Representative
- Janet Fulks, Lead, Bakersfield College (retired)
- Jeffrey Hernandez, Lead, East Los Angeles College
- Virginia May, Chair, ASCCC Treasurer
- Meridith Selden, Lead, Yuba College
- Ty Simpson, Lead, San Bernardino Valley College
- Eric Thompson, Lead, Santa Rosa Junior College
- Eric Wada, C-ID Co-Curriculum Director
- Jan Young, Member, Glendale College

ASCCC Staff

- Krystinne Mica, Executive Director
- Miguel Rother, Director of Grants and Initiatives

Action	Item
Action	I. Consent Calendar – 5 minutes Approval of January 30, 2020 meeting minutes Evaluating Student-Centered Scheduling is a future agenda item.
Discussion	II. Check In – 5 minutes Chair’s report: GPTF is doing great work. Rostrum articles due 6 March. CC Ginni on agenda items. Make travel requests as early as possible. <i>More time will be allotted on the agenda for “check-in” and “announcements”.</i>
Discussion	III. Previous Action Item Progress – 30 minutes

- a. Noncredit Instruction in Guided Pathways Efforts – Resolution S18 17.01
Addressed via two breakouts at Career and Noncredit Institute and a Rostrum article. Also submitting breakout proposals for the Curriculum Institute.
- b. Assessing Student Equity and Achievement Program to Guided Pathways Implementation – Resolution F19 3.01
Potentially addressed along with Resolution S19 5.02. Workgroup to address local and statewide allocation of SEAP and GP funds. How are decisions made about fund allocation? Where/when are reports published? How are faculty involved in equity-focused conversations? These discussions will continue early in the fall at GP workshops, and [planning will occur at the next GPTF meeting, April 3.](#)
- c. Guided Pathways Budget Development – Resolution S19 5.02
Breakout at Spring Plenary and Rostrum article. More information needed about when budget allocations occur. Concerns raised about ongoing GP funding.
- d. Equity Assessment Tool collaboration with EDAC
Related to AB 705 discussion below. Meridith, Jessica, Ginni, and Ty are on this group.

Discussion **IV. Committee Priorities – Resolutions (May) – 10 minutes**
[F19 9.09](#) Ensuring Access and Opportunity for Success for all Students Through AB705 (Irwin, 2017) Implementation

- Assigned to GPTF, Curriculum Committee, and Noncredit Committee. Rostrum article forthcoming. Ginni May had an article published in the Winter 2019 Board Focus. Work in this area will continue at ASCCC events.

Discussion **V. Canvas vs. ASCCC GP Tool Publishing (May) – 30 minutes**
 GP Resources page with a link to Canvas with a summary of the Canvas contents. GPTF page contains minutes, agendas, Rostrum articles. Ensure that we have identified faculty GP liaisons, that communication with liaisons is occurring, and clarify the role of a liaison to make them an effective part of the local academic senate. There was support to make one page that had links to all resources and other pages.

Discussion **VI. Evaluating AB 705 Implementation (May) – 60 minutes**

- Data and Timelines
- AB 705 Compliance (Simpson)

Continue at the forefront of conversations around data collection and analysis to evaluate AB 705. GPTF will do a research project, and share results with the field. Transparency and minimization of bias are musts.

- Discussion** **VII. Guided Pathways Workshops Update (All) – 45 minutes**
Fresno (13 Mar): Janet, Jessica, Julie, Ginni, Jeffrey, Ty, Nate?
Santiago Canyon (20 Mar): Janet, Jessica, Ginni, Jeffrey, Ty, Eric W.
Merritt (24 Apr): Janet, Jessica, Ginni, Ty, Eric T., Jan, Luke, Krystinne, Nate?, Mayra?

Counseling power point will be completed within the next week by Ty, Luke and Julie. They are meeting Monday March 2. Jessica reviewed some of the slides for the qualitative research breakout and requested input on the activity that she wants to use. The slides were discussed, and Jessica will morph into a one-hour presentation but save ad expand content for other venues.
Jeffrey, Julie and Ginni are ready to go with the GP Liaison portion.
Janet and Ginni are ready to go with the quantitative data portion.

- Discussion** **VIII. ~~Evaluating Student-Centered Scheduling~~ – 45 minutes – removed from agenda**

- Discussion/ Action** **IX. Collegial Consultation in Guided Pathways Evaluation Survey (Hernandez) – 45 minutes**
Discussion about the current survey was in depth. There was a discussion of the values that should be surveyed. Ideas involved to whom does the survey get sent, how do you deal with parallel pathways and with non faculty input. Who is the audience? How will it be used?
Clarify the research question.
The format of the survey is be re-developed.
Finalized – short survey, ranking and committee selects items and the Meredith model of two sliding scales. Further work will be emailed.

Dismissed at 3:04

List of Agenda Enclosures

Enclosure 1: January 30, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Enclosure 2: [S18 17.01 Noncredit Instruction in Guided Pathways Efforts](#)

Enclosure 3: [F19 3.01 Assessing Student Equity and Achievement Program Contribution to Guided Pathways Implementation](#)

Enclosure 4: [S19 5.02 Guided Pathways Budget Development](#)

Enclosure 5: [F19 9.09 Ensuring Access and Opportunity for Success for all Students Through AB705 \(Irwin, 2017\) Implementation](#)

Enclosure 6: Draft Survey to Evaluate Collegial Consultation in Guided Pathways



Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW)

February 3, 2020

CCC Chancellor's Office

Rooms 638 A & 639 B

1102 Q Street, Sacramento, CA 95811

In Attendance:

Raul Arambula, Dean Intersegmental Support, CCCCCO
David Barsky, Mathematics Faculty, CSU San Marcos
Dolores Davison, Vice President, ASCCC
Lynn Fowler, Articulation Officer, American River College
Njeri Griffin, C-ID Project Monitor, CCCCCO
Mary Legner, Mathematics Faculty, Riverside City College
Virginia "Ginni" May, Treasurer, ASCCC
Krystinne Mica, Executive Director, ASCCC
Amanda Paskey, C-ID Curriculum Director, ASCCC
Michelle Pilati, C-ID Special Projects Director, ASCCC
Erik Shearer, Projects Director, ASCCC
Karen Simpson-Alisca, Assistant Director, CSU Office of the Chancellor
Eric Wada, Incoming C-ID Curriculum Director, ASCCC

Via Zoom:

Michelle Bean, Area C Representative, ASCCC
Julie Glass, Mathematics Faculty, CSU East Bay
Michael Jenkins, Engineering Faculty, CSU Fresno
Catherine Nelson, Senate President, ASCSU

Staff:

Miguel Rother, Director of Grants and Initiatives, ASCCC
Megan Trader, C-ID Program Coordinator, ASCCC

I. Introductions and Announcements

Chair Davison welcomed committee members and introductions were made.

II. Approval of the Agenda

By consensus, the agenda was approved as presented.

III. Approval of March 19, 2019, Meeting Minutes

The March 19, 2019, minutes were approved by consensus.

IV. UC Transfer Pathways & TMC

Chair Davison began the discussion by summarizing the conversations that have transpired around UC Transfer Pathways (UCTP) and Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC). The ASCCC has been engaged in efforts to align UCTP with C-ID TMC at the direction of the delegates from the academic senates represented at the Fall 2017 plenary session who passed resolution [15.01](#), Aligning Transfer Pathways for the California State University and University of California Systems. As a result, the ASCCC and C-ID recently reviewed existing UCTP and identified seven disciplines that align or nearly align with the C-ID TMC. The seven (7) disciplines are Anthropology, Business Administration, Economics, History, Mathematics, Philosophy, and Sociology. Draft TMC templates were recently developed and feedback is being sought by the field. One webinar was recently held to solicit feedback from faculty in the seven disciplines and another is scheduled for February 4, 2020.

A. IGETC

The group discussed how IGETC would be used in the templates in relation to IGETC for STEM or IGETC for CSU transfer, and that by allowing more than 60 units of lower division preparation in certain STEM disciplines, it would ensure that students are better-prepared for upper division course work. This is problematic, however, due to the 60-unit cap for CSUs set by SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010). A second possible issue is whether the extra units would be accepted toward the students' major at UC, and whether it will be made clear to students that they may be earning more units than necessary to transfer to a CSU. A question was raised whether CCCs will be able to offer all courses necessary to obtain a degree and also meet UC requirements, with the concern that students will be taking courses that may be inappropriate substitutions. It was stated that some CCCs may need to create courses in order to offer the degree locally.

B. Policy & Procedure

Chair Davison discussed that C-ID policy and procedure are being followed for the proposed templates and that statewide vetting for the proposal will occur in the near future. Additionally, feedback is being received through webinars and the C-ID appointed Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) members for each discipline. Once further work is completed for the seven disciplines, opportunities to align the other UCTP with TMC will be explored.

V. Revisions to Business Admin TMC

The Business Administration FDRG is proposing substantive changes to the TMC for their discipline. Since the revisions are considered substantive, the revised TMC must be approved by a subset of ICW, the Intersegmental Curriculum Faculty Workgroup (ICFW). The role and responsibility of ICFW was

explained to the group, and it was stated that arrangements will be made for the group to meet and discuss Business Administration TMC revisions as soon as possible.

The group discussed various ways colleges could differentiate between the previous degree and the new transfer degree in the catalog. Suggestions included placing a parenthetical note in the catalog for CSUs, giving the revised TMC a different name, adding numerical values to signify which version of the TMC is being used, and looking through policies and processes regarding revised TMCs before changing the name of a degree. A suggestion was made that it could be helpful to have a process document that answers questions regarding determination of similar and catalog rights.

Follow up: A doodle poll will be set up for ICFW to review the proposed changes to the Business Administration TMC.

VI. C-ID and CSU Articulation Process

Shearer shared concerns raised during a recent Articulation Officer (AO) Subgroup meeting in relation to how C-ID approval dates are displayed on the C-ID website. The C-ID website posts the Course Outline of Record (COR) effective term on the website, and there was confusion that the date displayed was the date a C-ID faculty reviewer reviewed and approved the COR. This could be problematic for some CSUs that use C-ID designation to grant course to course articulation on the basis of C-ID designation. It was stated that C-ID is a review process for courses within an ADT and was not intended to be used for course to course articulation purposes. The field has expressed concerns that CSU AOs have not been looking for C-ID articulation, but looking at course to course articulation instead. Simpson-Alisca confirmed that this should not be happening for students transferring with an ADT, and it would be helpful if the CSU Chancellor's Office (CSUCO) receives a notification regarding the incident when it happens, so that the CSUCO can reach out to the college.

VII. ETE Revisions to Descriptors

In 2015, the California Commission on Teacher Credential (CTC) revised the Elementary Teacher Education Multiple Subject program standards. As a result of those changes, the CSU segment requested that C-ID review the Elementary Teacher Education (ETE) TMC and certain descriptors within it. The FDRGs have agreed to include suggested revisions, but some of the FDRGs don't have full CSU membership and cannot complete the process. During the spring semester of 2019, the C-ID Advisory Committee included a section in their descriptor review policy that would allow the committee to take action on behalf of the FDRG in situations such as this that could negatively impact students. Other instances that this is being found is the C-ID 5-Year Review process where FDRGs are unable to finalize revisions that reflect changes in the field. The group discussed potentially taking similar action and adopting policy language that would allow disciplines to move forward in these sort of extraordinary

circumstances. A suggestion was made to review C-ID policy and procedure to see if changes can be made to allow exceptions for finalizing revisions to TMC and descriptors when necessary.

The group again discussed the disciplines on hold due to lack of course reviewers, specifically CSU reviewers. Mica asked the group to consider voting on a motion to allow FDRGs and discipline faculty to move forward in the C-ID process for approving updated TMCs and descriptor changes, and suggested eliminating the 5-Year policy of reviewing or changing the process so that work does not stop due to lack of participating faculty.

The group agreed to convene a smaller workgroup to review C-ID policy and bring recommendations to ICW at the April 20, 2020 meeting. Volunteers for the group are:

Dolores Davison
David Barsky
Julie Glass
Ginni May
Michelle Pilati
Mark Van Selst
Eric Wada
Krystinne Mica

Follow up: A doodle poll will be sent to arrange an in-person meeting to review C-ID policy and develop recommendations.

VIII. 5-Year Reviews

A. Nutrition

The 5 Year Review documents for Nutrition were presented, and the group was informed that the FDRG did not propose any changes to the descriptors or TMC.

B. Economics

The Economics 5 Year Review documents were presented, and the group was informed that changes were made to add clarification to the TMC and descriptors.

IX. Future Agenda Items

- Potential revisions to policies and processes

X. Adjournment