



## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Residence Inn Sacramento Downtown at Capitol Park  
1121 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 267-6806

### Friday, February 28, 2014 meeting

10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon

12:00 to 12:30 p.m. Lunch

12:30 p.m. to 5:00 pm meeting continued

*The meeting is accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification in order to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting Tonya Davis at (916) 445-4753 or by sending a written request to Ms. Davis at the Executive Committee's address 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 525, Sacramento, CA 95816 or [tonya@asccc.org](mailto:tonya@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 testimony will be invited in conjunction with the Executive Committee discussion on each item. A written request to address the Executive Committee shall be made on the form provided at the meeting. Materials for this meeting are found on the Senate website at: [http://www.asccc.org/executive\\_committee/meetings](http://www.asccc.org/executive_committee/meetings). Please note that the Executive Committee meetings are taped and kept for 30 days for the purposes of accurate note taking only.*

*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.*

## I. ORDER OF BUSINESS

### A. Roll Call

### B. Approval of 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. Calendar

### E. Action Tracking List

### F. Dinner Arrangements

## II. CONSENT CALENDAR

## III. OLD BUSINESS (Possible Action)

### A. Spring Session Planning – 25 mins., B. Smith

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

### B. Credit by Exam Paper – 30 mins., Kawaguchi

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the draft Credit by Exam paper to forward to the Spring Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

### C. Multiple Measures Paper – 30 mins., Grimes-Hillman

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the draft Multiple Measures Paper to forward to the Spring Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

### D. Discipline List Handbook – 20 mins., Grimes-Hillman

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the proposed Discipline List Handbook to forward to the Spring Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

### E. IPC Recommendations – 30 mins., Bruno

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the Internal Policy Committee recommendations to revise the Executive Committee and ASCCC policies.

### F. Operational Oversight Committee – 25 mins., Bruno

The Executive Committee will review the Operational Oversight Committee's recommendations on the Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate.

**G. Governor's Budget Proposal – 30 mins., B. Smith**

The Executive Committee will discuss elements of the proposed budget to shape a response and subsequent changes in the next months.

**H. Senate Grants – 25 mins., B. Smith**

The Executive Committee will discuss ways to 1) improve communication between grant projects and the Executive Committee, 2) establish criteria (if necessary) to determine when the Senate should pursue a grant, and 3) how to ensure that the policies of the Senate are used in completing the work of grants.

**I. Part-time Paper Revision – 30 mins., Morse**

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval a proposed outline for the revision of the part-time paper.

**J. Consistent Messaging – 20 mins., B. Smith**

The Executive Committee will consider adopting consistent messaging for the ASCCC.

**K. Update Executive Committee Members About the December 6 CCSF Workshop – 10 mins., P. Smith**

The Executive Committee will be updated about the December 6th CCSF Workshop.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS (Possible Action)**

**A. Responding to the ACCJC's Revised Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards– 20 mins., P. Smith**

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the timeline for providing public comment about the ACCJC's revised Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and consider appropriate ways to provide information to the field, gather feedback from the field, and organize a response to the first draft.

**B. Spring Plenary Session Resolutions – 60 mins., Freitas**

The Executive Committee will consider for approval resolutions to forward to the Area Meetings for discussion.

**C. Distance Education as the Theme for the 2015 Academic Academy– 30 mins., Freitas**

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the potential for making distance education the theme for the 2015 Academic Academy.

**D. Survey about Recruiting, Screening, and Hiring FT/PT Faculty– 30 mins., Chiabotti**

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval a survey to be sent to local senate presidents, to collaborate with the appropriate individuals, regarding their college's practices.

**E. Faculty Hiring and Peer Reviews – 30 mins., Chiabotti**

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the concept of regional meetings in May on faculty recruiting and hiring.

**F. Campus Climate Index – 30 mins., Chiabotti**

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the chair of the committee calling local senates to encourage the college to complete the Campus Climate Survey.

**V. INFORMATION AND REPORTS (*Time certain: 4:00 pm – 5:00 pm*)**

**A. Chancellor's Office Liaison Report – 15 mins.,**

A liaison from the Chancellor's Office will provide the Executive Committee members with an update of system-wide issues and projects.

**B. Liaison Oral Reports (*please keep report to 5 mins., each*)**

Liaisons from the following organizations are invited to provide the Executive Committee with update related to their organization: AAUP, CCA, CCCI, CFT, FACCC, Part-time Faculty, and Student Senate

**RECESS**

**Saturday, March 1, 2014**

8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Executive Committee Meeting Resumes

**VI. FIRST READING (No Action)**

**A. Executive Committee Meeting Locations – 30 mins., Adams**

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the Executive Committee meeting and event dates.

**B. Leadership Institute Planning – 30 mins., B. Smith**

The Executive Committee will discuss the June Leadership planning and give direction to the president on possible topics and presentations.

**C. Curriculum Institute – 20 mins., Stankas**

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the Curriculum Institute Program.

**D. Evaluation of Accreditation Institute and Academic Academy– 30 mins., Stankas**

The Executive Committee will discuss the Accreditation Institute and Academic Academy.

**VII. INFORMATION AND REPORTS (No Action)**

**A. Board of Governors/Consultation Council – 20 mins., B. Smith/Morse**

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

**B. C-ID/TMC Presentation and Update – 20 mins., Bruno**

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

**C. Written Reports – B. Smith**

Written reports from the Executive Director, Foundation President, committees, task forces, liaisons, grants, and other events are provided for informational purposes. The public can pull any item from this section for discussion.

**New Business** (*No action/Next Agenda*)

**Adjournment**





# March 2014

## Executive Committee Calendar

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday																																																																																				
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">Feb 2014</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><td>S</td><td>M</td><td>T</td><td>W</td><td>T</td><td>F</td><td>S</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>10</td><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td>17</td><td>18</td><td>19</td><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td></tr> <tr><td>23</td><td>24</td><td>25</td><td>26</td><td>27</td><td>28</td><td></td></tr> </table> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">Apr 2014</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><td>S</td><td>M</td><td>T</td><td>W</td><td>T</td><td>F</td><td>S</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>10</td><td>11</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>17</td><td>18</td><td>19</td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>24</td><td>25</td><td>26</td></tr> <tr><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td><td>30</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </table> </div> </div>						S	M	T	W	T	F	S							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28		S	M	T	W	T	F	S			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30				<i>1</i> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">                     Executive Committee Meeting: Sacramento                 </div>
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																				
						1																																																																																				
2	3	4	5	6	7	8																																																																																				
9	10	11	12	13	14	15																																																																																				
16	17	18	19	20	21	22																																																																																				
23	24	25	26	27	28																																																																																					
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																				
		1	2	3	4	5																																																																																				
6	7	8	9	10	11	12																																																																																				
13	14	15	16	17	18	19																																																																																				
20	21	22	23	24	25	26																																																																																				
27	28	29	30																																																																																							
2	3 <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">Hayward Award Presentation @BOG Meeting</div>	4	5	6	7	8																																																																																				
9	10 <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">Diversity Award selection due in ASCCC office</div>	11	12	13	14	15																																																																																				
16	17	18	19	20 <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">Consultation Council Meeting</div>	21	22																																																																																				
23	24	25	26 <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">CI: 1st Reading Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</div>	27	28	29																																																																																				
30	31 <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">Cesar Chavez Day (Office Closed)</div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center; width: fit-content; margin: 0 auto;">Area Meetings</div>																																																																																								


# April 2014

## Executive Committee Calendar

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday																																																																																											
		1	2	3	4	5																																																																																											
6	7	8	9 Executive Committee Meeting: SFO Westin	10	11 Diversity Award presentation	12																																																																																											
Spring Session: SFO Westin																																																																																																	
13	14	15	16	17 Consultation Council Meeting	18	19																																																																																											
20	21 CI: Prelim Presenters List Due	22	23	24	25	26																																																																																											
27	28 FL: Final Program due to Julie FL: Presenter Travel and AV Requests Due	29	30	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; margin-right: 20px;"> <caption>Mar 2014</caption> <thead> <tr><th>S</th><th>M</th><th>T</th><th>W</th><th>T</th><th>F</th><th>S</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>10</td><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td>17</td><td>18</td><td>19</td><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td></tr> <tr><td>23</td><td>24</td><td>25</td><td>26</td><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td></tr> <tr><td>30</td><td>31</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"> <caption>May 2014</caption> <thead> <tr><th>S</th><th>M</th><th>T</th><th>W</th><th>T</th><th>F</th><th>S</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1 2 3</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>10</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>17</td></tr> <tr><td>18</td><td>19</td><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>25</td><td>26</td><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td><td>30</td><td>31</td></tr> </tbody> </table>			S	M	T	W	T	F	S							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31						S	M	T	W	T	F	S							1 2 3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																											
						1																																																																																											
2	3	4	5	6	7	8																																																																																											
9	10	11	12	13	14	15																																																																																											
16	17	18	19	20	21	22																																																																																											
23	24	25	26	27	28	29																																																																																											
30	31																																																																																																
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																											
						1 2 3																																																																																											
4	5	6	7	8	9	10																																																																																											
11	12	13	14	15	16	17																																																																																											
18	19	20	21	22	23	24																																																																																											
25	26	27	28	29	30	31																																																																																											

# May 2014

## Executive Committee Calendar

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday																																																																																				
<table border="1"> <caption>Apr 2014</caption> <tr><td>S</td><td>M</td><td>T</td><td>W</td><td>T</td><td>F</td><td>S</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>10</td><td>11</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>17</td><td>18</td><td>19</td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>24</td><td>25</td><td>26</td></tr> <tr><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td><td>30</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </table>		S	M	T	W	T	F	S		1	2	3	4	5		6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30				<table border="1"> <caption>Jun 2014</caption> <tr><td>S</td><td>M</td><td>T</td><td>W</td><td>T</td><td>F</td><td>S</td></tr> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>10</td><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td></tr> <tr><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>17</td><td>18</td><td>19</td><td>20</td><td>21</td></tr> <tr><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>24</td><td>25</td><td>26</td><td>27</td><td>28</td></tr> <tr><td>29</td><td>30</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </table>		S	M	T	W	T	F	S	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30						1	2	3
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																				
	1	2	3	4	5																																																																																					
6	7	8	9	10	11	12																																																																																				
13	14	15	16	17	18	19																																																																																				
20	21	22	23	24	25	26																																																																																				
27	28	29	30																																																																																							
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7																																																																																				
8	9	10	11	12	13	14																																																																																				
15	16	17	18	19	20	21																																																																																				
22	23	24	25	26	27	28																																																																																				
29	30																																																																																									
4	5	6	7	8	9	10																																																																																				
11	12 FL: Program to Print	13	14 CI: 2nd Reading Executive Committee Agenda Deadline	15 Consultation Council Meeting	16	17																																																																																				
18	19	20	21	22	23	24																																																																																				
25	26 <b>MEMORIAL DAY</b>  Office Closed	27 CI: Presenter Travel and AV Requests Due FL: Digital Materials due FL: Early Registration Ends	28	29	30 Executive Committee Meeting / Orientation	31 Executive Committee Meeting / Orientation																																																																																				


# June 2014

## Executive Committee Calendar

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday																																																																																				
1 Executive Committee Meeting / Orientation	2 CI: Final Program Due to Julie	3	4	5	6	7																																																																																				
8	9 CI: Final Program to Printer FL: Shipping Deadline	10	11	12	13	14																																																																																				
				Faculty Leadership Institute (San Diego)																																																																																						
15	16	17	18	19 Consultation Council Meeting	20	21																																																																																				
22	23 CI: Digital Materials Due	24	25	26	27	28																																																																																				
29	30 CI: Early Registration ends	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; margin-right: 20px;"> <caption>May 2014</caption> <thead> <tr><th>S</th><th>M</th><th>T</th><th>W</th><th>T</th><th>F</th><th>S</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>10</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>17</td></tr> <tr><td>18</td><td>19</td><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>25</td><td>26</td><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td><td>30</td><td>31</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="display: inline-table;"> <caption>Jul 2014</caption> <thead> <tr><th>S</th><th>M</th><th>T</th><th>W</th><th>T</th><th>F</th><th>S</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>10</td><td>11</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>17</td><td>18</td><td>19</td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>24</td><td>25</td><td>26</td></tr> <tr><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td><td>30</td><td>31</td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>					S	M	T	W	T	F	S					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	S	M	T	W	T	F	S			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31		
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																				
				1	2	3																																																																																				
4	5	6	7	8	9	10																																																																																				
11	12	13	14	15	16	17																																																																																				
18	19	20	21	22	23	24																																																																																				
25	26	27	28	29	30	31																																																																																				
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																																																				
		1	2	3	4	5																																																																																				
6	7	8	9	10	11	12																																																																																				
13	14	15	16	17	18	19																																																																																				
20	21	22	23	24	25	26																																																																																				
27	28	29	30	31																																																																																						

# July 2014

## Executive Committee Calendar

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday																																																								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Jun 2014</th> </tr> <tr> <th>S</th> <th>M</th> <th>T</th> <th>W</th> <th>T</th> <th>F</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> <td>10</td> <td>11</td> <td>12</td> <td>13</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>16</td> <td>17</td> <td>18</td> <td>19</td> <td>20</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>22</td> <td>23</td> <td>24</td> <td>25</td> <td>26</td> <td>27</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>29</td> <td>30</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Jun 2014							S	M	T	W	T	F	S	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30						1	2	3 CI: Final confirmation email out	4  4th of July -- Office Closed	5							
Jun 2014																																																														
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7																																																								
8	9	10	11	12	13	14																																																								
15	16	17	18	19	20	21																																																								
22	23	24	25	26	27	28																																																								
29	30																																																													
6	7 CI: Shipping deadline	8	9	10	11	12																																																								
				Curriculum Institute (TBD)																																																										
13	14	15	16	17 Consultation Council Meeting	18	19																																																								
20	21	22	23	24	25	26																																																								
27	28	29	30	31	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Aug 2014</th> </tr> <tr> <th>S</th> <th>M</th> <th>T</th> <th>W</th> <th>T</th> <th>F</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>11</td> <td>12</td> <td>13</td> <td>14</td> <td>15</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17</td> <td>18</td> <td>19</td> <td>20</td> <td>21</td> <td>22</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>25</td> <td>26</td> <td>27</td> <td>28</td> <td>29</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Aug 2014							S	M	T	W	T	F	S						1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31						
Aug 2014																																																														
S	M	T	W	T	F	S																																																								
					1	2																																																								
3	4	5	6	7	8	9																																																								
10	11	12	13	14	15	16																																																								
17	18	19	20	21	22	23																																																								
24	25	26	27	28	29	30																																																								
31																																																														







## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Spring Session Planning		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: III. A.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith/Julie Adams	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Tonya Davis	First Reading	X
		Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

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

### BACKGROUND:

The Executive Committee will discuss the final planning for the Spring 2014 Plenary Session.

Timelines:

#### DUE March 7, 2014

- A/V Needs to Tonya
- Presenter List due to Beth/Julie

#### DUE March 14, 2014

- Second Session Packet emailed and posted on the website. This includes preliminary schedule, Executive Committee resolutions, and any draft papers.
- Room availability guarantee expires

#### DUE March 17, 2014

Final breakout descriptions due to Julie

#### DUE MARCH 22 (Area A and B) and 23 (Area C and D)

- Deadline for Area Meeting resolutions to Julie/John
- Early Registration expires
- Final changes to the program

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

**DUE March 26, 2014**

- Deadline for any print requests to Tonya
- All presentations, handouts, and material due for posting to website to Holly

**Spring Session:** April 9-12, 2014

SFO Westin

## SPRING 2014 PLENARY SESSION PROGRAM

Thursday, April 10, 2014

**7:30 a.m. to 8:15 a.m. Registration/Delegate Sign In/Continental Breakfast**

### **FIRST BREAKOUT SESSION (8:30 a.m. to 9:45 a.m.)**

1. I'm New—Now What do I Do?
2. African American Male Student Success
3. Practical Leadership: Connecting Local Senates with Statewide Events
4. Multiple Measures Paper Follow Up
5. Unit Creep, GE Bloat, and IGETC for STEM
6. What Does "Career Ready" Mean for Our Students: Discussing a Meaningful Definition

### **SECOND BREAKOUT SESSION (10:00 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.)**

1. Your Role in the College Student Success Support Plan
2. Academic Integrity in Distance Education
3. Accreditation: The Revised Standards
4. Legislation and Advocacy: What's Coming and What Local Senates Can Do?
5. Difficult Conversations: Handling Biased Comments in a Collegial Manner
6. What Local Senates should be doing in Response to AB86?

### **FIRST GENERAL SESSION – Luncheon (11:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.)**

*Chancellor Brice Harris: The Mission of California Community Colleges*

Chancellor Harris will comment on the issues affecting the current and proposed mission for community colleges.

Keynote Presentation: Mitchell Stevens, Stanford University

*Panel Discussion: State Technology Initiatives*

At Fall Plenary, Vice Chancellor Patrick Perry introduced and gave the goals for the three technology initiatives: the Online Course Exchange Initiative, Education Planning Initiative, and Common Assessment Initiative. The panel will give brief updates on the work of each project with a focus on those issues that affect faculty and academic senates.

### **THIRD BREAKOUT SESSION (2:45 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.)**

1. Professional Development College: Leadership Module
2. C-ID, TMC, SB 440 and Area of Emphasis Degrees
3. Open Educational Resources
4. Noncredit Success from Indicators to Student Completion
5. Community Colleges Offering Bachelor's Degrees?: Possible Responses to the Chancellor's Office Task Force Report
6. Hot Topics in Distance Education

**FOURTH BREAKOUT SESSION (4:15 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.)**

1. Evaluating the Academic Senate: An Update
2. Accreditation: Recent Events
3. Legislative Direction to the Senate: A New Era
4. Strengthening your ties with Student Services and Instruction
5. Curriculum from Design to Apportionment: Enrollment Management at 30,000 Feet
6. Doing What Matters: Informing Program Decision Making

**6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. President's Reception**

**Friday, April 11, 2014**

**7:30 a.m. Registration/Delegate Sign in/Continental Breakfast**

**THIRD GENERAL SESSION (8:30 a.m. to 9:45 a.m.)**

Election Speeches

**10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. Area Meetings**

**Area A**, Julie Bruno, Secretary and Previous Area A Representative

**Area B**, Dolores Davison, Area B Representative

**Area C**, Lesley Kawaguchi, Area C Representative

**Area D**, Cynthia Rico, Area D Representative

**FOURTH GENERAL SESSION (11:45 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.)**

**1:25 p.m. – 2:15 p.m. General Session:** Shanna Smith Jaggars, Community College Research Center (CCRC), at Teachers College, Columbia University.

**FIFTH BREAKOUT SESSION (2:30 p.m. to 3:45 p.m.)**

1. Minimum Qualification Breakout
2. Effective Practices in Academic Integrity
3. Credit by Exam Paper
4. "I'm Never Gonna Use This Stuff": Helping Students Understand the Importance of General Education
5. Faculty Hiring/Peer Evaluations
6. Quality Agenda

**4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Problem Solving Discussions**

**6:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m. Foundation Dinner**

**Saturday, April 12, 2014**

**7:30 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. Final Delegate Sign In/Breakfast**

**FIFTH GENERAL SESSION (8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.)**





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Implementing Credit by Exam paper		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: III. B.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Lesley Kawaguchi	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

**DESIRED OUTCOME:** The Executive Committee will consider for approval the draft Credit by Exam paper to forward to the Spring Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

**BACKGROUND:**

The Executive Committee has received two drafts of the Credit by Exam paper and provided feedback. Members will review the current draft and determine if it is ready to forward to the Spring Plenary Session for discussion and debate.

---

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



## Implementing Credit by Exam

### I. Introduction

Credit by exam is a mechanism employed in the California community colleges as a means of granting credit for student learning outside of the traditional classroom. In some instances, credit by exam is the means used to award college credit for structured learning experiences in a secondary educational setting, while in other instances knowledge is obtained in non-traditional environments or an individual is self-taught. The Academic Senate for California Community College's position is that colleges should seek to maximize the opportunities available for credit by exam as is appropriate to meet the needs for their student populations, while maintaining academic excellence.

Although the relevant Title 5 regulation (§ 55050) states that the credit by examination process must adequately measure the “mastery of the course content as set forth in the outline of record”, the course outline of record delineates not only the course content, but the objectives to be achieved and the rigor of the coursework. Furthermore, student learning outcomes may be an integral component of the course outline and a component of the expected “mastery” that awarding of course credit should affirm. As such, it is necessary that any end of course assessment that is intended to be the basis for course credit be designed in a manner that ensures it is measuring not only “mastery of the course content”, but achievement of any delineated objectives and outcomes. (the comma is not part of the T5 reg – so it should not be IN the quotes – unless some English faculty person says otherwise.)

### 09.08 Credit by Exam Processes

Fall 2010

Whereas, National and state interest in decreasing time to degree completion and increasing degree production has resulted in an interest in finding novel ways to meet these goals;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has been active in determining whether and how existing competency-based exams (e.g., College Level Examination Program, International Baccalaureate, Advanced Placement) can be translated into course credit; and

Whereas, "Credit by exam" is a mechanism long in existence that can be used to award credit for demonstrated learning;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community develop and disseminate information to local academic senates regarding effective practices for using credit by exam to recognize learning gained through alternative mechanisms;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to ensure that students are aware of the existing mechanisms for earning credit through exam processes; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that local academic senates consider the needs of their local communities and strive to ensure that all appropriate exam opportunities are available.

Not only is it important to ensure that credit by exam is available to students, but it is critical to safeguard that both the assessment employed and the credit by exam process have integrity and that no credit is awarded if a student has not achieved the outcomes and objectives specified for the course. As the transcription of credit ensures the mobility of that credit and its acceptance by other higher education institutions, the processes employed for the awarding of credit must be well-documented and able to withstand any scrutiny.

### **09.05 Ensuring the Integrity of Credit by Exam Processes**

Fall 2008

Whereas, Title 5 55050 Credit by Examination establishes the following:

(a) The governing board of each community college district shall adopt and publish policies and procedures pertaining to credit by examination in accordance with the provisions of this section;

(b) The governing board may grant credit to any student who satisfactorily passes an examination approved or conducted by proper authorities of the college. Such credit may be granted only to a student who is registered at

the college and in good standing and only for a course listed in the catalog of the community college; and

(c) The nature and content of the examination shall be determined solely by faculty in the discipline who normally teach the course for which credit is to be granted;

Whereas, Resolution 9.07 F07 encourages "credit faculty to consider developing credit by exam options for credit courses that have noncredit equivalents"; and

Whereas, Credit by examination processes must be developed and evaluated by the appropriate discipline faculty;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges assert the right of discipline faculty to establish the content of credit by examination processes, including the use of exams administered at high schools and assessments based on portfolios; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges research and share effective practices for credit by exam processes with local senates.

In the Spring of 2013, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted a paper, **Alternative Methods for Awarding of College Credit: Credit by Examination for Articulated High School Courses**. This paper provided guidance for one method of earning credit by exam, the use of credit by exam to award college credit for structured learning experiences in secondary educational settings, such as articulated courses taken in high school. The reader is referred to that prior paper for more details on this form of credit by exam. The focus of this paper is on credit by exam more generally and aims to provide a complete overview that can inform local development of policies and practices regarding credit by exam.

## II. What is Credit by Exam?

Traditional course offerings include class sessions or other means of delivering course content, learning activities, assignments, study, and other structured activities intended to facilitate achievement of the course objectives. Students



then demonstrate their knowledge of the course content and the achievement of course objectives through examinations or other assessment methods. Credit by Exam (CBE) is an alternative method for students to earn credit for a college course by providing students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of the course content and objectives through a comprehensive assessment without first participating in the traditional structured learning process. In other words, CBE is a way for students who have already mastered course content and objectives through prior education or experience to earn credit for the course without “sitting through” the class sessions. The college faculty determines whether or not to offer CBE for particular courses; students do not have the right to take an exam for course credit unless that option is approved by the faculty. A course for which credit is awarded via CBE fulfills the same certificate, degree, transfer/articulation, and other requirements as it would if passed via the traditional method (although the student’s transcript must be annotated to indicate that credit was earned via CBE – See Title 5 §55050(e)).

Title 5 § 55050 has several requirements designed to ensure the structure, quality, and integrity of the CBE process. These include the following:

- Only students who are registered and in good standing at the college may take the college’s classes via CBE

*§ 55050(b): The governing board may grant credit to any student who satisfactorily passes an examination approved or conducted by proper authorities of the college. Such credit may be granted only to a student who is registered at the college and in good standing and only for a course listed in the catalog of the community college.*

- The nature and content of the exam must be determined solely by faculty in the discipline who normally teach the course for which credit is to be granted
- The course itself has been approved through the local curriculum committee process

*§ 55050(c): The nature and content of the examination shall be determined solely by faculty in the discipline who normally teach the course for which credit is to be granted in accordance with policies and*

*procedures approved by the curriculum committee established pursuant to section 55002....*

- The examination must adequately measure mastery of the course content as set forth in the course outline of record.

*§ 55050(c): ....The faculty shall determine that the examination adequately measures mastery of the course content as set forth in the outline of record. The faculty may accept an examination conducted at a location other than the community college for this purpose.*

- A separate examination must be conducted for each college course that is offered via CBE.

*§ 55050(d): A separate examination shall be conducted for each course for which credit is to be granted. Credit may be awarded for prior experience or prior learning only in terms of individually identified courses for which examinations are conducted pursuant to this section.*

- The student's grade for a course taken via CBE must follow the regular grading system used by the college, including "pass-no pass" if that option is normally available to students who take the course in the traditional manner [55050(f)].

*§ 55050(f): Grading shall be according to the regular grading system approved by the governing board pursuant to section 55023, except that students shall be offered a "pass-no pass" option if that option is ordinarily available for the course.*

The complete Title 5 language pertaining to Credit by Exam is included in Appendix A.

It should be noted that "credit by exam" may not involve an actual "exam." As faculty are empowered to determine the nature of the assessment employed, faculty may opt to use means other than a traditional exam to verify that the course objectives and outcomes are achieved. In some disciplines, for example, a portfolio or skill demonstration using a rubric may be the appropriate means of verifying that the learning that would have been accomplished in the course for which credit is to be awarded has occurred. The means used to determine

student mastery of the course content, objectives, and outcomes should be documented and approved by discipline faculty.

### CBE and Other Sources of Credit

The fundamental difference between CBE and alternative sources of credit such as military credit or national exams (e.g., AP, IB, CLEP, etc.) is that CBE is a means for students to demonstrate they have mastered the learning that would have been achieved in the college's own courses, while alternative sources of credit are the result of assessments external to the college. In other words, the source of credit from CBE is the college itself rather than an outside agency or service. Therefore, colleges should be as scrupulous in maintaining the quality and integrity of the CBE method of earning credit for their courses as they are of the traditional method.

If a college's course is articulated to a university's course, and credit for the college's course can be earned via CBE, the university is obligated to accept that transcribed credit, treating the credit earned via exam in the same manner that credit earned by taking the course would be treated. In contrast, a university is under no obligation to treat credit awarded by the college for an external exam in the same way as the college. For example, while a community college may award course credit for a specific AP score, the university faculty is not obligated to treat that AP-based credit in the same manner as they would the community college course. But for CBE, if the course in question has been articulated by the university, the university is obligated to accept the exam in lieu of their course because of the articulation agreement. This situation underscores the need to maintain high quality standards in the implementation of CBE. Because the local university may not accept the AP score in lieu of the course, a best practices recommendation is that colleges not establish AP/IB practices that are inconsistent with the universities to which they commonly send students.



To understand CBE, it is helpful to clarify what CBE is not, as described in the following list:

- CBE is not the same as national or international external exams (AP, IB, CLEP, etc.). While both may be used to fulfill requirements for a degree or certificate, CBE is a method of earning credit for the college's own courses while external exams may not be aligned with the college's own courses.
- CBE is not the same as military credit or credit from other nontraditional sources, such as life or career experiences. While both may be used to fulfill requirements for a degree or certificate, CBE is a method of earning credit for the college's own courses while military credit or other nontraditional coursework is not the college's own courses.
- CBE is not the same as waiving or substituting degree requirements. Waivers or substitutions are methods to relieve a student from completing a particular course or requirement, while CBE is a method to earn credit for the actual course.
- CBE is not typically the same as a prerequisite challenge exam, although there may be instances where credit by exam may be awarded for the successful challenge of a prerequisite. Prerequisite challenges provide the means for students to enroll in a course without passing the required prerequisite but still demonstrating the necessary prerequisite knowledge and skills. CBE provides the means for a student to earn credit for the course.
- CBE is not the same as high school articulation, although credit by exam could be available for courses at the high school that have been articulated. High school articulation, absent CBE, is a way to fulfill major requirements for an associate degree or certificate using previously completed high school coursework; it does not result in college credit. CBE is a way for a currently enrolled college student to demonstrate that they have mastered what they would have learned in a college course; it does result in college credit. (See **Alternative Methods for the**

**Awarding Of College Credit: Credit by Examination for Articulated High School Courses.** See also Section IV below in local determination and definition of “currently enrolled college student” and “in good standing.).

The California State University system has a policy that considers CBE. See <http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1036.html>. The relevant paragraph is 2.3: Verification and Evaluation of Learning, Knowledge, or Skills Acquired through Experience

If campus policy permits award of such credit, the experience must be verified through written examinations, portfolios, personal interviews, demonstrations, and/or other appropriate means of documentation and must be evaluated in accord with legitimate academic standards by faculty who are competent in the appropriate disciplines. Supporting information may be supplied by a field supervisor and/or employer.

### **III. New Trends and Credit by Exam**

Interest in ensuring access and increasing efficiency in higher education is always present, but reached a new high during the 2013 legislative session. As a consequence, a bill was passed allowing for the offering of community college courses “at cost” during intersessions (AB 955, Williams, 2013) and new mandates related to associate degrees for transfer were introduced (SB 440, Padilla, 2013). In addition, another proposed bill would have ensured college credit for online educational experienced offered by 3<sup>rd</sup> parties. Despite diminishing issues with access and new efforts to operate as a coordinated system, finding new ways to move students through the system more quickly to meet accountability targets is likely to continue to be a challenge faced by all segments of education.



While there has long been interest in awarding credit for non-traditional learning experiences, the pressure to offer or identify mechanisms for doing so reached a new high in 2012 when massive open online courses or “MOOCs” began to be touted as a means of making a college education available to anyone with a computer. MOOCs can offer a high-quality self-directed learning experience and may be designed to align with a community college course. The existence of CBE at the California community colleges was noted as an existing means of awarding credit for non-traditional learning experiences, be that learning from a MOOC or a book. It is imperative that the colleges ensure that CBE is appropriately available and that the exam process is designed to award credit fairly and accurately, as opposed to creating a process that is difficult or onerous for students to complete. The interest in awarding CBE is unlikely to subside in the near future, making it critical that colleges have appropriate opportunities available.

Not only must colleges ensure the availability of appropriate exams, but also the existence of policies regarding credit by exam is critical. Absent limits on credit by exam, for example, the only requirement that a student actually takes any courses at the college is the 12-unit residency requirement established in Title 5 §55063; §55050(g). (See section IV. Local Implementation of Credit by Exam for local considerations in determining a college’s Credit by Exam policies.)

Community colleges are experiencing a significant increase in the enrollment of veterans as well as active duty and reserve military personnel. These students have often completed a significant amount of valuable training and education during their military service. In recognition of that fact, all CSU campuses and a large majority of CCC campuses have policies in place to recognize and award credit for military coursework. The military’s Joint Service Transcript (JST) and the American Council on Education’s Military Guide (the “ACE Guide”) are invaluable resources in doing this work; they “translate” military coursework into language easily understood in the field of education. However, a significant

challenge remains in determining how to apply military credit toward specific degree requirements. In other words, while most California public institutions recognize and accept military coursework, it usually only applies as general elective credit. This is the case primarily because 1) military training is often focused on the practical application of course content while college courses usually emphasize the conceptual understanding and critical analysis of course content; and 2) the JST and ACE Guide, while invaluable evaluation tools, often lack the specificity needed to fully determine the comparability of military and college courses. It may well be the case that veterans and service members have, in fact, mastered the content of a specific college course through their military training and subsequent occupational experience, but that fact is not readily apparent in existing ACE documentation.

CBE provides a powerful tool that can address this problem because it provides an alternate means of assessing and documenting student mastery of a college course without the need for the student to “sit through” the class for a semester. In this scenario, the JST and ACE Guide would be used to identify appropriate courses for the student to take CBE; if passed, the student would receive college credit that fulfills the same certificate, degree, transfer/articulation, and other requirements as if the student passed the class via the traditional method.

For example, consider a veteran who completed the Department of Defense Advanced Electronic Journalism course. The ACE Guide description for this course is unlikely to closely match the COR for the college’s *Newswriting for Digital Media* course for the reasons stated above. However, the student might still have mastered the content, objectives, and outcomes in the college course through the combined experience of the military course and subsequent work as a military video journalist. In this case, the student might be encouraged to take the CBE examination for the college’s course. Upon passing the examination the student would receive college credit that fulfills all degree and transfer requirements met by *Newswriting for Digital Media*. Applying CBE in this way, the

student's military coursework and experience can be used to fulfill specific degree requirements rather than just general elective credit.

#### **IV. Local Implementation of Credit by Exam**

When implementing credit by exam, faculty and the curriculum committee and/or local academic senate, working with the appropriate administrators, must establish local policies and practices that are consistent with the relevant sections of Title 5. For example, Title 5 § 55050 (b) states that, “The governing board may grant credit to any student who satisfactorily passes an examination approved or conducted by proper authorities of the college. Such credit may be granted only to a student who is registered at the college and in good standing and only for a course listed in the catalog of the community college.” As is often the case, the regulatory language is open to interpretation, allowing for local variations in its implementation. Colleges offering credit by exam must determine how both “registered” and “in good standing” will be defined locally. Varying interpretations of such language have resulted in varied practices across the state.

Title 5 § 55050 does not, however, offer any guidance with respect to a wide array of policy considerations including whether or not a student can seek to earn credit by exam for a class in which s/he was previously enrolled, the number of times a student can attempt credit by exam for the same course, and the maximum number of units that may be attempted and/or completed using credit by exam. The college also needs to establish whether or not credit will be given for a course at a lower level than a course that a student has taken for credit either at that college or another accredited institution. For example, would the college allow a student who has already passed second semester Spanish to later attempt first semester Spanish via CBE? The college needs to determine deadlines as to when a student can request CBE, such as, if the request can only occur during regular semesters or quarters and not in intersessions and up to



what point in the semester or quarter can the request be made. The college must also make information about credit by exam publicly available. While this has always been a best practice, recent legislation (AB 1025, Garcia, 2013) now mandates that community colleges “shall provide information about credit by examination opportunities wherever course and class information is available.” [Education Code, 66027.5 (a)]. Finally, the faculty at the college needs to determine the courses for which CBE will be available. It should be noted that the means of assessment may be something other than a traditional exam, especially in areas where demonstration of a skill is a more appropriate means of demonstrating that the course's objectives have been achieved.

In implementing CBE, colleges should pay attention to particular populations, their needs, and necessary processes that can ensure students get the credits they have earned. For example, students who have completed articulated high school career technical education (CTE) courses may be well-prepared for CBE or may have already engaged in a CBE process for which they should be awarded credit. Local practices should be designed to identify such students and either facilitate access to the exam process or ensure that awarded credit is earned. As addressed elsewhere in this paper having the means to award credit for a degree or transfer for military veterans and others could also be furthered through CBE.

All community college faculty members want to help students reach their educational goals. Given the potential for CBE to assist in this effort, local senates have the opportunity and obligation to foster discussion about whether CBE will be used on their campuses, and if so, how. If the local academic senate determines that CBE is appropriate, it or college curriculum committee (if delegated to do so) should set policy and specify procedures for proposing and approving courses for which CBE will be available. Some colleges may agree to leave final approval to discipline faculty while others may choose to require that discipline faculty request a final approval from the college curriculum committee.

In determining which courses discipline faculty might choose to offer CBE, the faculty should also consider criteria or instances when CBE might not be appropriate for certain courses. For instance, if the course structure is an inherent aspect of assessment, then CBE might be inappropriate. Courses with both lecture and lab would need serious discussion as to the means of assessment if discipline faculty chooses to offer CBE. Students should also be made aware of possible negative consequences of CBE, such as the accumulation of too many units or the possibility of earning a less than satisfactory grade in the course based on the CBE results. (NOTE: Title 5 §55050 (f) regarding grading of CBE implies that the CBE grade will be part of the student's GPA.)

In addition, senates should work with their local Board of Trustees to write or update board policy and procedures permitting faculty to grant CBE as appropriate. District and campus CBE policies should be easily accessible on the college web site. These policies should include possible fees. Title 5 § 55050(h) specifies that a fee can be charged for CBE up to the cost of enrollment for the class itself.

The most efficient place to begin may be to simply make sure faculty know Title 5 permits granting CBE to students. Discipline faculty should review their active courses and deliberate which ones' objectives and outcomes could potentially be met through previous life experience as opposed to those with objectives and outcomes that can only be reached in a college classroom environment. It is imperative to use the Course Outline of Record as a central focus of discussion. Per Title 5 the assessment used must measure mastery of content as set forth in the Course Outline of Record, so discipline faculty should come to consensus about whether or not to allow students to earn CBE for a course and the means of assessment. In other words, the nature and content of the assessment used

cannot be specific to an individual instructor teaching a particular section of a course.

In terms of the assessment used, time factors need consideration. While a portfolio would not require a specified time allotted, the time provided for a student to take and complete a written exam needs to be thought out. Since the exam needs to be cumulative to incorporate the specified course content, objectives, and outcomes, a traditional two or three-hour final exam time frame may be inadequate. A different time frame may need to be considered if the assessment is based on observation of skills using a specified rubric.

Faculty must also agree on who will administer and grade the assessment, with the goal of consistency from student to student. Because local exam administration and grading will take a significant amount of time and effort, when setting CBE policy senates may wish to require the student to enroll in the course and speak with the instructor or dean about earning CBE before being permitted to take the exam. The policy might also include providing students with a copy of the Course Outline of Record to help them determine whether or not they should attempt taking credit by exam. This may help to avoid large numbers of students requesting to take the local exam on the off chance that they might be able to pass it even though they have no demonstrable prior learning or life experiences to suggest they may have mastery.

Once the courses for which CBE may be earned are identified and approved, this information should be published in the class schedule or on-line. Counselors can also assist by informing students about CBE options when they meet with students who may have adequate prior learning or life experience to demonstrate mastery of a course in their education plan.

Although determining which courses and exams are appropriate for local CBE is the primary responsibility of the faculty, administrators can also facilitate the



process for students. For example, faculty may ask deans to assist in reviewing student requests to take a local exam for credit to verify the student can indeed demonstrate some appropriate prior learning or life experience.

#### V. Recommendations to local senates and discipline faculty

- Local senates, particularly colleges with large population of students with prior learning from non-collegiate experiences such as military service, need to recommend policy regarding the use of Credit By Exam as a means for students to earn course credit.
- Discipline faculty are the experts who need to determine which courses for which Credit by Exam may be offered and the nature and content of the assessment tools used to determine if students have mastered the course content, objectives, and outcomes.
- Credit By Exam processes must be applied consistently to all students.
- The college should provide students with a copy of the Course Outline of Record to aid them in making the decision whether or not to attempt taking the credit by exam test.
- Credit by Exam processes must be held to the same high standards of quality as the traditional method of passing a course.

#### **VI. Conclusion**

Credit by Exam is a viable way for students to earn college credit. Discipline faculty must be the ones to determine the courses for which Credit by Exam is available and the means of assessing student mastery of the course content, objectives, and outcomes. Credit by Exam is a particularly useful tool for students who have already mastered college course content through previous non-collegiate experiences such as work, life experiences, or military training. Finally, in helping students reach their goals and attain success, it is critical to create pathways whether to four-year institutions, careers, or better jobs, and Credit by Exam is one possible option.



## Implementing Credit by Examination (CBE)

### Glossary

<b>Credit by Examination (CBE)</b>	<b>Assessments that are “internal” to the college resulting in college credit fulfilling all requirements associated with the course.</b>
<b>Credit by Examination Options</b>	<b>Assessment may be other than an examination such as a portfolio and/or skill demonstration.</b>
<b>Credit by Examination vs. High School Articulated Courses</b>	<b>CBE is a way for currently enrolled college student to pass a college course and earn college credit. Whereas, High school articulation is a way to fulfill community college requirements with previously completed high school courses, but does not result in college credit.</b>
<b>External Examinations</b>	<b>Assessments that are “external” to the college resulting in college credit granted by a non-college agency or service; Advance Placement, College Level Examination Program, International Baccalaureate or military credit.</b>
<b>Mastery of Course Content</b>	<b>CBE assessment must reflect mastery course objectives and student learning outcomes as well as course content.</b>
<b>Prerequisite Challenge</b>	<b>A method by which allows a student to enroll in a class without passing the required prerequisite. Could be instances where prerequisite challenge could be awarded CBE credit.</b>
<b>Transcript Annotation</b>	<b>CBE credit must be annotated on transcripts.</b>
<b>Waivers or Substitutions</b>	<b>Methods to relieve a student from completing a particular course or requirement.</b>

## **Implementing Credit by Examination (CBE)**

### **Checklist**

<b>Faculty Awareness</b>	<b>Are the discipline faculty aware that they have the ability and responsibility to determine if courses are appropriate for CBE?</b>
<b>Board Policies</b>	<b>Do Board Policies need to be reviewed, modified and/or developed?</b>
<b>Faculty Determination</b>	<b>Discipline Faculty identify which, if any, of their courses are appropriate for CBE.</b>
<b>CBE Development</b>	<b>CBE process must assess course content, objectives and learning outcomes.</b>
<b>CBE Considerations</b>	<b>Negative consequences must be considered such as too many units and/or earning less than satisfactory grade.</b>
<b>CBE Decisions</b>	<b>College policy needs to address how administered, grading assessment, approval process, whether student needs to register for the course, how many times a course can be taken via CBE, etc</b>
<b>College Documentation</b>	<b>Courses available for CBE must be published in a college document; class schedule, online and/or in the catalog.</b>

To be determined: Julie Bruno will talk with Dave DeGroot

**Acceptance and Application of External Credit:**

**Military Coursework and National Examinations – Why Curriculum Committees Need to Determine Equivalencies**

There are a number of reasons why Curriculum Committees should be reviewing external sources of credit such as Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), International Baccalaureate (IB), or military coursework to determine general education area equivalency and, when appropriate, course-to-course equivalencies.

Decisions about granting credit for external exams necessitate familiarity with the external exams available; in addition, they may also be informed by knowledge of the ways CSUs and UCs utilize a particular external exam score for placement and/or credit. It's important that faculty remember that even if they determine an external exam is not sufficient to grant unit credit for a particular course on their campus, the exam might instead be used to inform placement of the student into a target course or to satisfy a prerequisite. Faculty must also decide what the minimum score must be, how much credit to grant, and whether the credit will count towards major and/or general education requirements.

To this end, local senates can invite their campus Articulation Officer to familiarize faculty with external exam options such as IB, AP and CLEP, and with baccalaureate institutions' policies for accepting these exams for placement or major/general education credit. The College Board makes sample exams for AP and CLEP available for faculty review and it is well worth the time for faculty to spend a few moments reading through at least some of the exam items to get a sense of the breadth and rigor and assessment methods for each exam.

**Why Establish Equivalencies for External Credit or Examinations**

The primary reason for such reviews is that we are seeing an ever increasing number of students arriving on our campuses with potential credit from non-collegiate sources such as the military or national exams. Add to this the fact that many of our students attend more than one college. For these two reasons alone, there is a need not only to establish campus specific equivalencies, but when possible establish statewide equivalencies. For example, systemwide CCC GE external examination lists can provide students and counselors with clear and consistent references for applying external examination scores towards associate degree GE “area” requirements. On many of our campuses students may receive associate degree general education credit at one college for their external examination but not at another college because there is no course equivalency at the second college or the faculty have not established GE “area” equivalencies. With the adaptation of the CCC GE AP, CLEP and IB lists, students could be assured of comparable general education equivalency credit at any CCC campus.

The difference between Credit by Exam and the above alternative sources of credit can be illustrated in the different outcomes for transfer. As an example, consider a community college *Microeconomics* course that is articulated to the *Principles of Microeconomics* course at a local university. The community college faculty may choose to deem the *Microeconomics* course requirement in their Business major as fulfilled when a student has passed the *Microeconomics Advanced Placement (AP)* exam with a score of 3 or higher (the maximum score possible on an AP exam is a 5). That decision by the community college does not obligate the university faculty to also accept the AP score in lieu of their *Principles of Microeconomics* course. However, if a student at the community college earns credit for the community college’s *Microeconomics* course via CBE, that decision obligates the university faculty to treat the credit earned just as they would treat the articulated course from the college, meeting the university’s *Principles of Microeconomics* course when a student passes the college’s examination and the course has been granted articulation.

## **Why General Education Equivalency – Title 5 and Area Breadth of Study**

The ASCCC has approved resolutions encouraging local districts to adopt the CCC GE AP, CLEP and IB lists. Since every California community college must offer local general education 'area' requirements that align with the Title 5 general education 'area' definitions and general education requirements by their very nature cover wide area breadths of study, the individual general education requirements on each of our campuses can allow for external examination lists to be commonly applied at all colleges. If the CCC GE external examination lists are adopted students will know that regardless of which of the 112 CCC campuses they choose to attend, or how many CCC campuses they attended, their external examinations will fulfill the same general education requirement at every college.

Another important reason for the adoption of the CCC GE AP, CLEP and IB lists is that they are modeled upon the CSU GE AP, CLEP and IB lists and the IGETC AP and IB (UC doesn't accept CLEP). The alignment of the CCC GE lists with the CSU and UC lists would benefit the 55,000 to 60,000 CCC students that annually transfer to the CSU system and the 10,000 to 12,000 CCC students that annually transfer to the UC system by allowing them to fulfill local associate degree general education requirements as well as fulfilling the CSU and IGETC transfer pattern general education pattern requirements.

Similarly, all CSU campuses accept and apply credit for military coursework in accordance with the recommendations in the American Council on Education Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Forces (the ACE Guide.) Specifically, all military coursework evaluated as Lower-Division Baccalaureate/Associate Degree or Upper-Division Baccalaureate applies toward both the 60 CSU-transferable units required for upper division standing and



toward the total number of units required for a CSU baccalaureate degree. In addition, every CSU campus will accept the use of military coursework to fulfill of CSU GE Area E if a CCC has applied it in this manner in the students' CSU GE certification pattern. If all 112 CCC campuses accept and apply credit for military coursework in the same manner as the CSU system does, students will know that regardless of which of the 112 CCC campuses they choose to attend or which of the 23 CSU campuses they transfer to, their military coursework will fulfill the same unit and general education requirements at every institution.

### **Why Course-to-Course Equivalencies – Subject/Unit Credit or Prerequisite Waiver**

Course-to-course external credit equivalency determination is a local district decision. Courses that are specific to individual campuses should have “course equivalencies” determined by the discipline faculty on those campuses. Discipline faculty are the experts in the field and should decide whether the material tested in the external examination or covered in the military training is comparable to the content of their courses. If it's determined that course-to-course equivalency is appropriate, colleges can choose to apply subject and unit credit toward a certificate or associate degree or to assign a prerequisite waiver. Either way, the benefit for the student is the opportunity to matriculate to the next level of coursework thereby not having to repeat course material they have already mastered, as demonstrated by their score on an external examination or their completion of related military coursework. In addition, in these times of legislative concern with progress to degree and/or transfer and excessive units any credit applied from external sources will not only assist the student, but bode well for the college.

An important factor to consider in the determination of course-to-course equivalencies is the effect upon transfer. To evaluate such effects, feeder CSU, UC and private institutions' policies regarding the application of external credit



need to be researched. Course-to-course equivalencies are generally specific to each individual institution, unlike general education credit which is generally applied systemwide. The articulation officer and/or transfer center director should be enlisted to help the discipline faculty in this research. For example, if a transfer institution applies course-to-course credit for an external examination and the college offers a similar course that is articulated to the transfer institution's course, it provides strong justification for the college to apply external examination credit in the same way. The articulation officer and/or transfer center director can also be very helpful in navigating the external examination websites in order to find specific examination descriptions, examples of examination questions, reliability and validity studies and other important external examination information that discipline faculty may find useful in their equivalency determination.

The practice of awarding course-to-course equivalencies for military coursework is not as common or well developed as that for external examinations. However, many colleges apply credit for physical activity or health education courses based on the completion of military basic training. Other colleges may find that specific kinds of military coursework are applicable for course-to-course credit in similar college programs. For example, military coursework related to office technologies might be used to clear course requirements for keyboarding, word processing, computer operating systems, etc. A review and summary of the curricular content of most military coursework can be downloaded from the ACE Guide website at [www.militaryguides.acenet.edu](http://www.militaryguides.acenet.edu). More detailed curricular information may sometimes be obtained from the military school or training facility where the military coursework was completed.

### **External Examination Descriptions**

#### **Advanced Placement (AP)**

The College Board administers the AP examinations for high school students that have taken high school AP courses. The AP examinations are offered once a year at the end of the high school year.

*“One of the best standard predictors of academic success at Harvard is performance on Advanced Placement Examinations.”* (William R. Fitzsimmons, Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, Harvard University)

Specific AP Examination Information

<http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/courses/index.html>

### **College Level Examination Program (CLEP)**

The College Board also administers the CLEP examinations. CLEP is a credit-by-examination program serving a diverse group of college ready students, including adults, non-traditional learners, and military service members. The CLEP examinations are offered year round.

Specific CLEP Examination Information

<http://clep.collegeboard.org/professionals>

### **International Baccalaureate (IB)**

The International Baccalaureate (IB) is an integrated, pre-university, “two-year full-time program” that encourages “critical thinking through the study of a wide range of subjects in the traditional academic disciplines while encouraging an international perspective.” IB programs have been offered since 1968 in public and private high schools in more than 125 countries throughout the world; in California, many IB programs are a-school-within-a-school, with dedicated classrooms, faculty, and resources for a smaller subset of students on that high school campus. Students in IB programs may earn a diploma from such a program upon successful completion of requirements that also include community service, familiarity with several languages, research projects, and “an inquiry into the nature of knowledge.” Alternatively, students may choose not seek the entire diploma but may complete IB “college-level courses and examinations.”

Specific IB Examination Information  
<http://www.ibo.org/diploma/index.cfm>

### **Military Coursework Information**

#### **Military Courses Listed in the ACE Guide**

Courses listed in the Guide are service school courses conducted on a formal basis, i.e., approved by a central authority within each service and listed by the service in its catalog. These courses are conducted for a specified period of time with a prescribed course of instruction, in a structured learning situation, and with qualified instructors.

The courses are evaluated by teams of at least three subject matter specialists (college and university professors, deans, and other academicians). Through discussion and the application of evaluation procedures and guidelines, team members reach a consensus on the amount and category of credit to be recommended.

Evaluation materials include the course syllabus, training materials, tests, textbooks, technical manuals, and examinations. Additional information may be obtained from discussions with instructors and program administrators, classroom observations, and examination of instructional equipment and laboratory facilities.

Evaluators have two major tasks for each course: the formulation of a credit recommendation and the preparation of the course's description. The credit recommendation consists of the category of credit, the number of semester hours recommended, and the appropriate subject area. Evaluators phrase the course description (which appears in the Guide exhibits under the headings Learning Outcomes or Objectives and Instruction) in terms meaningful to civilian

educators. The course description supplements the credit recommendations by summarizing the nature of a given course.

For more information, visit [www.militaryguides.acenet.edu](http://www.militaryguides.acenet.edu).

### **Military Occupations Listed in the ACE Guide**

In addition to military coursework, the ACE Guide also lists credit recommendations for military occupations (i.e. job fields.) Credit recommendations in this section are based on the skills, competencies, and knowledge required of military servicemembers who are qualified in a given occupation specialty. That demonstrated learning is compared to the same attributes acquired by students who have completed a comparable postsecondary course or curriculum. Because the evaluations are based on a comparison of learning outcomes, the amount of time a servicemember may have spent acquiring occupational proficiency is not taken into consideration. The emphasis is on translating the learning demonstrated through occupational proficiency into terms used in formal civilian postsecondary education systems to recognize the same learning.

For more information, visit [www.militaryguides.acenet.edu](http://www.militaryguides.acenet.edu).

### **Categories of Educational Credit Recommendations in the ACE Guide**

ACE evaluators use the following categories of educational credit when formulating credit recommendations:

*Vocational Certificate.* This category describes course work of the type normally found in certificate or diploma (nondegree) programs that are usually a year or less in length and designed to provide students with occupational skills. Course content is specialized, and the accompanying shop, laboratory, or similar practical components emphasize procedural more than analytical skills.



*Lower-Division Baccalaureate/Associate Degree.* This category describes course work of the type normally found in the first two years of a baccalaureate program and in programs leading to the associate degree. The instruction stresses development of analytical abilities at the introductory level. Verbal, mathematical, and scientific concepts associated with an academic discipline are introduced, as are basic principles. Occupationally-oriented courses in this category are normally designed to prepare a student to function as a technician in a particular field.

*Upper-Division Baccalaureate.* This category describes courses of the type found in the last two years of a baccalaureate program. The courses involve specialization of a theoretical or analytical nature beyond the introductory level. Successful performance by students normally requires prior study in the area.

*Graduate Degree.* This category describes courses with content of the type found in graduate programs. These courses often require independent study, original research, critical analysis, and the scholarly and professional application of the specialized knowledge or discipline. Students enrolled in such courses normally have completed a baccalaureate program.

For more information, visit [www.militaryguides.acenet.edu](http://www.militaryguides.acenet.edu).

### **About the ACE Guide**

The ACE Guide is a reference tool used to “translate” military coursework into descriptions and terms used in civilian postsecondary education. ACE facilitates the review and evaluation of military courses by civilian academicians to determine how learning acquired in the military may be comparable to civilian postsecondary coursework. The ACE Guide is best used as a starting place for determining how a particular military course might be accepted and applied toward degree credit, general education, or course requirements.

The following page contains a sample ACE Guide course exhibit with explanatory information. For more information, visit [www.militaryguides.acenet.edu](http://www.militaryguides.acenet.edu).

Decisions about granting credit for external exams necessitate familiarity with the external exams available; in addition, they may also be informed by knowledge of the ways CSUs and UCs utilize a particular external exam score for placement and/or credit. It's important that faculty remember that even if they determine an external exam is not sufficient to grant unit credit for particular course on their campus, the exam might instead be used to inform placement of the student into a target course or as adequate to satisfy a prerequisite. Faculty must also decide what the minimum score must be, how much credit to grant, and whether the credit will count towards major and/or general education requirements.

To this end, local senates can invite their campus Articulation Officer to familiarize faculty with external exam options such as IB, AP and CLEP, and with baccalaureate institutions' policies for accepting these exams for placement or major/general education credit. The College Board makes sample exams for AP and CLEP available for faculty review and it is well worth the time for faculty to spend a few moments reading through at least some of the exam items to get a sense of their breadth and rigor. [WU1]



## Sample Course Exhibit

**ID Number.** A ten-character code assigned by ACE to identify each course exhibit.

**AR-1401-0033**

1. FINANCE SPECIALIST
2. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT TECHNICIAN  
(Finance Specialist)

**Title.** The title of the course as provided on the service school's program of instruction. Version 1 is the oldest. If the titles are the same for all versions, then the version number is omitted.

**Military Course Number.** The number assigned to the course by the service school, as indicated on the program of instruction. Listed by version, if appropriate.

**Course Number**  
*Version 1:* 542-73C10; 542-73C10 (ST).  
*Version 2:* 542-73C10 (F); 542-73C10; 542-73C10 (ST); 541-44C10.

**Subtitle.** Subtitles are in parentheses, and are typically the titles of previous versions if there has been a change in the course title.

**Location**  
*Version 1:* Finance School, Soldier Support Institute, Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN.  
*Version 2:* Soldier Support Institute, Fort Jackson, SC; Finance School, Soldier Support Institute, Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN; Finance School, Fort Jackson, SC.

**Location.** The service school, military installation, and state. Listed by version, if appropriate.

**Length.** The length of the course in weeks, with contact hours in parentheses. Listed by version, if appropriate.

**Length**  
*Version 1:* 7-8 weeks (244-296 hours).  
*Version 2:* 7-9 weeks (244-307 hours).

**Exhibit Dates**  
*Version 1:* 10/86-3/91.  
*Version 2:* 4/91-Present.

**Exhibit Dates.** Training start date on materials evaluated and, if applicable, the date the training was eliminated. "Present" denotes that the training is still on-going. Listed by version, if appropriate.

**Learning Outcomes.** Competencies students acquire during the course. Some courses prior to 1990 have *Objectives*. Listed by version, if appropriate.

**Learning Outcomes**  
*Version 1:* Before 10/86 see AR-1401-0002. Upon completion of the course, the student will be able to identify and determine the types of incentive pay plans, prepare pay vouchers, complete pay documents, and compute pay allowances.  
*Version 2:* Upon completion of the course, the student will be able to determine pay status and adjustments, compute payroll and travel allowances, prepare payroll and travel vouchers, process pay inquiries, and access and input data on computer.

**Recommendation.** Expressed in semester hours and recommended in four categories: vocational certificate, lower-division baccalaureate/associate degree, upper division baccalaureate, and graduate. Listed by version, if appropriate.

**Instruction.** Description of instruction, including teaching methods, facilities, equipment, and major subject areas covered. Listed by version, if appropriate.

**Instruction**  
*Version 1:* Methods of instruction include lectures, role playing, and in-class exercises. Topics covered include financial operations, data entry operations, and payroll processing.  
*Version 2:* Methods of instruction include lectures, role playing, and in-class exercises, and computer based instruction. Topics covered include financial operations and payroll processing.

**Team Review Date.** Date when the course was last evaluated by a team of faculty members drawn from academia. This information is particularly useful in subject areas where state-of-the-art is important in determining the applicability of credit. ACE's policy is that Team Reviews must occur at least every ten years.

**Related Occupation.** A cross reference to related Army MOS exhibits. Officials awarding credit for a course and an MOS should compare the exhibit for the course with that of the MOS before awarding credit. This paragraph is included for Army-sponsored courses only.

**Credit Recommendation**  
*Version 1:* In the vocational certificate category, 2 semester hours in payroll accounting. In the lower-division baccalaureate/associate degree category, 1 semester hour in computer applications (4/91)(4/91).  
*Version 2:* In the lower-division baccalaureate/associate degree category, 2 semester hours in payroll accounting and 1 in computer applications (4/04)(1/08).

**Related Occupations**  
 44C; 73C.

**Review Date.** Most recent date the course was reviewed, either by an academic team or in-house by ACE (in-house reviews are conducted when changes to course content are minor).

## Appendix A

### **§ 55050. Credit by Examination.**

- (a) The governing board of each community college district shall adopt and publish policies and procedures pertaining to credit by examination in accordance with the provisions of this section.
- (b) The governing board may grant credit to any student who satisfactorily passes an examination approved or conducted by proper authorities of the college. Such credit may be granted only to a student who is registered at the college and in good standing and only for a course listed in the catalog of the community college.
- (c) The nature and content of the examination shall be determined solely by faculty in the discipline who normally teach the course for which credit is to be granted in accordance with policies and procedures approved by the curriculum committee established pursuant to section 55002. The faculty shall determine that the examination adequately measures mastery of the course content as set forth in the outline of record. The faculty may accept an examination conducted at a location other than the community college for this purpose.
- (d) A separate examination shall be conducted for each course for which credit is to be granted. Credit may be awarded for prior experience or prior learning only in terms of individually identified courses for which examinations are conducted pursuant to this section.
- (e) The student's academic record shall be clearly annotated to reflect that credit was earned by examination.
- (f) Grading shall be according to the regular grading system approved by the governing board pursuant to section 55023, except that students shall be offered a "pass-no pass" option if that option is ordinarily available for the course.
- (g) Units for which credit is given pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not be counted in determining the 12 semester hours of credit in residence required for an associate degree.
- (h) A district may charge a student a fee for administering an examination pursuant to this section, provided the fee does not exceed the enrollment fee which would be associated with enrollment in the course for which the student seeks credit by examination.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66700 and 70901, Education Code. Reference: Sections 70901 and 70902, Education Code.





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Multiple Measures Paper		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: III. C	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Michelle Grimes-Hillman	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the draft Multiple Measures Paper to forward to the Spring Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

### BACKGROUND:

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

The Executive Committee reviewed a first draft of the paper at the January 3, 2014 meeting and provided extensive feedback to task force members. Members will review the current draft and determine if it is ready to forward to the Spring Plenary Session for discussion and debate.

---

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



## Multiple Measures in Assessment:

### The Requirements and Challenges of Multiple Measures in the California Community Colleges

#### Introduction

Assessing a student's ability to be successful in courses and programs is an important and necessary aspect of student success. Two major practices exist to predict a student's likelihood of succeeding in a course or program: 1) Successful completion of prerequisite or advisory courses (as documented on transcripts) and 2) the assessment for placement process. These two methods are presumed to be mechanisms that ensure that a student has acquired needed the knowledge and skills necessary for success.

Presuming a student is prepared for a course through the completion of a prerequisite course is a rather straightforward process; however, placing a student using an assessment for placement process is necessarily more complicated, as such placements can not be made based on assessment test scores alone. Some students may possess necessary course or program skills but have difficulty demonstrating those skills on standardized tests or fail to prepare adequately for an assessment test. For this reason, Title 5 § 55502(i) clearly mandates that California community colleges use multiple measures in their assessment processes: "Multiple measures' are a **required** component of a district's assessment system and refer to the use of more than one assessment measure in order to assess the student" [emphasis added]. The requirement to use multiple measures is reiterated in Title 5 § 55522(a): "When using an English, mathematics, or ESL assessment test for placement, it must be used with one or more other measures to comprise multiple measures."

While multiple measures have always been required by Title 5, adequate research into the accuracy of these measures has not been readily available to inform educational decisions. Individual colleges have made various decisions regarding the use of subjective measures and have therefore reported differing experiences. While colleges are required to employ assessment tools that have been validated, no mandate exists for a corresponding effort to validate the application of multiple measures. This paper addresses the broader issue beyond simply evaluating a transcript for previous coursework or limiting placement based on an exam; it examines the use of multiple measures in addition to placement tests as a way to improve the overall assessment of students' abilities.

Title 5 § 53200 gives academic senates responsibility for making recommendations about academic and professional matters concerning "standards or policies regarding student preparation and success." The intent behind prerequisites and placement processes, including the selection and application of multiple measures, is to ensure or enhance student success through proper preparation. Therefore, academic senates must be directly involved and play a leading role in facilitating and developing recommendations about assessment processes and the use of multiple measures at both local and state levels.



46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79

The concept of applying multiple measures for placement is often misunderstood by local colleges, and data is sometimes difficult to collect. Even within a single college placement practices may vary among different disciplines. Multiple methods and placement practices were summarized in 2011(West ED and the CCCO). A survey was implemented to examine current practices and applications of multiple measures. One hundred, twelve colleges, 59, or just over half (59) of all colleges provided survey information about multiple measures. (See Appendix W). This information is neither research data that informs decision making nor an indication of best practices, but instead survey data suggesting what colleges are currently using. The survey noted that only 48 of the 59 surveyed colleges reported how they used multiple measures, and 34 of the colleges reported using a “weighted score” of placement tests and then adding or subtracting points for multiple measures. Twelve colleges reported relying most heavily on qualitative data to direct placement decisions, placing less consideration on placement test scores. WestEd reported that weighting of multiple measures varied widely and that only a few colleges used regression analysis to predict success.

In this paper, “use of multiple measures for placement,” or simply “multiple measures,” refers to a process in which colleges rely on more than a single factor to determine student readiness for a course or program. The purpose of this paper is to do the following:

- review the value of and reasons for using multiple measures in California community colleges for placing students into the curriculum;
- address the role of the academic senate, discipline faculty, and counselors in multiple measures placement;
- provide guidance regarding best practices for implementing multiple measures in order to improve placement accuracy.

In addition, the paper will explore the implications of multiple measures on current issues involving efforts to implement a common assessment across the state, including unresolved issues of portability of assessment for placement results, accuracy and reliability of assessment, and local autonomy regarding assessment and placement decisions.

80  
81  
82

## **Regulatory Framework**

### **Regulatory Guidelines for Multiple Measures**

84

85 Title 5 §55502(i) and 55522(a) explicitly require the use of multiple measures in  
86 assessment for placement. Thus, the question for California community colleges and  
87 districts is not whether to use multiple measures, but which measures to use and how to  
88 apply them.

89 Colleges have latitude in what types of multiple measures may be used in their placement  
90 process. In addition to assessment tests, Title 5 §55502(i) notes that additional measures  
91 may include “interviews, holistic scoring processes, attitude surveys, vocational or career  
92 aptitude and interest inventories, high school or college transcripts, specialized  
93 certificates or licenses, education and employment histories, and military training and  
94 experience.” Furthermore, Title 5 § 55522(a)(2) allows the Chancellor’s Office to  
95 “identify other measures of a student’s college readiness that community college districts  
96 may use for student placement into the college’s curriculum.” This section of Title 5 has  
97 permitted some colleges to explore the use of high school transcripts for placement, as  
98 well as the scores earned through the CSU’s Early Assessment Program.

99 As noted in these Title 5 sections, the initial assessment process must consist of multiple  
100 measures, meaning that all the various measures must be collected and evaluated prior to  
101 determining the student’s placement. Colleges that rely only on assessment tests for  
102 initial placement but then allow other measures to be considered on appeal of the decision  
103 are not employing a multiple measures approach to placement. Instead they have a single  
104 measure placement approach with a multiple measures appeals process.

105 Although assessment processes are most commonly employed to place students in  
106 appropriate English, mathematics, or English as a Second Language (ESL) courses, a  
107 college may have assessment processes for other sequential courses in the curriculum  
108 (e.g., Chemistry). Since Title 5 §55502(i) indicates that multiple measures are a required  
109 component of a college’s or district’s assessment system, colleges must also implement  
110 multiple measures of assessment for any subject in which they have a placement process,  
111 and these measures should be determined using data that provide knowledge about each  
112 measure’s usefulness and accuracy.

### **Regulatory Discussion on Assessment Tests**

114 Of the set of possible multiple measures, Title 5 places the most stringent guidelines on  
115 assessment tests for placement. Using guidelines prepared by the Chancellor’s Office,  
116 districts and colleges must validate all assessment for placement tests to ensure that the

117 tests are being used in a proper manner and that the tests show little or no cultural or  
118 linguistic bias (Title 5 §55522(a)(1)). In general, with minor exceptions, the following  
119 mandates and restrictions apply to all such tests:

- 120 • Assessment test procedures must be clearly communicated to students, including  
121 the availability of sample tests, how assessment test results will inform placement  
122 decisions, and any limits that the college or district places on retakes of the  
123 assessment test. [§ 55522(b)]  
124
- 125 • Assessment tests must be approved by the Chancellor’s Office. [§ 55522(c)(1)]  
126
- 127 • Assessment tests may not be used in a manner or for a purpose other than that for  
128 which it was developed or otherwise validated. [§ 55522(c)(2)]  
129
- 130 • Assessment tests may not be used to deny admission to a college. [§ 55522(c)(3)]  
131
- 132 • Assessment tests may not be used to exclude students from any particular course  
133 or educational program, except that districts may establish appropriate  
134 prerequisites. [§ 55522(c)(4)]  
135

136 Although Title 5 contains no other specific guidelines about reviewing and evaluating  
137 other assessment measures, Title 5§ 55522(c)(5) includes a blanket prohibition that no  
138 “Student Success and Support Program practice which has the effect of subjecting any  
139 person to unlawful discrimination” is permitted. Any assessment test that contains  
140 culturally or otherwise biased content or language is therefore in violation of state  
141 regulation. The Chancellor’s Office Assessment Workgroup, which reviews and  
142 approves all locally developed or proposed assessment instruments, focuses on ensuring  
143 that the instruments do not reflect any discrimination or bias. However, colleges and  
144 districts should scrutinize their assessment for placement processes locally to guarantee  
145 the absence of prejudicial language and content, not only to comply with Title 5 but  
146 simply as good practice for the sake of students. Furthermore, the application of multiple  
147 measures should be reviewed for any potential bias. Bias is not intuitive and is only  
148 evident when placement results are examined using data that is disaggregated, and even  
149 that examination may not be sufficient to identify bias. If, for example, a high school  
150 experience that is only available to certain populations of students is weighing heavily  
151 into the placement process, this practice should be reviewed for potential adverse impact.

## 152 **The Case for Multiple Measures**

153 Limiting assessment to a placement test, an exam with content and skills questions from  
154 several courses in a curricular sequence, represents a single and potentially unsuitable



155 measure of student preparation for college coursework. Likewise, assessment of  
156 foundational skills like writing, reading, and computation, for example, may be  
157 problematic if limited to measures such as transcript evaluation, employment history,  
158 interviews, and attitude surveys because, among other factors, students may have  
159 returned to college after a long break or because such measures involve a level of self-  
160 reporting that, unintentionally or not, may not accurately reflect students' preparation.

161

162 The drawbacks of relying exclusively on a single, high-stakes exam or test for placement  
163 decisions are well known. Many have noted that since the placement tests themselves are  
164 fairly brief, they are not able to delve deeply enough into the subjects they assess to  
165 provide a more complete assessment picture. Another problem with the placement tests  
166 is that even the best students may do poorly taking an exam on content they may not have  
167 engaged with for months or even years. Poor scores for these students lead to the problem  
168 of underplacement, the placement of students in courses considerably below their true  
169 knowledge and skill level. On the other end of the spectrum, since many placement  
170 exams rely on multiple choice items, students who are strategic about guessing and  
171 eliminating wrong answers may achieve high scores without having a solid grasp of a  
172 subject's underlying principles. High scores for such students may lead to overplacement,  
173 the placement of students in courses beyond their skill set and, consequently, in which  
174 students are unlikely to succeed.

175

176 Research suggests that one reason to use multiple measures is to increase the predictive  
177 ability of the placement process. In other words, applying multiple measures can  
178 increase the accuracy of the placement process over a single placement test. Findings  
179 from a recent predictive model study regarding the use of multiple measures that  
180 examined placements and success rates for 42,000 first-time entrants to a large urban  
181 community college system suggest that the use of multiple measures when determining  
182 student placements lower the number of students that need remediation (up to 12 %) by  
183 placing them in the correct courses; and at the same time increase the student success of  
184 these students in the courses that they were placed (Scott-Clayton, 2012, p. 38). Scott-  
185 Clayton (2012) also notes that the benefits of using multiple measures rather than relying  
186 on assessment tests alone are particularly strong for English placements because the use  
187 of assessment tests alone seems to be more accurate for math placements than for English  
188 (p. 37). The study also reported that an estimated 25-33 percent of students are  
189 incorrectly over or under assessed (p. 37) when additional measures are not included in  
190 the placement process. Other studies have reported similar problems with assessments.

191 Clayton, Crosta, and Belfield (2012) note that "roughly one in four test-takers in math  
192 and one in three test-takers in English are severely mis-assigned, with severe under-  
193 placements in remediation much more common than severe over-placements in college-  
194 level coursework" (p. 4).

195 If misplacement claims made by Clayton, Crosta, and Belfield (2012) and others are  
196 accurate, the consequences for community colleges that fail to include high quality,  
197 validated multiple measures in the placement process are significant. In places like  
198 California, which has 112 community colleges across the state, an incredibly large  
199 number of placement tests are given in a single year, so research suggests that the number  
200 of misplacements is likely to be quite high. The following placement test data from Fall  
201 2010 offers a sense of the magnitude of the problem:

<u>Subject</u>	<u># of Placement Tests Given</u>
<u>Math</u>	<u>350,129</u>
<u>English-Writing</u>	<u>319,892</u>
<u>English-Reading</u>	<u>282,936</u>
<u>ESL-writing</u>	<u>20,925</u>
<u>ESL-reading</u>	<u>21,560</u>
<u>ESL-intergrated</u>	<u>31,297</u>

202  
203



204 While this chart does not indicate how many misplacements occurred in each category,  
205 research suggests the number of misplacements may have been sizable. The large  
206 number of total placements in California suggests that error rates of 25-33% impact a  
207 considerably large number of students. For this reason, we must be more critical of the  
208 accuracy of our colleges' assessment data and more curious about how our community  
209 colleges use high quality, validated multiple measures in their assessment processes.

210 Inaccurate assessments resulting from the use of placement tests without multiple  
211 measures may contribute to poor persistence and success rates of basic skills students.  
212 We know that students enrolled in basic skills courses often do not move through English  
213 and Math basic skills sequences and complete transfer level courses in high numbers. In  
214 English, for example, of those who assessed at below transfer level, "the largest  
215 proportion assessed at two levels below transfer level, and about 38% of this proportion  
216 succeeded in completing transfer level English," and in mathematics, "of those who  
217 assessed at below transfer level in mathematics, the largest proportion assessed at three  
218 levels below transfer level, and 14% of this proportion succeeded in completing transfer-  
219 level mathematics" (Basic Skills Report, Nov 2012). If 25-33% of students who assess  
220 are misplaced, then the misplacements may be impacting students' ability to pass courses,  
221 learn skills, and persist in high numbers.

222 Since the use of placement tests in isolation may result in students being inaccurately  
223 placed into remediation when they were prepared for college-level work, more accurate  
224 placements may also result in various direct benefits for these more prepared students.  
225 Clayton, Crosta, & Belfield note that "prepared students who are assigned to remediation  
226 may garner little or no educational benefit, but incur additional tuition and time costs and  
227 may be discouraged from or delayed in their degree plans. Indeed, several studies using  
228 regression-discontinuity (RD) analysis to compare students just above and just below  
229 remedial test score cutoffs have generally found null to negative impacts of remediation  
230 for these 'marginal' students" (p. 2). While the utility of remediation is a complex subject  
231 that may produce various perspectives and conclusions, certainly no student who truly  
232 has no need of remediation should be required to complete unnecessary instruction, and  
233 the use of multiple measures may help to reduce the number of students placed into this  
234 situation.

235 Another reason that correct placement is essential is that remediation is expensive, both  
236 in terms of fiscal costs and the time it takes students to complete their degrees. The fiscal  
237 cost of remediation has been estimated to be nearly \$7 billion dollars per year in the  
238 United States (Clayton, Crosta, & Belfield, 2012, p.1). Many other costs related to the  
239 impact of remediation on students are not included in this estimate.

240 A final important reason to use multiple measures in the placement process is that  
241 colleges may use the improved assessment data to create better planning processes. By

242 improving the accuracy of placement process, colleges can collect better data and use that  
 243 data to impact other important processes from scheduling to educational planning.  
 244 Colleges often struggle to determine how many sections of a particular course should be  
 245 offered at each level of a curricular sequence, for example. More accurate assessment  
 246 data may be one of the keys to improving these planning processes, and the inclusion of  
 247 multiple measures in our assessment processes is an important step toward the goal of  
 248 improving the accuracy of assessments.

249 ***Pros and Cons of Individual Assessment Measures***

250 The following table looks at a collection of pros and cons of some commonly used  
 251 multiple measures. A complete chart is found in Appendix P.

Measure	Pros	Cons	Additional notes
<b>Assessment using a standardized test</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Placement tests</li> <li>Standardized California Standards test</li> <li>Early Assessment Program Test (EAP)</li> </ul>	Standardized and comparable among students that have taken the test.	A single high stakes test may not reflect all the student's skills and abilities and may introduce testing bias.	Requires cut score validation. Accuracy may vary with test used. Alignment with curriculum may affect content validity.
<b>Prior academic achievement</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GPA (self-reported)</li> <li>Transcripts</li> <li>AP – Advance Placement course completion or test scores</li> <li>Highest level course success</li> </ul>	Provides an aggregate measure of student achievement and motivation.	Concerns exists regarding accuracy or validity of grades and course work, especially when self-reported.	May be affected by the recency with which the skills or knowledge were acquired. Not comparable across a large population of students from different schools.
<b>Demographics and socioeconomic status</b>			

Measure	Pros	Cons	Additional notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age</li> <li>• Full-time/ part-time status</li> <li>• No. of hours employed</li> <li>• First Generation status (highest level of parental education)</li> <li>• Socioeconomic status (PELL grant or BOG recipient)</li> </ul>	Evidence suggests that full-time status results in better success than part-time status.	Specific evidence in this area may not take into consideration other factors regarding full-time vs. part-time such as the economic or family conditions that allow full-time enrollment.	Data are inconsistent here, at times showing better success in younger age groups and other times in older students. Direct correlations are currently not objectively measurable. Student profiling may occur. Inequitable treatment of students inevitable.
<b>Affective measures</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motivation (self-reported)</li> <li>• Declaration of a major</li> </ul>	Assessment of motivation level.	Self-reported information is very subjective.	Accuracy issues arise in the selection, recording, and changing of a major.
<b>Other measureable factors that contribute to academic success</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student education plans developed in 8<sup>th</sup> grade or HS that continue through college – (called “programs of study” in some districts) representing evidence of motivation</li> <li>• Employment history</li> </ul>	Data has correlated these activities with success.	These variables are broad and depend upon rigor, content, and alignment with student goals.	The value of this data may vary with the college.



253 **Relationship Between Multiple Measures, Prerequisites, and Assessment for**  
254 **Placement**

255 One way in which multiple measures may be used is to verify attainment of skills and  
256 knowledge expected in a prerequisite. As a condition of enrollment, a prerequisite is  
257 intended to specifically identify the skills or body of knowledge a student must have in  
258 order to be successful in the target course, and “the determination of whether a student meets  
259 a prerequisite shall be based on successful completion of an appropriate course or on an  
260 assessment using multiple measures” (§55003). Further, the ASCCC asserts that “students are  
261 placed into courses based on their success in prerequisite courses or an assessment process that  
262 involves the use of standardized tests in conjunction with other measures likely to effect the  
263 student’s performance (Student Success: The Case for Establishing Prerequisites Through  
264 Content Review, 2010). In other words, all placement decisions require the use of multiple  
265 measures.

266  
267 Although prerequisites have long been a useful tool with which faculty can increase the  
268 likelihood of student success in their courses, recent events have brought a renewed sense  
269 of importance and interest in their use. Notably, the final recommendations from the  
270 Student Success Task Force in 2011 include Recommendation 3.3, incentivizing students  
271 to “begin addressing basic skills deficiencies in the first year.” Data from Achieving the  
272 Dream Initiative (November, 2013,) support the fact that students who take their remedial  
273 courses in the first term are more successful in all subsequent courses.

274

275 Multiple Measures should contribute to the success of placement, especially in  
276 prerequisite courses. However, placing prerequisites on courses does not guarantee the  
277 successful of completion of target course unless the curriculum is aligned. Research by  
278 Rob Johnstone indicates that prerequisites make students successful in sequential courses  
279 if curriculum is aligned, but only significantly so if the student earns an A or B in the  
280 prerequisite class. (Johnstone, R. 2013) . It is clear that multiple measures are  
281 necessary for accurate placement in prerequisite courses.

282 **Making Placement Decisions With Multiple Measures**

283 All measures used for placement should be scrutinized and adopted based on available  
284 data rather than ease and portability alone. One way to address this issue is to have each  
285 college create a process to validate all measures, not just standardized assessments.  
286 However, some colleges may not be readily able to provide logistical regression or  
287 statistical models for their own student populations. For this reason, to some extent a  
288 statewide examination of these individual measures and their reliability should be  
289 conducted and made accessible to individual colleges. However, recognition of the  
290 unique curriculum alignment factors and local populations places a heavy responsibility  
291 on the local colleges to review the data and use it appropriately.

292 Locally, colleges, in consultation with their academic senates, should have a written  
293 process for validation and a written process for placement that involve discipline-specific  
294 faculty and student affairs areas. Discussions should include at a minimum content of  
295 courses, level of rigor, and college-level skill requirements such as writing, research,  
296 expectations, and hours of work outside of class. The process should include built-in  
297 mechanisms to collect data relevant to placement and success. This work usually requires  
298 the involvement of a researcher who is part of the discussions from the early stages of  
299 development.

300

### 301 **Multiple Measures in Conjunction With a Common Assessment Test**

302 In recent years, many individuals and interested groups have called for placement results  
303 that are portable among the colleges. The Board of Governors of the California  
304 Community Colleges has asserted the value of portable placement results, and  
305 Recommendation 2.1 of the 2011 Student Success Task Force stated that “Community  
306 colleges will develop and implement a common centralized assessment for English  
307 reading and writing, mathematics, and ESL.” A common assessment and individualized  
308 cut scores can to some extent facilitate the goal of establishing portable placement results,  
309 but the integration of such a common instrument with multiple measures is a challenge.  
310 One goal of this paper and the ongoing research is to explore a multiple measures  
311 approach that is both portable and accurate.

312 A system of portable placement decisions could benefit the students and the state in  
313 various ways. Currently, each California community college district selects and  
314 implements its own placement system. While certain popular instruments may be  
315 common to multiple districts, great variety still exists. Moreover, even if districts share a  
316 particular assessment instrument, they may not accept each other’s placement decisions:  
317 Each district may interpret and apply test results differently and may use different  
318 multiple measures to make placement decisions. Students, therefore, are often forced to  
319 re-test and are assigned a new placement result when they move among colleges. A  
320 system of portable placement would benefit students and create greater consistency by  
321 eliminating the need for retesting and re-placement at each college. Such a system would  
322 be especially useful to the many students who take courses at more than one college and  
323 might enable easier student movement among community colleges. In addition,  
324 community colleges and the state would experience cost savings if the number of  
325 assessment tests taken could be reduced by making placement portable and minimizing or  
326 eliminating the need for retesting.

327 California already has some tools in place which may help to facilitate the creation of a  
328 system of portable placement results. Work on developing a common assessment



329 instrument is already underway. Curricular comparability through use of the CB 21  
330 rubrics and the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) system may also allow  
331 for or encourage a more universal placement system. However, the application of  
332 multiple measures must also be a part of any discussion that hopes to achieve portable  
333 placement results.

334  
335 In working toward a statewide application of multiple measures, California might find  
336 useful examples in work that is underway in other states. “An example of weighted  
337 multiple measures is currently being worked out in New Jersey. A number of New  
338 Jersey’s community colleges have begun utilizing ‘decision zones’—a range of scores  
339 below the state-agreed-upon cutoff scores within which colleges can use additional  
340 measures to determine placement. The state will track outcomes for the different  
341 measures and use their findings to further inform statewide policy improvements.  
342 Additionally, the New Jersey Department of Education plans to match high school  
343 graduation and college readiness standards. Under this system, students who meet  
344 proficiency levels on the state high school exit exam, SAT, ACT, or newly developed  
345 end-of course assessments will be permitted to enroll directly in college coursework”  
346 (CCRC RESEARCH OVERVIEW 2013, p. 5). These efforts in New Jersey demonstrate  
347 one way in which a state may achieve agreement on the application of some measures  
348 and provide a more consistent overall placement framework.

349 Agreement on the use of multiple measures in portable placement results for the  
350 California community college system could take various forms. One possibility is that  
351 colleges would reach concurrence on a consistent system of multiple measures that all  
352 institutions would accept. Such discussions might best begin regionally, as colleges in a  
353 given area might compare the measures they are using and find that they are applying  
354 different processes that achieve the same or similar results. In the absence of statewide  
355 consensus and portability, the creation of regional agreements could provide significant  
356 benefit to students, as many students who move among various colleges would be most  
357 likely to do so within a given geographic area, and institutions would still experience  
358 specific cost savings through a reduction of re-testing. Such regional agreements might  
359 also, over time, lead to broader discussions that create state-level portability.

360  
361 Alternatively, colleges might develop their own applications of the common placement  
362 instrument and of multiple measures and then agree to accept and trust the results of other  
363 institutions. In such an instance, the use of multiple measures may help community  
364 colleges to tailor the common assessment instrument to meet local needs. Local  
365 community colleges could control the use of validated local multiple measures that they  
366 determine are relevant for student placement in their communities. If colleges agree to  
367 honor the placement results that student bring from other institutions, then a system of

368 portable placement would result without requiring specific agreement on the application  
369 of the assessment instrument or of multiple measures.

370

371 However, the concept of portable placement does raise issues for many within the  
372 California community college system. Certainly colleges within the system strive toward  
373 comparability in curriculum and standards through such projects as the CB 21 rubrics, the  
374 C-ID system, and the Transfer Model Curricula for the Associate Degrees for Transfer.  
375 Nevertheless, with 112 institutions and nearly 2 ½ million students spread out across  
376 more than 150,000 square miles, each district and even colleges within a district have  
377 their own unique populations to serve and issues to address. Portable placement is  
378 challenging when one considers the diversity of course offerings for unique student  
379 populations and innovations for student course completion. Based on such factors as  
380 compressed calendars, accelerated coursework, and different instructional modalities,  
381 individual multiple measures may take on different meaning even within a given  
382 discipline.

383

384 Given the wide variety of communities and cultures found throughout the state, the  
385 concept of local control over decision-making is a fundamental value to many within the  
386 community college system. Any discussion of common assessment or portable  
387 placement must be weighed against the importance of local control and should strive to  
388 respect this concept to the greatest extent reasonable while still serving the needs of both  
389 students and the state as a whole.

390

391 **Collaboration in the local determination of Multiple Measures and placement**  
392 **processes.**

393 Whereas the regulatory framework of Title 5 provides colleges and districts with  
394 information what is required and prohibited with respect to multiple measures  
395 assessment, it does not give guidance to colleges and districts on what measures to use or  
396 how to interpret individual or aggregated measurements. The professional judgment of  
397 discipline faculty and counseling faculty is necessary to fashion a multiple measures  
398 assessment process that maximizes students' likelihood of success in the courses in which  
399 they are placed.

400 While research on community college placement processes supports the use of multiple  
401 measures, integrating multiple measures into placement processes is not without costs  
402 and challenges. Multiple measures need to be carefully examined and matched to the  
403 needs of particular college communities so that local colleges can extend resources and  
404 time to validate their measures. Discipline faculty and counseling faculty. As well as the



405 local academic senate need to ensure that the multiple measures selected by their college  
406 contribute meaningfully to the placement process. All parties involved with placement of  
407 students need to evaluate the ways in which the use of multiple measures fits into existing  
408 placement processes and to incorporate a periodic review on the efficacy of the multiple  
409 measures.

410 Academic senates, which have responsibility for making recommendations about  
411 academic and professional matters regarding “standards or policies regarding student  
412 preparation and success,” play an important role facilitating and developing  
413 recommendations about multiple measures assessment. The purpose of this section is to  
414 provide context and structure for academic senate leaders, discipline faculty, and  
415 counselors as they develop local multiple measures policies and procedures.

416  
417 As discipline experts, the faculty in the areas being assessed have several roles to play in  
418 the assessment for placement process. In developing the college’s placement system,  
419 discipline faculty can determine the skill sets that are needed for success in target courses  
420 and with research partners can determine the best use of multiple measures along with  
421 cut-off scores for assessment tests. In addition, the reliability of all measures should be  
422 routinely evaluated based on factual outcomes of the placement decisions, including data  
423 indicating what students were placed in what courses by what measures and with what  
424 rates of success. Part of the role of discipline faculty is to discuss the result of the  
425 validation data and cut-off scores and to ensure that placement decisions result in student  
426 success by participating in the evaluation of placement processes. If the college is basing  
427 initial placement decisions on information other than an assessment test, such as using  
428 students’ high school grades, discipline faculty should take responsibility for determining  
429 how that information is applied for placement. Faculty will need to consider how to best  
430 use available, validated data. Content validity is an important aspect of any test such that  
431 discipline faculty need to review and interpret data. Student behaviors and sophistication  
432 are important factors in success, and therefore student affairs professionals should help  
433 interpret data. The data alone, produced by a researcher, do not provide the interpretation  
434 and application. For this reason, collaboration and review are essential. Discipline  
435 faculty must be actively involved in discussions to help validate the alignment of the  
436 methods and the results of the assessment process to the requirements of the coursework  
437 (WestEd, 2012) and must not allow the local researcher to make decisions or reach  
438 conclusions alone. In addition, the reliability of all measures should be routinely  
439 evaluated based on factual outcomes of the placement decisions, including data indicating  
440 what students were placed in what courses by what measures and with what rates of  
441 success. Consistent and ongoing evaluation of the process and its results is crucial to  
442 ensuring the validity and accuracy of the placement system.

443 In some cases, the primary roles of discipline faculty may involve establishing and  
444 evaluating the assessment system, while initial individual placement decisions are  
445 established by the college’s assessment staff based on test results. In other cases, such as  
446 placing students based in English faculty reading placement writing samples, discipline  
447 faculty may themselves determine the initial placement of a student. Regardless of the

448 process and whether their role includes establishment and evaluation of the system or  
449 direct involvement in placement decisions, discipline faculty should take direct  
450 responsibility for the initial placements assigned to students.  
451

452 Approval of a Multiple Measures process can include: the weighting for each of the  
453 measures based on local research; decision matrices clearly demonstrating the roles of  
454 decision makers; discipline faculty determining prerequisites; discussions with research,  
455 admissions, counseling and discipline faculty setting cut scores for assessment tests; and  
456 other measures based upon discussions with counseling, discipline faculty and research.

457 Counselors must be involved in the placement process before final placements are  
458 determined, not as an aspect of an appeal process. As identified in the Standards of  
459 Practice for California Community Colleges Counseling Faculty and Programs (2008),  
460 “academic counseling services include assessment using multiple measures and diagnosis  
461 of students’ academic abilities, disabilities, strengths and weaknesses.” As a result,  
462 counseling faculty are trained to apply those measures and then make placement  
463 recommendations based on a combination of assessment results and the institution’s use  
464 of multiple measures. Counselors need to know how to work with students in exploring  
465 information about their past educational experience, college readiness, possible  
466 disabilities, and academic skills. These questions become crucial when a student places  
467 below transfer-level English and math.”  
468

469 Once initial placement based on discipline faculty expertise and multiple measures  
470 adjustments by trained counselors have been determined, collaboration between  
471 discipline faculty and counselors is crucial. A college must work to effectively ensure  
472 that the application of multiple measures by counseling faculty is resulting in placement  
473 decisions that are comparable to those that would be made by discipline faculty and that  
474 the use of multiple measures does not result in placements inconsistent with the decisions  
475 and standards of discipline experts. While clear guidance can be developed for how to  
476 factor in external exam scores into placement decisions, counseling and discipline faculty  
477 must collaborate to establish a common understanding as to how other measures factor  
478 into such determinations and what steps are taken to verify that the placement process is  
479 effective. No single system of collaboration will work for all colleges, but each  
480 institution must work to create a system in which multiple measures are meaningfully  
481 applied, counseling expertise is respected, and the judgment of the discipline faculty is  
482 utilized.  
483

484 In compiling the necessary data for both establishing and evaluating an accurate  
485 assessment for placement system, college researchers also have a significant role to play.  
486 The knowledge and training of researchers can help to ensure that information used in the  
487 assessment system is valid, complete, and clear. However, the data alone, produced by a  
488 researcher, does not provide the interpretation and application. Student services  
489 professionals and discipline experts must interpret the data, often with guidance from the  
490 college researcher, and take responsibility for final decisions regarding the system. The  
491 college researcher is an important member of the collaborative effort necessary to create



492 and evaluate the placement system, but the final decisions regarding the system should  
493 remain in the hands of faculty experts.

494

### 495 **Varying Approaches to Collaboration Regarding Assessment and Multiple** 496 **Measures**

497

498 The following scenarios show very different local methods of establishing placement  
499 processes and illustrate how discipline faculty, counselors, and researchers can work with  
500 the local senate to establish the multiple measures and the process to place students  
501 accurately into either prerequisites or target courses.

502

#### 503 Scenario 1

504 Discipline faculty are actively involved in investigating the role placement plays in  
505 student success. Faculty regularly request that cut scores and student success by course  
506 be analyzed or researched. Over the last ten years, student success rates have risen  
507 significantly in all courses in one particular academic sequence. Discipline faculty have  
508 difficulty understanding the counselors' role in placement decisions and decide to review  
509 the multiple measures process. The discipline faculty determine that the best way to  
510 make the use of multiple measures more consistent is to include them as part of the  
511 assessment test in the form of five additional multiple choice questions meant to assess  
512 student motivation and prior achievement. This new assessment practice means that  
513 counselors do not collect additional multiple measures after the assessment test is given  
514 since the multiple measures are included as part of the assessment for all students.  
515 Counselors do not use multiple measures to override assessment test decisions and self-  
516 reported measures are worth very few points in the total assessment score and placement  
517 process.

518

#### 519 Scenario 2.

520

521 Each department that uses a test to place students into courses is asked to generate what  
522 they intend their multiple measure process to be. At this point, each department has an  
523 entirely separate set of desired measures. Next, the senate works with the counselors and  
524 the college committee structure to hold a Multiple Measures Retreat. At this retreat the  
525 relevant Title 5 sections are discussed and the intent of multiple measures is presented.  
526 At the meeting, the participants determine to create a single survey—called the “Student  
527 Success Inventory”—that can be given prior to assessment and that will address as many  
528 multiple measure points as possible. Each assessment test might only use a few questions  
529 from the survey, but collectively the survey is both concise and can be used from multiple  
530 areas.

531 The survey is fully vetted by the local Assessment and Matriculation Committee and is  
532 approved by the Academic Senate. The role of counseling is the subject of much  
533 discussion, but ultimately the college leaves the decision to each individual department.  
534 Some, such as mathematics, are comfortable with giving counselors considerable latitude  
535 to use their professional judgment, but other departments, such as Learning Assistance,  
536 desire a specific points-based model that leaves little authority to the individual evaluator.

537



538 The Scenarios depict that all colleges have different processes for establishing local  
539 processes. While the use of multiple measures is supported by the research on  
540 community college placement processes, integrating multiple measures into placement  
541 processes is not without costs and challenges. Multiple measures need to be carefully  
542 examined and matched to the needs of particular college communities, so local colleges  
543 can extend resources and time to validate their measures. Discipline faculty, counseling  
544 faculty, and the local academic senate need to be certain that the multiple measures  
545 selected by their college contribute meaningfully to the placement process. All parties  
546 involved with placement of students need to evaluate the ways in which the use of  
547 multiple measures fits into existing placement processes and to build in periodic review  
548 of how well the placement process results in student success.  
549

550 **Recommendations for Local Senates (See checklist of recommendations in Appendix**  
551 **X**

- 552 • Ensure that assessment procedures and the way placement decisions are made are  
553 clearly communicated to students. Students should be informed about the entire  
554 set of multiple measures that are being used to assess their level of knowledge and  
555 skill and how those multiple measures will be analyzed.  
556
- 557 • Ensure that multiple measures are applied consistently for all students.  
558
- 559 • Collect multiple measures before students complete assessment tests or as part of  
560 the assessment test process so that multiple measures are being applied to all  
561 students who are assessed, not just those who appeal their assessments.  
562
- 563 • Use measures that have a high degree of predictive validity. This may require  
564 longitudinal analysis of the predictive value of specific measures within service  
565 areas. Some communities may find relatively high predictive validity for high  
566 school math grades whereas in other communities that measure may be less  
567 useful.  
568
- 569 • Involve discussions by the local senate and discipline faculty at each college.  
570
- 571 • Create a local selection of validated measures policy and data.  
572
- 573 • Include periodic review of multiple measures assessment policies  
574
- 575 • Provide discipline faculty and counselors with information on why certain  
576 multiple measures have been selected for use at the college and the role that

577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588 |

multiple measures can play in accurate placement.

- Strive to produce an objective process and examine carefully the use of local measures that may be overly subjective like interviews.
- Make weighting of multiple measures transparent and research based.
- Consider a regional consortium among the counseling faculty and discipline experts to discuss how assessment outcomes might be portable and accurate

589 Conclusion:

590 The role of multiple measures is to enable an institution to look at a variety of  
591 characteristics to successfully place each student in the courses best suited to his or her  
592 skills and abilities. Multiple measures are clearly mandated, and yet they are a challenge  
593 to implement. Institutions must rely upon multiple measures rather than a single test or  
594 any other single measure because research has shown that no single measure is fair or  
595 adequate to make the complex prediction about a student's success. Data collected on the  
596 practices of CCCs demonstrates that no real consistency exists in what measures are used  
597 or how multiple measures are implemented at different colleges. Other than the common  
598 use of commercial tests, the similarities of multiple measures among the CCCs is very  
599 small.

600 While the necessity to use more than one measure is undeniably supported by Title 5  
601 requirements and by research, the determination of which set of measures to use is much  
602 more complicated. The value of the multiple measures vary when they are applied to  
603 different courses, diverse colleges, and dissimilar students. Once the multiple measures  
604 are decided upon, the application of the measures varies depending upon the policies of  
605 the colleges. Some colleges rely wholly upon discipline faculty, while other colleges rely  
606 more heavily on counselors. Some colleges value objective measures, other colleges see  
607 the importance of including subjective measures with objective data, and still other  
608 colleges allow student self-placement.  
609

610 The low success rate in the classes where placement is most controlled should challenge  
611 us to sharpen our use of multiple measures and to do more research, to work more  
612 collegially, and to make better decisions based upon more data. Because this work is not  
613 simple, the task demands collaborative thinking and cooperation between student services  
614 and instruction. The significant costs to the student and the institution should lead  
615 colleges to pursue better research targeting the viability of multiple measures and to make  
616 a commitment to develop policies that evaluate the success of multiple measure  
617 placements. Many of these issues are being studied as this paper is being finalized.  
618 Prompt follow-up to this paper may be necessary, with more published information  
619 describing statewide studies examining the use of high school data and other multiple  
620 measures,

621

622

623 **References**

624

625 CCRC RESEARCH OVERVIEW Designing Meaningful Developmental Reform  
626 February 2013  
627 [http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/designing-meaningful-developmental-](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/designing-meaningful-developmental-reform-research-overview.pdf)  
628 [reform-research-overview.pdf](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/designing-meaningful-developmental-reform-research-overview.pdf))

629 .

630 A Framework for Evaluating the Technical Quality of Multiple Measures Used in  
631 California Community College Placement Rachel Lagunoff, Hillary Michaels,  
632 Patricia Morris, and Pamela Yeagley at WESTEd  
633 <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/SSSP/Matriculation/Assessment/CCCCOMulti>  
634 [pleMeasuresFramework2012.pdf](http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/SSSP/Matriculation/Assessment/CCCCOMulti)

635 Predicting Success in College: The Importance of Placement Tests and High  
636 School Transcripts (February 2012) Belfield and Crosta  
637  
638 [http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/predicting-success-placement-](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/predicting-success-placement-tests-transcripts.pdf)  
639 [tests-transcripts.pdf](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/predicting-success-placement-tests-transcripts.pdf)

640

641 Designing Meaningful Developmental Reform  
642 [http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/designing-meaningful-](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/designing-meaningful-developmental-reform-research-overview.pdf)  
643 [developmental-reform-research-overview.pdf](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/designing-meaningful-developmental-reform-research-overview.pdf)

644 *(This is a good article on the problems with reform in developmental education*  
645 *particularly with reference to placement. The brief shows a large placement error*  
646 *rate produced by using standardized tests by themselves (30% in English and*  
647 *25%% in Math). That error is reduced (in half) by adding HS grades)*

648 Do High-Stakes Placement Exams Predict College Success? By: **Judith Scott-**  
649 **Clayton**

650 **[http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/high-stakes-placement-exams-](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/high-stakes-placement-exams-predict.html)**  
651 **[predict.html](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/high-stakes-placement-exams-predict.html)**

652 Improving the Targeting of Treatment: Evidence from College Remediation  
653 Clayton, Crosta, Belfield Oct 2012 National Bureau of Economic Research  
654 (*Discusses the cost of misplacement on a National Scale.*)  
655 **[www.aeaweb.org/aea/2013conference/program/retrieve.php?pdfid=106](http://www.aeaweb.org/aea/2013conference/program/retrieve.php?pdfid=106)**

656

657 Why Traditional Placement Testing Is Being Replaced by Multiple Measures By  
658 *Brad Bostian* Leadership Extract League of Innovation December 2012, Volume 25,  
659 Number 12

660 **[http://league.org/blog/post.cfm/why-traditional-placement-testing-is-being-](http://league.org/blog/post.cfm/why-traditional-placement-testing-is-being-replaced-by-multiple-measures)**  
661 **[replaced-by-multiple-measures](http://league.org/blog/post.cfm/why-traditional-placement-testing-is-being-replaced-by-multiple-measures)**

662 Multiple Measures Placement – Improving Placement Accuracy with  
663 ACCUPLACER and Background Information (College Board) *The company*  
664 *solution to their inaccuracy*

665 **[http://professionals.collegeboard.com/profdownload/improving-placement-](http://professionals.collegeboard.com/profdownload/improving-placement-accuracy-with-accuplacer-and-background-information.pdf)**  
666 **[accuracy-with-accuplacer-and-background-information.pdf](http://professionals.collegeboard.com/profdownload/improving-placement-accuracy-with-accuplacer-and-background-information.pdf)**

667 Meaningful Access and Support (August 2013) Martha E. Casazza and Sharon  
668 L. Silverman

669

670 **[http://www.cladea.net/white\\_paper\\_meaningful\\_access.pdf](http://www.cladea.net/white_paper_meaningful_access.pdf)**

671 “This paper is a call to action for U.S. colleges and universities and higher  
672 education policymakers to provide meaningful access and academic support for  
673 all students. Meaningful access and academic support are imperative to increase  
674 graduation rates, develop an educated workforce, strengthen the economy, and  
675 compete globally.”

676

677 NADE resolution on Placement Testing Dec 2010 – A Standing and revised resolution

678 **[http://www.nade.net/site/documents/publications/Resolutions/New/Resolution%20%20](http://www.nade.net/site/documents/publications/Resolutions/New/Resolution%20%20Mandatory%20Testing%20and%20Placement%20Final%202.2.11.pdf)**  
679 **[Mandatory%20Testing%20and%20Placement%20Final%202.2.11.pdf](http://www.nade.net/site/documents/publications/Resolutions/New/Resolution%20%20Mandatory%20Testing%20and%20Placement%20Final%202.2.11.pdf)**

680 **[Basic Skills Accountability \(CCCCO.Nov 2012\)](#)**



681 <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/TRIS/Research/Accountability/Basic%20Skills/2012>  
682 [/REPORT BASICKILLS FINAL 110112.pdf](http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/TRIS/Research/Accountability/Basic%20Skills/2012)

683 Research and Practice Group (RP) Perspectives, March 2012, p 3-4)

684

685 CCCAssess: Centralizing Student Assessment in the California Community Colleges,  
686 CCCCO, 2011

687 [Achieving the Dream Supplementary Data for the Five Student Success Elements Bakersfield College](#)  
688 [Nov2013 page 22](#)

689 <http://www.kccd.edu/Educational%20Services/Institutional%20Research/Achieving%20the%20D>  
690 [ream/BC%20ATD%20Student%20Success%20Disaggregated%20Data%20Dec2013.pdf](http://www.kccd.edu/Educational%20Services/Institutional%20Research/Achieving%20the%20D)

691 [and Porterville College Achieving the Dream Supplementary Data for the Five Student Success](#)  
692 [Elements Bakersfield College Nov2013 page 19](#)

693 <http://www.kccd.edu/Educational%20Services/Institutional%20Research/Achieving%20the%20D>  
694 [ream/PC%20ATD%20Student%20Success%20Disaggregated%20Data%20Dec2013.pdf](http://www.kccd.edu/Educational%20Services/Institutional%20Research/Achieving%20the%20D)

695 [and Cerro Coso College Achieving the Dream Supplementary Data for the Five Student Success](#)  
696 [Elements Bakersfield College Nov2013 page 23](#)

697 <http://www.kccd.edu/Educational%20Services/Institutional%20Research/Achieving%20t>  
698 [he%20Dream/CC%20ATD%20Student%20Success%20Disaggregated%20Data%20Dec20](http://www.kccd.edu/Educational%20Services/Institutional%20Research/Achieving%20t)  
699 [13.pdf](http://www.kccd.edu/Educational%20Services/Institutional%20Research/Achieving%20t)

700 [WestEd. \*Types of Multiple Measures Used in California Community College\*](#)  
701 [Mathematics, English, and English as a Second Language Course Placement: Summary](#)  
702 [Report of Survey Results. December 21, 2011 REL West of WestEd. Retrieved 2/3/2014](#)  
703 [from](#)

704 <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/SSSP/Matriculation/Assessment/CCCCOMultipleMea>  
705 [sureSurveyReport2011.pdf](http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/SSSP/Matriculation/Assessment/CCCCOMultipleMea)

706 [Engaging Practitioners in a Culture of Inquiry: A Catalyst for](#)  
707 [Improving Student Outcomes. Presentation, October 2013, Bakersfield](#)  
708 [College, Bakersfield, CA\)](#)

709 [Designing Meaningful Developmental Reform \(February](#)  
710 [2013\)](#)<http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/designing-meaningful->  
711 [developmental-reform-research-overview.pdf\)](http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/designing-meaningful-)

712

713

714

715 Appendix P: Complete Table of Multiple Measures

Measure	Pros	Cons	Additional notes
<b>Assessment using a standardized test</b>			
Specific placement tests taken prior placement in college courses in English, Reading, ESL or Math e.g. Accuplacer, MDTP, CASAS etc. See appendix of 2013 approved assessment for placement tests	Standardized and comparable among students that have taken the test.	A single high stakes test may not reflect all the student's skills and abilities and may introduce testing bias. Accuracy may vary greatly, influenced by curriculum and test content alignment.	Requires cut score validation. Must be approved by CCCCCO. See appendix of approved tests.
California Standards Test (STAR test). This includes the EAP; early assessment program developed by the California State University system for early indicators for high school juniors	Standardized and comparable among students that have taken the test. EAP provides early indicators to allow high school students time to remediate before enrollment in college.	A single high stakes test which may not reflect all the student's abilities.	New testing focused on the common core will not include the EAP. Long Beach City College study indicated little correlation with actual outcomes in LBCC courses.
<b>Prior educational achievement</b>			
Self-reported high school or college GPA	Provides an aggregate measure of student achievement and motivation.	May not be reported accurately.	May be affected by the recency with which the skills or knowledge were acquired and the geographic location of the high school
High school (transcript) College transcript	Provides a documented aggregate measure of student	Concerns about high school GPA inflation and significant differences	In a narrow study at LBCC involving one high school district, researchers reported a high correlation

Measure	Pros	Cons	Additional notes
	achievement and motivation.	among high school practices.	with course success based upon high school course grades as the major placement measure outcomes. Some LBCC faculty question these reported results and note that placement through high school grades raised other significant issues that may have negatively impacted instruction.
Highest level of math, English or ESL	Provides discipline specific achievement .	Same as above.	May be affected by the recency and the alignment of the high school curriculum with the college curriculum.
Any senior level English and/or math course	English and math courses taken in the senior year of high school, when they are not required, are evidence of motivation.	This measure does not indicate a specific course level, but merely the completion of any a course in math or English.	
Advancement Placement (AP) course completion or AP scores or International Baccalaureate (IB) coursework, or test scores in HS	Provides discipline specific information about motivation and achievement,	Same as above,	Same as above,
<b>Demographics and socioeconomic status</b>			
Age	In some disaggregated data, age is correlated with success or lack of success.	This data is not consistent across ages or among specific discipline success.	Students claiming skills upgrade as their educational goal have very different outcomes by age than the general population.

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>	<b>Additional notes</b>
Units planned	Evidence suggests that full-time status results in better success and part-time status results in poorer success,	Evidence in this area is limited and may not take into consideration other factors regarding full-time vs. part-time performance such as the economic or family conditions that allow full-time enrollment.	Planned units within a specific time frame are not always represented of the actual units completed.
Hours employed	Directly relates to student effort in CCSSE where limited work hours positively influence success.	This measure is self-reported and may therefore raise questions of accuracy. Work hours and times may vary having a positive effect during one period of time and a negative effect at another period of time.	The direct correlations are unknown and may involve many other factors and variables such as the actual hours and days worked or the relationship of work to the courses and content studied.
First Generation status (highest level of parental education)	Provides insight into student support needs but in no way assumes or predicts a student's ability.	Does not directly relate to skills and knowledge. This measure may reflect more on institutional support and outreach than on individual success.	many data sources indicate when student capability is evident (even measured through diagnostic testing), success is more influenced by support than student performance. CCCs are currently examining more data to understand this variable.
Socioeconomic status (PELL grant or BOG recipient)	Provides insight into student support needs.	Does not directly relate to skills and knowledge.	Complex variable influenced by work hours and family responsibilities, but data indicates lower

Measure	Pros	Cons	Additional notes
			income students have a more difficult time with completion.
Parenthood or direct family responsibilities	Provides insight into student support needs and student responsibility.	Must be self-reported and may therefore raise questions of accuracy; potential time management issues.	Direct correlations are unclear. Some data in STEM indicates single parents have better success rates in CTE courses.
<p>Understanding motivational and maturity factors of students is complex and involves factors that have a potential of encouraging bias. The CCRC paper <i>Designing Meaningful Developmental Reform</i> (February 2013) asserts, “demographic variables such as gender, age, race, or ethnicity, which may have predictive value but would be unethical to consider in placement decisions.” Concerns exist that these socioeconomic factors may result in biased or discriminatory placement. On the other hand, these factors may provide useful prognostic data concerning the student service needs that then result in greater success.</p>			
<b>Affective measures</b>			
Motivation (self-reported)	Provides students’ own assessment of motivation level.	Self-reported information is very subjective.	Level of honesty may vary and motivation may vary based on circumstances; may fluctuate during the term.
Declaration of a major	Research indicates this correlates with success.	Declaration of a major is only helpful if it is a committed declaration.	Accuracy issues arise in the selection, recording, and changing of a major.
<b>Other measurable factors that contribute to academic success</b>			
Degrees, classifications or certifications	Completion of a series of study provides an aggregate measure of the student’s ability to complete academic goals in the same way a HS diploma provides	Not all degrees and certificates provide the same level of information.	Some military training or proprietary schools have a lower degree of rigor or focus on skills without background.



Measure	Pros	Cons	Additional notes
	information relevant to attendance and overall life success.		
Internships	Internships correlate well with success where content and skills are aligned.	The breadth and depth of the student's abilities are difficult to truly assess in order to place them in a specific course or program.	
Computer skills	Predictor of success.	This factor is commonly referred to as the "digital gap" and may measure socioeconomic status rather than student abilities.	Use of this as a multiple measure may result in bias, preferentially advantaging those with more money and access to personal computers and technology.
Program of study - Student education plan that begins in 8 <sup>th</sup> grade or HS and extends through college	Correlated with success.	Depends upon rigor, content, and alignment of the plan with realistic student goals.	SEPs vary widely with regard to quality and investment.
Employment history	Direct knowledge and skills correlation results in great success.	Lack of alignment of employment and course expectations may not correlate or contribute to course success.	May contribute to maturity and better success in many situations not just course taking.

716

717

718 Appendix W

719 Current Commonly Used Multiple Measures Summarized from the CCCC Survey as

720 Analyzed by WestEd 2011 (N= 59 of 112 colleges)

<u>Tests used for placement and the disciplines they are used for</u>	<u>Percent of respondents using this</u>
	<u>Total 57 of 59 (85%) colleges used tests</u>
<u>Accuplacer - English, Reading, Writing, ESL</u>	<u>68% (but varies depending on discipline it is used for e.g. only a few use this for ESL)</u>
<u>CELSA - ESL</u>	<u>42%</u>
<u>COMPASS - Math, Reading, Writing and ESL</u>	<u>33%</u>
<u>CTEP - Reading and writing</u>	<u>16%</u>
<u>MDTP -Math</u>	<u>36%</u>
<u>Locally developed multiple choice - Math, Reading, Writing and ESL</u>	<u>14%</u>
<u>Locally developed performance test - Math, Reading, Writing and ESL</u>	<u>16%</u>
<u>Educational Background Information</u>	<u>Percent of respondents using this</u>
	<u>Total 48 of 59 (81%) colleges used ed background</u>
<u>Length of time out of school</u>	<u>60%</u>
<u>Highest level of educational attainment</u>	<u>64%</u>
<u>High school GPA</u>	<u>79%</u>
<u>General Proficiency in math</u>	<u>44%</u>
<u>Grade in last math class completed</u>	<u>88%</u>
<u>Highest math course completed</u>	<u>90%</u>
<u>Length of time since last math class</u>	<u>79%</u>
<u>General Proficiency in reading and</u>	<u>44%</u>

writing	
<u>Grade in last English class completed</u>	<u>81%</u>
<u>Highest English course completed</u>	<u>52%</u>
<u>Number of years of high school English</u>	<u>63%</u>
<u>Plans Goals, and Experience</u>	<u>Percent of respondents using this</u> <u>Total 44 of 59 (75%) colleges used ed background</u>
<u>Student's Ed Goals</u>	<u>80%</u>
<u>Student's choice of major</u>	<u>68%</u>
<u>Number of units student plans to enroll in</u>	<u>77%</u>
<u>Highest math course student plans to take</u>	<u>48%</u>
<u>Time of day attending</u>	<u>45%</u>
<u>Students attitude toward studying</u>	<u>55%</u>
<u>Planned hours to study</u>	<u>61%</u>
<u>College Education</u>	<u>Percent of respondents using this</u> <u>Total 44 of 59 (75%) colleges used ed background</u>
<u>College GPA</u>	<u>50%</u>
<u>College units completed</u>	<u>50%</u>
<u>College degree earned (foreign)</u>	<u>55%</u>
<u>Other Characteristics</u>	<u>Percent of respondents using this</u>

	<u>Total 42 of 59 (71%) colleges used ed background</u>
<u>Age</u>	<u>55%</u>
<u>Veteran Status</u>	<u>60%</u>
<u>Importance of college to student</u>	<u>67%</u>
<u>Importance of college closest to student</u>	<u>55%</u>
<u>Hours employed</u>	<u>67%</u>
<u>time spent in extracurricular activities</u>	<u>36%</u>
<u>Time devoted to family commitments</u>	<u>38%</u>
<u>Perseverance with academic challenge</u>	<u>48%</u>
<u>Time spent reading English</u>	<u>48%</u>
<u>Ease of reading/writing in English</u>	<u>45%</u>

721

722



723 Appendix X: Questions to ask to begin your placement process using multiple measures.

- 724 • What is your college's placement process?
- 725 • Does your college have an assessment and matriculation committee?
- 726 • Is your college's placement process based on data?
- 727 • Who decides the placement?
- 728 • Who communicates the assessment procedures and the way placement decisions  
729 are made?
- 730 • How do students find out which multiple measures are being used to assess their  
731 level of knowledge and skill and how those multiple measures will be analyzed?
- 732 • Is your college's process consistent?
- 733 • Is it used on all students?
- 734 • Do your college's multiple measures have predictive validity?
- 735 • Has the college determined the placement decisions results are successful  
736 regardless of who makes them?
- 737 • Who was involved in deciding which multiple measures are used on your  
738 campus?
- 739 • Does your college have a local selection of validated measures policy and data?
- 740 • Does the college use a periodic review of multiple measures assessment policies?
- 741 • Are discipline faculty and counselors given information on why certain multiple  
742 measures have been selected for use at the colleges?
- 743 • Are discipline faculty and counselors given information on the role that multiple  
744 measures can play in accurate placement?
- 745 • Does your college use interviews? If so, has there been a review of the placement  
746 decisions and the success values to determine whether or not the interviews  
747 improve the process?
- 748 • Is your college communicating with the local high schools?
- 749 • Have you talked to other local colleges in your area to determine what placement  
750 processes they are using?

751 | \_\_\_\_\_

752





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Discipline List Handbook		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: III. D.	
		Attachment: Yes	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Michelle Grimes-Hillman	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the proposed Discipline List Handbook to forward to the Spring Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

### BACKGROUND:

*(Please include the following components: issue, implication, analysis, relevant ASCCC positions/resolutions/policies, or any other useful data or information.)* The Executive Committee reviewed the first draft of the Disciplines List Handbook at its January meeting and provided feedback, which was incorporated into the attached version of the document.

In the first draft, the Standards and Practices Committee made several recommendations to the process including changing the review cycle to annual. The Executive Committee rejected changing the cycle to be annual and other specific recommendations. Those improvements to the process that were not rejected by the Executive Committee are noted in red. The Executive Committee will discuss the Handbook and determine whether the handbook is ready to move forward to the body for adoption.

---

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





## Disciplines List Revision Handbook

### Purpose

In spring of 2013, the delegates passed resolution 10.07 requesting that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) consolidate information related to the Disciplines List Process to ensure that all pertinent information to the process is consistent, housed in one place, and can be used by both faculty at large and the Standards and Practice Committee (S&P). In response to this resolution and to the need to ensure that the process is clear and effective, the S&P Committee prepared this handbook to provide faculty members with a guide to the disciplines review process.

### Background

The California Community Colleges System replaced its former credentialing system with a system of Minimum Qualifications in 1990. The document listing the minimum qualifications (*Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*) is commonly called the Disciplines List. Faculty members recommend changes and/or revisions to existing disciplines or additions to the List), and the Academic Senate facilitates hearings and voting on the changes. Once the process has been completed, the Academic Senate consults with the Chancellor's Office on the changes and additions, and a recommendation is forwarded to the Consultation Council for review and then to the Board of Governors for adoption.

In the late 1980s, the Academic Senate developed a process for determining the initial minimum qualifications for faculty to teach at a California community college. Since that time, the ASCCC developed and continuously refines the review process to determine the disciplines. Currently, every two years, the ASCCC conducts a process to determine what changes, if any, are needed to bring the Disciplines Lists up to date. Local academic senates, colleges and districts, students, professional organizations, other interested parties, and Chancellor's Office staff are solicited for recommendations to change the Disciplines Lists.

Recently, delegates raised concern regarding the Discipline List Revision process and passed the following resolution:

#### 10.07 S13 Improvements to the Disciplines List Process

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges reviews the Disciplines List in the Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges every two years to recommend additions and changes to the Board of Governors;

Whereas, During every two-year cycle the Academic Senate evaluates the process used to revise the disciplines list and makes modifications as necessary (e.g., recommending a new category requiring a "Specific Bachelor's degree or Associate Degree List" during the last review);

Whereas, Transparency, awareness, participation, and a thorough understanding of the Disciplines List review process is difficult since the process only occurs every two years; and

## Disciplines List Revision Handbook

Whereas, While the current Discipline List Revision Process provides directions and timelines to the field, there is limited information about the entire process including the roles and responsibilities of Senate committees and how the Executive Committee makes determinations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges consolidate the information in the three Disciplines List Process documents, and pertinent information from the paper, *Disciplines List Review Process* (Academic Senate Standards and Practices Committee, 2004) to create a *Disciplines List Process Faculty Handbook* to ensure all pertinent information to the process is consistent, housed in one place, and can be used by both faculty at large and the Standards, Equity, Access, and Practice Committee to ensure clarity and effectiveness of the process; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work to perfect the Disciplines List Process so that it is more inclusive and thorough to ensure that recommendations to the Board of Governors are based on the perspective of a broad group of faculty and not the voices of a few.

### Process

#### *History*<sup>1</sup>

Below is a chronological listing of the development of the Disciplines List:

- The complete disciplines list was designed to replace the system of credentials that was in force until June 30, 1990.
- The relevant sections of Education Code were adopted by the Legislature in September 1988 as part of AB 1725, the community college reform bill.
- Significant amendments were made by AB 2155 and SB 1590 (1989), SB 2298 (1990), and SB 343 (1993). Faculty internship programs were authorized by SB 9 (1991).
- The Disciplines List was adopted in July 1989 and has been revised 11 times (1990, 1991, 1993, 1996, 1999, 2002, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2013)<sup>2</sup>.
- Separate from the Disciplines List, Title 5 regulations specify minimum qualifications for certain other faculty members, including health service professionals, non-credit instructors, apprenticeship instructors, DSPS personnel, EOPS personnel, learning assistance and tutoring coordinators, and work experience coordinators.

Prior to 1989, the California Community College Board of Governors delegated the Disciplines List Revision process to the Academic Senate and adopted the following Education Code language.

---

<sup>1</sup> The full history of the Disciplines List Revision process is provided in the ASCCC adopted 2004 publication *Discipline List Review Process* found on the Senate's website at <http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/DisciplinesListReview2004.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Archived editions of the Disciplines List are available on the ASCCC website at <http://asccc.org/disciplines-list-archives>.

## Disciplines List Revision Handbook

### Education Code §87357

In establishing and maintaining minimum qualifications pursuant to Section 87356, the board of governors shall do all of the following:

(1) With regard to minimum qualifications for faculty, consult with, and rely primarily on the advice and judgment of, the statewide Academic Senate, and with regard to minimum qualifications for instructional or student service administrators, consult with, and rely primarily on the advice and judgment of, an appropriate statewide organization of administrators. In either case, the board of governors shall provide a reasonable opportunity for comment by other statewide representative groups.

(2) The board of governors shall establish a process to review at least every three years the continued appropriateness of the minimum qualifications, and the adequacy of the means by which they are administered. The process shall provide for the appointment of a representative group of community college faculty, administrators, students, and trustees to conduct or otherwise assist in the review, including particularly, representatives of academic senates, collective bargaining organizations, and statewide faculty associations. In addition, the group shall be broadly representative of academic and vocational programs in the curriculum from both urban and rural districts, and representative of ethnic minority communities.

(b) The board-of governors, relying primarily upon the advice and judgment of the statewide Academic Senate, shall prescribe by regulation a working definition of the term "discipline" and shall prepare and maintain a list of disciplines that are "reasonably related" to one another, as that phrase is used in the minimum qualifications. The initial list shall be distributed to the community college districts by July 1, 1989, for their use in applying the minimum qualifications for hire.

In formulating advice and recommendations to the board of governors regarding the definition of the term "discipline," the statewide Academic Senate shall consult with appropriate statewide organizations representing administrators and faculty collective bargaining agents. The statewide Academic Senate shall incorporate the advice of those groups into its recommendations to the board of governors, particularly as it relates to the practical ramifications of any proposed definition of the term "discipline" on issues of reassignment, transfer, and reduction in force.

The board of governors, relying primarily upon the advice and judgment of the statewide Academic Senate, shall prepare and maintain a list of disciplines in which the master's degree is not generally expected or available. The initial list shall be distributed to the community college districts by July 1, 1989, for their use in applying the minimum qualifications for hire.



## Disciplines List Revision Handbook

### *Disciplines List Process*

In February, every even year, the Senate will distribute the Disciplines List Process to the field. A packet of information about the process including procedure and timeline are sent to a wide variety of constituents including local senate presidents, college presidents, chief instructional officers, curriculum chairs, human resources officers, and discipline professional organizations informing them of the opportunity to propose a change to the Disciplines List. At this point, local senates, discipline or professional organizations, may begin submitting proposals.

**Local Senate proposal:** Any faculty member may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List. The local senate must approve and forward any such proposal, which is demonstrated by the signature of the local senate president to acknowledge local senate support.

**Recognized Discipline or professional organization:** Any member of a statewide organization that represents a discipline or profession may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List. The members of the organization should discuss proposals. The governing body of the organization must approve the recommendation. The organization's president must sign the Disciplines List Change Proposal Form.

In March, the Discipline Process and any proposed changes are discussed at the state level including discussions at Area meetings, plenary breakout sessions, and reinforced by *Rostrum* articles or other communications.

**Proposal Deadline:** The deadline for submitting proposals is September 30 each even year. This allows for initiators of proposals to work with S&P to refine the proposal and ensure that all evidence and supporting documentation is substantive and accurate. Please note that if the proposals does not meet all the requirement and cannot have two hearing, the proposal will be postponed until the next two-year cycle.

### *Proposals*

Any Disciplines List proposal must be submitted on the appropriate form (see Appendix). As noted on the form, the proposal must have the following evidence. This evidence is essential because it provides the S&P Committee, the Executive Committee, and the delegates with the rationale about why the change is needed as well as inform the field that the research has been completed to ensure that the change is necessary.

Required investigation of the following and statement of findings:

- Contact with the professional organization to determine support of proposal
- Evidence of degrees
  - Minimum of three
  - Regionally accredited institutions (all public institutions in California)
  - Disciplines in the Master's List requires evidence of the availability of masters degrees



## Disciplines List Revision Handbook

- Disciplines in the Non-masters List requires evidence of the availability of degree, certification, and/or professional experience, if necessary
- Statewide Need
  - Balance across the state (North/South)
  - Discipline second from another district
  - Impact across the state
- Impact of Proposal
  - List the pro and con arguments
  - Include refutation of the con arguments
- Other evidence such as significant changes to the field that requires a change to the Disciplines List.

### *Submission*

Once a proposal is received by the Senate Office, it is reviewed by staff to ensure that all the information is complete and includes the revision, contact information, appropriate signatures and rationale. The Senate Office will also check to ensure that the proposal has not previously been considered and rejected by the delegates at a plenary session or, if it has, it is supported by a new rationale. The proposal is then sent to the S&P Chair to review the Senate Office information and to ensure that the proposal meets the initial requirements of the Disciplines List review process as well as to verify that the proposal is not being submitted to deal with a district-specific problem that does not apply broadly. If there are any concerns with the proposal, the S&P Chair, working with the S&P Committee, will immediately follow up with the initiator.

The initiator or designee must be present at each hearing. A proposal must be presented twice to the field at separate, but not necessarily subsequent, hearings at plenary sessions.

### **Roles and Responsibilities**

#### *Initiator*

In an effort to ensure that the proposal process is smooth and efficient, the initiator of the proposal should ensure that the proposal is clear and complete. A complete proposal will provide all the information requested on the form including any existing language for revisions to the Discipline List or new language for adding a discipline to the Disciplines List. The evidence submitted should provide for the need for the change, degrees offered by CSU/UC or other universities, and any other criteria needed to provide background to those who may or may not be familiar with the issue. The initiator should also respond to any requests for information from the S&P Chair or committee member. If the initiator does not respond in a timely manner to meet deadlines established by S&P, the proposal may not be forwarded to the next hearing. This is extremely important because if questions or requests for information are not provided in a timely manner, the proposal may not have adequate time for review. Finally, the initiator must be present (or send an informed designee) to both hearings where the proposal is presented.

## Disciplines List Revision Handbook

### *S&P Chair*

The S&P Committee Chair should ensure that the Disciplines List Revision process is efficient and the proposals are logical. Specific responsibilities include:

- Oversee the process
- Work with Senate Staff to initiate the process
- Investigate the efficacy of the proposals
- Seek information from the initiator for clarity and/or missing evidence
- Educate the Executive Committee on the process, their role in the process, and potential proposals
- Facilitate the S&P Committee work
- Draft *Rostrum* articles on the process
- Prepare the Executive Committee agenda item for the Disciplines List Revision process and proposals for discussion/action as necessary. This item will include summary report and resolutions when appropriate.

### *Senate Staff*

- Assist the S&P Committee Chair to prepare correspondence and other items as necessary
- Send communication to CEOs, CIOs, Curriculum chairs, local senate presidents, professional organizations, and human resources offices
- Provide clear expectations via timelines developed by the S&P Committee
- Notify in the *Rostrum*, on ASCCC website, and via listservs (senate president, curriculum chairs, as well as C-ID discipline and Chancellor's Office listservs)
- Publish the hearing testimony and documents to the Senate website
- Work with S&P Committee Chair to prepare digest for the Consultation Council, agenda item for the Board of Governors, and update the MQ document
- Collaborate with the Chancellor's Office staff to ensure that the final MQ document is published and available online

### *Standards and Practices Committee*

One of the major responsibilities of the S&P Committee is to oversee the Disciplines List Revision process. Specifically related to this process, the Committee will:

- Receive, review, and work with initiator to clarify proposals
- Prepare proposal a summary report for dissemination to field
- Facilitate hearings and record the testimonies
- Collect testimony and hearing information
- Summarize proposal and prepare report for the Executive Committee and field

In addition, the S&P Committee is responsible for educating the field, local senates, delegates, and the Executive Committee regarding the process and procedures for revising the Discipline's List. This

## Disciplines List Revision Handbook

training includes but is not limited to webinars, breakouts at plenary sessions and other events (Leadership, Curriculum, etc.), regional events, or technical faculty visits.

### *Executive Committee*

The Executive Committee is responsible for forwarding proposals to the body for deliberation. Hence, it is their responsibility to understand the process, procedures, expectations, and their role. This may require that the S&P Committee Chair provide Executive Committee members with training about the process and information about specific proposals. The duty of the Executive Committee is not to approve the revision to the Disciplines List but instead to confirm that the process has been followed and that sufficient evidence exists for the proposal to be debated by the body. Once they have confirmed that the process has been followed and sufficient evidence exists, the Executive Committee will approve sending a resolution forward to the body for deliberation. Through the resolution process, the body will vote on whether to send the revision forward to the Board of Governors for consideration. If an Executive Committee member does have experience in the discipline, he or she should work with his/her college and/or discipline group to inform the discussion and testify at hearings as long as they clearly identify that they are providing input as a discipline expert, not as an Executive Committee member. This is important to reduce the confusion about the role of the Executive Committee, particularly since the Executive Committee is not approving the revision to the Disciplines List but instead only sending the proposal to the body for discussion and debate.

### **Appeal Process**

If a proposal is rejected by the Executive Committee or the body, the initiator may submit a proposal via a resolution through an Area Meeting for discussion and debate. The proposal will need to be modified significantly and include rationale and evidence for why it is being brought forward.

### **Hearings and Testimony**

Every discipline revisions must be heard twice prior to being forwarded to the Executive Committee for consideration. The hearings provide the field with an opportunity to hear the rationale and evidence about why the revision is needed, as well as provide feedback to the initiator. During each hearing, testimony is gathered to inform the field about the need for the revision to the Discipline's List. Changes to the proposal can occur at the hearings but then must be heard again twice in its final form prior to moving forward to the body for debate and possible adoption. In other words, the final proposal must be presented at two hearings.

### **Conditions and Rationale for Changes to the Disciplines List<sup>3</sup>**

The following examples provide conditions and rationale that may establish a need for change to the Disciplines List. The intent of these comments is to provide direction for preparing or reviewing a proposal to change the minimum qualifications for a discipline.

---

<sup>3</sup> Many of the following questions and answers were included in the original ASCCC adopted 2004 publication *Disciplines List Revision Process*.



## Disciplines List Revision Handbook

### *Proposals to Update Language to Reflect New Terminology*

**Condition:** A degree is no longer awarded under the exact name used in the disciplines list. For example, at nearly all California State Universities, what previously was called *Physical Education* is now called *Kinesiology*. The discipline of *Physical Education* is now viewed as a specialization in the field of *Education* and *Kinesiology*.

**Comment:** Although this may be interpreted as a new discipline; in fact, it is actually a revision to the existing discipline. These types of changes are straightforward proposals.

### *Proposals to Create a New Discipline*

**Condition:** A completely new field has developed that truly is not covered in any existing discipline. For example, *peace studies* was added in 2013 when it was established as a discipline.

**Comment:** The proposal would need to demonstrate that the proposed discipline requires its own status and does not belong under an existing discipline.

**Condition:** An area within an existing discipline has evolved such that it should have its own status as a separate discipline. For example, in the 2002 review the argument was made and accepted that *Sign Language, American* should be a separate discipline from *Sign Language/English Interpreting*. They now are separate disciplines (on the non-master's list).

**Comment:** The proposal will need to demonstrate that the newly proposed discipline is indeed distinct from the discipline in which it is presently included.

### *Proposals to Make an Existing Discipline's Minimum Qualifications MORE Restrictive*

**Condition:** To reconsider the appropriateness of a discipline's current minimum qualifications, specifically to make them MORE restrictive. For example, it has been argued that one who possesses a Master's in Creative Writing (usually a Master's in Fine Arts) should not be considered minimally qualified to teach all English courses.

**Comment:** Support for this type of proposal needs to be substantial and well documented. Essentially, this type of proposal argues that the original minimum qualifications are inadequate and that they need to be adjusted. Such action will result in decreasing the number of faculty considered qualified to teach in that discipline. The proposal should focus on making the actual case, rather than assuming that more restrictive minimum qualifications will necessarily improve the quality of teaching within the discipline. Currently, a separate Creative Writing discipline does not exist in the Disciplines List.

### *Proposals to Make a Currently Existing Discipline's Minimum Qualifications LESS Restrictive*



## Disciplines List Revision Handbook

**Condition:** To reconsider the appropriateness of a discipline's current minimum qualifications, specifically to make them LESS restrictive.

**Comment:** As with the proposal to make minimum qualifications more restrictive, the proposal should argue that the original minimum qualifications were too stringent and that they need to be adjusted. Such action will result in increasing the number of faculty considered qualified in that discipline. This proposal should focus on requirements needed to ensure that faculty are qualified to teach in the discipline (or provide services) and not on other expected effects such as increasing the hiring pool. Note that many of the reasons for changing the Disciplines List that have been previously rejected were requests to relax the standards. See the following section for conditions of proposals determined to be unacceptable.

**Condition:** To institutionalize a qualification that is commonly used as an equivalency for a particular discipline.

**Comment:** Authors need to be careful with this one. "Because everyone is already doing it" is not a good reason. The proposal should take the position that expansion of the minimum qualifications for that discipline is appropriate because such qualification really does confer the expertise required to teach within the entire discipline.

**Condition:** A license, credential, or other certification *not already covered by Title 5* has become universally recognized as equivalent to an already named degree.

**Comment:** In the past, many proposals that have been received have **not** been advanced because they are already covered in Title 5. Check there first. For example, Section 53410.1 specifies that a bachelor's degree plus certain professional licenses (i.e., Certified Public Accountant (CPA); Marriage, Family, and Child Counselor; Professional Engineer; Registered Dietician) may be accepted as equal to a master's degree. Title 5 §53417 establishes requirements for licensure or credentials when that license or credential is required for program or course approval. If a license or other credential is not specified in this section of Title 5, then it may be an appropriate matter for the Senate to consider.

*Reasons Considered Unacceptable for Submitting Proposals*

## Disciplines List Revision Handbook

**Condition:** A proposal to delete a discipline because the discipline faculty feel that the minimum qualifications required are inadequate and that there is an existing discipline that is more appropriate.

**Comment:** Before moving forward with this type of proposal, there needs to be a broad discipline discussion across the state. Different regions may be using the disciplines differently—the loss of the discipline for one district may be negligible while in another it might be catastrophic. Rather than deleting the discipline, a more constructive avenue may be to have a discussion of the merits of raising the minimum qualifications. The proposal should focus on requirements needed to ensure that faculty are qualified to teach in the discipline (or provide services) and not on other expected effects such as increasing (or decreasing) the hiring pool. In addition, in a situation where there are overlapping minimum qualifications (e.g. Drama/Theatre Arts and Stagecraft) local faculty can choose which minimum qualifications are attached to their curriculum—effectively they can choose whether or not to use the less restrictive minimum qualification.

**Condition:** A district is having trouble finding qualified candidates within a discipline area and expanding the minimum qualifications would remedy that problem.

**Comment:** This is a district-specific problem and should not be addressed by changing the minimum qualifications for the entire system. To do so could potentially compromise the quality of instruction and other services, as well as the professionalism of faculty.

**Condition:** A district is having trouble finding enough load for certain faculty members, and expanding the disciplines that person's degree qualifies him or her to teach will enable the district to fill their loads.

**Condition:** A new discipline is proposed on the basis of there being a TOP code for it.

**Comments:** TOP codes are developed by the Chancellor's Office as a tracking and bookkeeping mechanism. They are not related to the defined minimum qualifications on the Disciplines List.

The Academic Senate views the mandate to review the "appropriateness of minimum qualifications, and adequacy of the means by which they are administered" (Education Code §87357 (a) (2)), as a professional responsibility to be taken very seriously. Proposals to change minimum qualifications are carefully evaluated, disseminated statewide, and discussed with faculty and consultative groups in open hearings at plenary sessions before decisions are made to endorse recommended changes and forward them to the Board of Governors. The next section outlines the steps of the discipline review process.

More FAQs can be found on the ASCCC website at

[http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Enclosure204\\_MQs\\_FAQs\\_September2008\\_0.doc](http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Enclosure204_MQs_FAQs_September2008_0.doc).

### Resources

Relevant ASCCC papers, documents, *Rostrum* articles, Resolutions as well as relevant regulations, Education Code sections or other legal requirements are included in the appendix.

## Check Lists

### *Initiator's Check List*

The following provides a checklist to facilitate the development of a Disciplines List Revision Proposal. It is recommended that Initiators' use this list to ensure that all the requirements of the process have been met.

#### Check List

- Identified a discipline problem that affects colleges other than my local campus
- Reviewed the information about the Disciplines List Revision process, particular the FAQs
- Discussed with people at other colleges, districts, and areas representing a cross section of faculty to capture urban, suburban and rural colleges
- Discussed with local senate and professional organizations
- Developed a proposal using the approved form ensuring the following information is complete:
  - Discipline Title (if a revision, please include existing title from the MQ document.
  - Selected whether the proposal is for a new or revising an existing discipline
  - Selected one of the following reasons for the proposal:
    1. Create a new discipline
    2. Update language in existing discipline to reflect new terminology
    3. Make minimum qualifications in existing discipline more restrictive
    4. Make minimum qualifications in existing discipline less restrictive
    5. Delete a discipline
- Provided the proposed language including either: the existing minimum qualification language and change using strikeouts and italics for revisions; OR the new language in a clear format similar to existing Disciplines List language.
- Provide the rational for the proposal including the following evidence:
  1. Contact with the professional organization to determine support of proposal
  2. Evidence of degrees
    - Minimum of three
    - Regionally accredited institutions (all public institutions in California)
    - Disciplines in the Master's List requires evidence of the availability of masters degrees
    - Disciplines in the Non-masters List requires evidence of the availability of degree, certification, and/or professional experience, if necessary
  3. Statewide Need
    - Balance across the state (North/South)
    - Discipline seconder from another district
    - Impact across the state
  4. Impact of Proposal
    - List the pro and con arguments
    - Include refutation of the con arguments

## Check Lists

5. Other evidence such as significant changes to the field that requires a change to the Disciplines List (see Conditions and Rational for Changes to the Disciplines List section in this paper)

- Complete contact information including home phone or cell
- Secured local senate approval of the proposal which is verified by the local senate president's signature
- Mailed proposal (or scanned and emailed) to the Senate Office
- Responded to requests within one week (via email or phone)
- Attended two hearing (or sent a designee)
- Received confirmation that the proposal was adopted or not

### ***Standards and Practices Committee Chair***

#### *Ongoing*

- Receive and review proposals ensuring the following (note proposal submission is ongoing throughout the year):
  - The information on the proposal is complete and accurate
  - The proposal does not exceed the scope of the Disciplines List review process
  - The proposal has not previously been considered and rejected by the plenary session or, if it has, it is supported by a new rationale
  - The proposal is not being submitted to deal with a district-specific problem that does not apply broadly
  - Contact the author if any concerns or problems with the proposal are identified

#### *February*

- Work with Senate Office Staff and the S&P Committee to update information, develop timeline, and communicate to the field via email and website
- Draft *Rostrum* article on the process and timelines
- Submit an agenda item for the Executive Committee Agenda to provide members with a study session on the Disciplines List Revision process and their roles and responsibilities

#### *March*

- Work with Area Representatives to include the Disciplines List Revision process on their meeting agendas
- Include a breakout session and hearing is on the spring plenary session schedule

#### *April*



## Check Lists

- Facilitate breakout session and hearing at the spring plenary session
- Record the hearing and collect names, colleges, and positions of individuals testifying

### *May/June*

- Work with Senate Office Staff to develop a digest for the Consultation Council discussion.

### *July*

- Work with Office Staff to submit an agenda item to the Chancellor's Office for first reading by the Board of Governors.

### *September*

- Include a breakout session and hearing on the fall plenary session schedule
- Work with the Standards and Practices Committee to make a recommendation to the Executive Committee about which proposals should move forward ensuring to present all the pertinent information
- Remind the Executive Committee that they only verify that the process was followed and whether to move the proposal forward and not on the proposal itself.
- Prepare a summary document with any new or revised proposals including rationale and any testimony from the hearings that will assist the field in making a decision.
- Submit an agenda item to the Executive Committee for discussion and approval to move the proposals forward. Note: The Executive Committee will only consider moving forward proposals that have had two hearings.
- Work with Office Staff to submit an agenda item to the Chancellor's Office for second reading by the Board of Governors.

### *October*

- Work with Area Representatives to include the summary document on their agenda for discussion
- Draft a *Rostrum* article

### *November*

- Facilitate breakout session and hearing at the spring plenary session.
- Record the hearing and collect names of individuals testifying.

**DISCIPLINES LIST FORM**

**REVISIONS TO DISCIPLINES LIST**

**PLEASE TYPE**

*(Note: Only typed forms will be accepted.)*

**DATE SUBMITTED:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DISCIPLINES LIST TITLE:** \_\_\_\_\_

This proposal is for a  New discipline  
 Revision to existing discipline

Reason for the proposal  Create a new discipline  
 Update language in existing discipline to reflect new terminology  
 Make minimum qualifications in existing discipline more restrictive  
 Make minimum qualifications in existing discipline less restrictive  
 Delete an existing discipline

**PROPOSAL LANGUAGE:** (If this is an existing minimum qualification, please include the original language and change using strikeouts and *italics*).

**RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSAL:**

*Please write a brief explanation of the proposal as an attachment and include documentation of required investigation of the following and statement of findings:*

- Contact with the professional organization to determine support of proposal (if appropriate)
- Evidence of degrees
  - Minimum of three
  - Regionally accredited institutions (all public institutions in California)
  - Disciplines in the Master's List requires evidence of the availability of masters degrees
  - Disciplines in the Non-masters List requires evidence of the availability of degree, certification, and/or professional experience, if necessary
- Statewide Need
  - Balance across the state (North/South)
  - Discipline seconder from another district
  - Impact across the state
- Impact of Proposal
  - List the pro and con arguments
  - Include refutation of the con arguments
- Other evidence such as significant changes to the field that requires a change to the Disciplines List.

Contact person (author of proposal) \_\_\_\_\_

**DISCIPLINES LIST FORM**

Phone number (please provide at least two numbers) \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of College Academic Senate President \_\_\_\_\_

College \_\_\_\_\_

Email \_\_\_\_\_ Date approved by College Academic Senate \_\_\_\_\_

**OR**

Organization \_\_\_\_\_

President \_\_\_\_\_

Date Approved by Organization \_\_\_\_\_ Phone for President \_\_\_\_\_

Add email

**RETURN FORM TO:**

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges  
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 525, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Fax 916.323.9867 Email: [disciplineslist@asccc.org](mailto:disciplineslist@asccc.org)

## DISCIPLINES LIST PROPOSAL PROCESS

### How Changes Are Proposed?

There are two avenues for proposing changes: 1) through a local or district academic senate or 2) through a recognized organization. Although the process for new proposals remains the same, a procedure for resubmissions has been added. For more detailed information about the process, we highly suggest you review the document “Disciplines List Handbook”, which can be accessed on our website at: <http://www.asccc.org/disciplines-list>. Each proposed change should be accompanied by a rationale and must have as its basis at least one of the following criteria:

1. changes within the profession or discipline
2. clarification or elimination of confusion and ambiguity
3. inclusion of new degrees
4. continual use of the equivalency process to hire under a specific discipline
5. assurance of the maximum degree of flexibility for the discipline while maintaining discipline integrity
6. other reason, as fully detailed and justified in the proposal

It is the responsibility of the initiator to include pertinent information concerning the proposed change. Failure to include a coherent rationale for the proposed change is grounds for rejection of the proposal.

### **Newly proposed changes may be submitted:**

#### **1. Through the local/district senate**

- a. Any faculty member may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List.
- b. Local academic senates should engage in discussion regarding the proposals among its faculty.
- c. Local academic senates must approve any/all recommendations before forwarding them to the Academic Senate Office. This local senate president must sign the Discipline List Revision Form.

#### **2. Through a recognized discipline or professional organization**

- a. Any member of the organization may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List.
- b. The organization should hold hearings or engage in discussion regarding the proposals among its members.
- c. The governing body of the organization must approve any/all recommendations before forwarding them to the Academic Senate Office. The president of the organization must sign the Discipline List Revision Form.

### Appeal Process:

If a proposal is rejected by the Executive Committee or the body, the initiator may submit a proposal via a resolution through an Area Meeting for discussion and debate. The proposal will need to be modified significantly and include rationale and evidence for why it is being brought forward.

### Only if

- a new justification and rationale are provided, *AND*
- the Discipline List Revision Form is submitted to the Senate Office by the final deadline – September 30 each even year.
- a resolution is passed at an Area meeting (prior to the second hearing in November during this same year) to include the proposed change in the review and approval process, *OR*



### **DISCIPLINES LIST PROPOSAL PROCESS**

- through the regular resolution process at the Fall Plenary Session during the same year, where the mover must seek approval at the Session to include the proposed change in the review and approval process.

**DISCIPLINES LIST REVIEW PROCESS**  
**Generic Timeline**

Month/Year	Process
February (each even year)	<p><b>Distribution of Process to the field.</b> The Senate Office sends requests for proposals to local senate presidents, college presidents, chief instructional officers, curriculum chairs, human resources officers, and discipline professional organizations informing them of the opportunity to propose a change to the Disciplines List. The material contains information on the process and a timeline for submission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rostrum</b> announcement and description of process</li> <li>• <b>Website</b> posting of announcement and description of process</li> </ul>
March (each even year)	<p><b>Submission of Proposals.</b> Proposals may be submitted to the Senate Office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Through Local Senates:</b> Any faculty member may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List. The local senate must approve and forward any such proposals, with the signature of the local senate president to acknowledge local senate support, to the Senate Office.</li> <li>• <b>Through a recognized discipline or professional organization:</b> Any member of an organization that represents a discipline or profession may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List. The members of the organization should discuss proposals. The governing body of the organization must approve the recommendation. The organization’s president must sign the Disciplines List Change Proposal Form.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discipline process is reinforced through:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussions at Area Meetings</li> <li>• Breakout Discussion at Spring Plenary</li> <li>• Update in <i>Rostrum</i> on the process</li> </ul> <p><b>Initial review BEGINS when proposals are received and continues <u>until the proposal has had two hearings</u>.</b> The Senate Staff and the Standards &amp; Practices Committee perform an initial review of proposals using the following required investigation of the following and statement of findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Contact with the professional organization to determine support of proposal</li> <li>○ Evidence of degrees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minimum of three</li> <li>▪ Regionally accredited institutions (all public institutions in California)</li> <li>▪ Disciplines in the Master’s List requires evidence of the availability of masters degrees</li> <li>▪ Disciplines in the Non-masters List requires evidence of the availability of degree, certification, and/or professional experience, if necessary</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Statewide Need</li> </ul>

**DISCIPLINES LIST REVIEW PROCESS**

**Generic Timeline**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Balance across the state (North/South)</li> <li>▪ Discipline seconder from another district</li> <li>▪ Impact across the state</li> <li>○ Impact of Proposal             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ List the pro and con arguments</li> <li>▪ Include refutation of the con arguments</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Other evidence such as significant changes to the field that requires a change to the Disciplines List.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the proposal must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be complete and accurate;</li> <li>• does not exceed the scope of the Disciplines List review process;</li> <li>• has not previously been considered and rejected by the plenary session or, if it has, it is supported by a new rationale; and</li> <li>• is not being submitted to deal with a district-specific problem that does not apply broadly.</li> </ul> <p><b>Revising Proposals with Problems.</b> Standards &amp; Practices Committee Chair will contact the maker of the proposal to help resolve the problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If problems are resolved to the satisfaction of the Committee, the proposal will be considered.</li> <li>• The maker may withdraw a proposal.</li> </ul>
<p align="center">April (each even year)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process reinforced at Area Meetings.</li> <li>• Executive Committee reviews potential</li> <li>• Prepare <i>Rostrum</i> Article on proposals and process.</li> <li>• The Standards &amp; Practices Committee will prepare summary document to be shared with the Executive Committee and included in the mailings for the Area Meetings. At this point, the summary will <b>not</b> include recommendations from the Executive Committee but instead provide information to the field on the proposals received and to be discussed at the Spring Plenary Session.</li> <li>• Spring Plenary Session—<u>First Hearing</u> on process and any proposals received. All testimony is collected.</li> </ul> <p><i>[Note: At a minimum proposals must be vetted at one of the statewide hearings]</i></p>
<p align="center">September/October (each even year)</p>	<p><b>Second and final call for proposals this cycle.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senates and organizations can submit new proposals or revise proposals already submitted that were found to have problems.</li> <li>• The summary document will be distributed and include all proposals (new and updated). Any testimony information will be included in the summary.</li> <li>• Discussed at Area Meetings.</li> <li>• Any interested party may submit written comments to the Committee, via the Senate Office.</li> </ul>

**DISCIPLINES LIST REVIEW PROCESS**

**Generic Timeline**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standards &amp; Practices Committee will update summary document with any new proposals, which will be included in the mailing for the Area Meetings. The summary will <b>not</b> include recommendations from the Executive Committee but instead provide information to the field on the proposals received and to be discussed at the Fall Plenary Session (even years).</li> </ul>
<b>September 30</b> (each even year)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>No new proposals will be accepted beyond September 30<sup>th</sup> because there are no other opportunities for publication and hearing beyond the November 11<sup>th</sup> date. All proposals submitted beyond the September date will be held over to the next Discipline Review cycle.</b></li> </ul>
September/ October (each even year)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The summary document will be distributed and include all proposals (new and updated). Any testimony information will be included in the summary.</li> <li>Discussed at Area Meetings.</li> <li>Any interested party may submit written comments to the Committee, via the Senate Office.</li> </ul>
November (each even year)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fall Plenary Session—<u>Hearing</u> on process and any proposals received. All testimony is collected. <i>[Note: At a minimum proposals must be vetted at two of the statewide hearings]</i></li> <li>Prepare <i>Rostrum</i> Article on proposals and process</li> </ul>
January/February (each odd year)	<p>Submission to Executive Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Standards &amp; Practices Committee Chair presents the proposals and associated testimony to the Senate Executive Committee including the rationale for those recommendations and any other comments that may assist the Executive Committee in its deliberations.</li> <li>The Senate Executive Committee considers each proposal and recommends that the body either forwards or rejects the proposal to move forward to the Board of Governors.</li> <li>If the Executive Committee recommends that the proposal not be forwarded to the Board of Governors, the author is contacted and given the opportunity to pull the proposals and provide more information at a later date.</li> </ul>
March (each odd year)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summary document with Executive Committee positions will be included in the mailings for the Area meetings.</li> <li>Discussion at Area Meeting</li> <li><i>Rostrum</i> Article (summary of additional proposals)</li> </ul>
<b>April</b> (each odd year)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spring Plenary Session—<u>Third Hearing</u> on process and any proposals received. All testimony is collected. <i>[Note: At a minimum proposals must be vetted at two of the statewide hearings]</i></li> <li>Delegates vote on Discipline Changes.</li> <li>No changes may be made to the proposal, even by amendment during plenary session, and proposals may not be withdrawn. [This is because no changes can be made when the field has not had an opportunity to comment on them.]</li> </ul>
	<b>Appeal Process:</b> If a proposal is rejected by the Executive Committee or the body,



**DISCIPLINES LIST REVIEW PROCESS**  
**Generic Timeline**

	<p>the initiator may submit a proposal via a resolution through an Area Meeting for discussion and debate. The proposal will need to be modified significantly and include rationale and evidence for why it is being brought forward.</p> <p>Only if</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a new justification and rationale are provided, AND</li> <li>• the Discipline List Revision Form is submitted to the Senate Office by the final deadline – September 30 each even year.</li> <li>• a resolution is passed at an Area meeting (prior to the second hearing in November during this same year) to include the proposed change in the review and approval process, OR</li> <li>• through the regular resolution process at the Fall Plenary Session during the same year, where the mover must seek approval at the Session to include the proposed change in the review and approval process.</li> </ul>
May/June (each odd year)	Consultation with CIOs, CEOs, and COFO (bargaining units). Informal consultation with personnel officers. This is done through an item on the Consultation Council agenda. Council members comment on the process, not the recommendations.
July (each odd year)	Submit proposal to BOG (First reading): Each proposal adopted by the Senate is forwarded to the Board of Governors as a recommendation. The Board of Governors considers the recommendations of the Senate and formally acts on them. To date, the Board of Governors has accepted all recommendations of the Senate.
September (each odd year)	BOG (Second Reading)
February (each even year)	Restart process for new cycle.

## DISCIPLINES LIST REVIEW PROCESS RESOURCES

Page: <http://asccc.org/disciplines-list-archives>

AB 1725: <http://www.faccc.org/advocacy/bills/historical/ab1725.pdf>

Title 5: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/lr/fa/sf/title5regs.asp>

Education Code: <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/calawquery?codesection=edc>

Education Code 87360	<a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87360">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87360</a>
Education Code 87357	<a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87355-87359.5">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87355-87359.5</a>
Education Code 87610	<a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87600-87612">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87600-87612</a>
Education Code 70902	<a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=70001-71000&amp;file=70900-70902">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=70001-71000&amp;file=70900-70902</a>
Education Code 87150	<a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87150-87154">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&amp;group=87001-88000&amp;file=87150-87154</a>

### ***Rostrum***

June	2013	It's Time to Integrate All Faculty Minimum Qualifications into the Disciplines List	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/it%E2%80%99s-time-integrate-all-faculty-minimum-qualifications-disciplines-list">http://asccc.org/content/it%E2%80%99s-time-integrate-all-faculty-minimum-qualifications-disciplines-list</a>
April	2001	Disciplines List Review Begins	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176553">http://asccc.org/node/176553</a>
March	2013	Controversies at Disciplines List Hearings	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176452">http://asccc.org/node/176452</a>
May	2007	Disciplines Lists - Breakout on the Structure ("Exploring New Approaches") and Hearing on Proposals	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176745">http://asccc.org/node/176745</a>
February	2002	The Disciplines List Hearings	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176540">http://asccc.org/node/176540</a>
October	1998	Disciplines List Revisions	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176651">http://asccc.org/node/176651</a>
April	2013	Got Associate Degree Equivalency Guidelines?	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/got-associate-degree-equivalency-guidelines">http://asccc.org/content/got-associate-degree-equivalency-guidelines</a>
December	2008	Disciplines List Proposals: What Do They Want to Change Now?	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/disciplines-list-proposals-what-do-they-want-change-now">http://asccc.org/content/disciplines-list-proposals-what-do-they-want-change-now</a>
December	2010	Considerations for Moving Noncredit MQs from Title 5 to the Disciplines List	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/considerations-moving-noncredit-mqs-title-5-disciplines-list">http://asccc.org/content/considerations-moving-noncredit-mqs-title-5-disciplines-list</a>
September	2004	Discipline List Revision	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176479">http://asccc.org/node/176479</a>

## DISCIPLINES LIST REVIEW PROCESS RESOURCES

March	2004	Disciplines List Review Preparation	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176489">http://asccc.org/node/176489</a>
February	2006	The Time-Lines They Are A Changin': The New Disciplines List Review Process	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176658">http://asccc.org/node/176658</a>
September	2008	Understanding Interdisciplinary Studies	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/understanding-interdisciplinary-studies">http://asccc.org/content/understanding-interdisciplinary-studies</a>
October	2001	Standards and Practices	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176559">http://asccc.org/node/176559</a>
September	2010	Discipline Specialization	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/discipline-specialization">http://asccc.org/content/discipline-specialization</a>
September	2006	Government, Disciplines, and Accreditation	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176702">http://asccc.org/node/176702</a>
March	2009	Challenge Your MQ Knowledge	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/challenge-your-mq-knowledge">http://asccc.org/content/challenge-your-mq-knowledge</a>
May	2011	Interdisciplinary? What were we thinking?	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/interdisciplinary-what-were-we-thinking">http://asccc.org/content/interdisciplinary-what-were-we-thinking</a>
February	2007	The Issue of Establishing Equivalency in Noncredit	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176719">http://asccc.org/node/176719</a>
September	2009	"On the Other Hand. There Is No Other Hand"	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/other-hand-there-no-other-hand">http://asccc.org/content/other-hand-there-no-other-hand</a>
December	2007	MQs, Equivalencies and Eminence, Oh My!	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/mqs-equivalencies-and-eminence-oh-my">http://asccc.org/content/mqs-equivalencies-and-eminence-oh-my</a>
December	2003	Complications in Determining Faculty Minimum Qualifications	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176524">http://asccc.org/node/176524</a>
December	2008	Just the Minimum Facts	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/just-minimum-facts">http://asccc.org/content/just-minimum-facts</a>
January	2010	It's Not FSAs	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/it%E2%80%99s-not-fsas">http://asccc.org/content/it%E2%80%99s-not-fsas</a>
April	2010	Minimum Qualifications Equivalency Standards and Criteria – A New Journey	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/minimum-qualifications-equivalency-standards-and-criteria-%E2%80%93-new-journey">http://asccc.org/content/minimum-qualifications-equivalency-standards-and-criteria-%E2%80%93-new-journey</a>
November	2011	Separating Learning Assistance and Tutoring	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/separating-learning-assistance-and-tutoring">http://asccc.org/content/separating-learning-assistance-and-tutoring</a>
April	1998	What is Needed to Realize the Vision of AB 1725?	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176631">http://asccc.org/node/176631</a>
May	2008	Eminence-Do I Know It When I See It?	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/eminence-do-i-know-it-when-i-see-it">http://asccc.org/content/eminence-do-i-know-it-when-i-see-it</a>
December	2004	Survey of Equivalency Practices Reveals Problems	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176467">http://asccc.org/node/176467</a>
November	2011	Transfer Model Curricula: Preserving the Integrity of Transfer Associate Degrees	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/transfer-model-curricula-preserving-integrity-transfer-associate-degrees">http://asccc.org/content/transfer-model-curricula-preserving-integrity-transfer-associate-degrees</a>
January	2010	Ethnic Studies Requirement: Understanding It and Fulfilling It.	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/ethnic-studies-requirement-understanding-it-and-fulfilling-it">http://asccc.org/content/ethnic-studies-requirement-understanding-it-and-fulfilling-it</a>
September	2007	Minimum Qualifications Audits	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/minimum-qualifications-audits">http://asccc.org/content/minimum-qualifications-audits</a>



## DISCIPLINES LIST REVIEW PROCESS RESOURCES

May	2005	On Red Stars, White Guys, and Trailer Trash; Non-random Musings on Owning our Symbols	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176447">http://asccc.org/node/176447</a>
May	2001	The Integrated Interview – Re-thinking the Faculty Hiring Process	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/integrated-interview-%E2%80%93-re-thinking-faculty-hiring-process">http://asccc.org/content/integrated-interview-%E2%80%93-re-thinking-faculty-hiring-process</a>
December	2003	Equivalency Training	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176525">http://asccc.org/node/176525</a>
January	1998	President's Message: Strengthening the Academic Senate Role in Governance	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176620">http://asccc.org/node/176620</a>
May	2006	A Snapshot of Noncredit in the California Community Colleges	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176686">http://asccc.org/node/176686</a>
March	2005	The Proposal to Increase Funding for Noncredit Instruction	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176450">http://asccc.org/node/176450</a>
February	2012	Julie's Inbox	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/julie%E2%80%99s-inbox-3">http://asccc.org/content/julie%E2%80%99s-inbox-3</a>
February	2008	Have You Heard About the Two-Year Rule and Accreditation?	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/have-you-heard-about-two-year-rule-and-accreditation">http://asccc.org/content/have-you-heard-about-two-year-rule-and-accreditation</a>
October	1998	Overuse and Undercompensation of Part-Time Faculty in the California Community Colleges	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176639">http://asccc.org/node/176639</a>
September	1997	California Citizen Commission on Higher Education	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/california-citizen-commission-higher-education">http://asccc.org/content/california-citizen-commission-higher-education</a>
September	2008	Academic Excellence: Why California's Community Colleges Need the 75/25 Full-Time Faculty Standard	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/academic-excellence-why-californias-community-colleges-need-7525-full-time-faculty-standard">http://asccc.org/content/academic-excellence-why-californias-community-colleges-need-7525-full-time-faculty-standard</a>
May	2005	Administrators in Our Midst: Retreat Rights and Evaluation	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176442">http://asccc.org/node/176442</a>
November	2009	The Accelerated Learning College, California Leadership Alliance for Student Success, and Embracing Faculty Leadership	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/accelerated-learning-college-california-leadership-alliance-student-success-and-embracing-fa">http://asccc.org/content/accelerated-learning-college-california-leadership-alliance-student-success-and-embracing-fa</a>
February	2012	Noncredit and Credit Basic Skills - A Provocative Balance	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/noncredit-and-credit-basic-skills-provocative-balance">http://asccc.org/content/noncredit-and-credit-basic-skills-provocative-balance</a>
December	2007	Julie's Inbox	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/julies-inbox">http://asccc.org/content/julies-inbox</a>
May	2011	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/training-new-or-potential-faculty-whose-responsibility-it">http://asccc.org/content/training-new-or-potential-faculty-whose-responsibility-it</a>	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/training-new-or-potential-faculty-whose-responsibility-it">http://asccc.org/content/training-new-or-potential-faculty-whose-responsibility-it</a>
March	2011	Sustaining Sustainability: A Role for Curriculum	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/sustaining-sustainability-role-curriculum">http://asccc.org/content/sustaining-sustainability-role-curriculum</a>
May	2011	The Case for Course Completion as the Single Measure of Student Success	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/case-course-completion-single-measure-student-success">http://asccc.org/content/case-course-completion-single-measure-student-success</a>
November	2005	Blurring the Distinction Between Credit and Noncredit Dos and	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176421">http://asccc.org/node/176421</a>



## DISCIPLINES LIST REVIEW PROCESS RESOURCES

		Don'ts	
May	2005	The Forgotten Ones: Whom Do We Represent?	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176445">http://asccc.org/node/176445</a>
February	2006	An Ounce of Prevention is Worth a Pound of Cure: Getting Ahead of the Enrollment Chase in Distance Education	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176674">http://asccc.org/node/176674</a>
May	2007	CTE: A Five Year Plan to Help Link Planning to the Budget	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176740">http://asccc.org/node/176740</a>
December	2006	To Diversify Faculty, Interrupt the Usual and Seize Opportunities	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176706">http://asccc.org/node/176706</a>
December	2004	Occupational Programs. Everybody's Business	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176461">http://asccc.org/node/176461</a>
December	2003	A Principled Perspective: Something to Act Upon Or, Making a List and Checking it Twice	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176515">http://asccc.org/node/176515</a>
October	2003	Equity and Diversity. Implementation and the Role of Local Senates	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176511">http://asccc.org/node/176511</a>
October	2003	Access? To What?	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/176502">http://asccc.org/node/176502</a>

### Publication

Fall	2004	Disciplines List Review Process	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/174995">http://asccc.org/node/174995</a>
Recurrent	2012	Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in the California Community Colleges	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/174932">http://asccc.org/node/174932</a>
Spring	2004	Qualifications For Faculty Service In The California Community Colleges: Minimum Qualifications, Placement Of Courses Within Disciplines, And Faculty Service Areas	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/174989">http://asccc.org/node/174989</a>
Fall	2006	Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/175009">http://asccc.org/node/175009</a>
Fall	1988	Sections of AB 1725 Affecting Academic Senates	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/174791">http://asccc.org/node/174791</a>
Spring	1999	Revised Equivalence to the Minimum	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/174924">http://asccc.org/node/174924</a>

## DISCIPLINES LIST REVIEW PROCESS RESOURCES

		Qualifications	
Fall	1989	Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/174923">http://asccc.org/node/174923</a>
Spring	1991	Hiring Effective Faculty: An Introduction	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/174929">http://asccc.org/node/174929</a>
Spring	1994	Placement of Courses within Disciplines	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/174858">http://asccc.org/node/174858</a>
Spring	1991	Basic Skills: Ad Hoc Basic Skills Committee Final Report	<a href="http://asccc.org/node/174842">http://asccc.org/node/174842</a>

### Breakout Materials

Fall	2012	Evolution and the Minimum Qualifications Disciplines List: Integrating Outliers Into the Disciplines List	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/evolution-and-minimum-qualifications-disciplines-list-integrating-outliers-disciplines-list">http://asccc.org/content/evolution-and-minimum-qualifications-disciplines-list-integrating-outliers-disciplines-list</a>
Spring	2013	Discipline List Process	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/discipline-list-process">http://asccc.org/content/discipline-list-process</a>
Spring	2012	Minimum Qualifications	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/minimum-qualifications-1">http://asccc.org/content/minimum-qualifications-1</a>
Fall	2010	Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies Training	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/minimum-qualifications-and-equivalencies-training">http://asccc.org/content/minimum-qualifications-and-equivalencies-training</a>
Fall	2011	Minimum Qualifications	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/minimum-qualifications-0">http://asccc.org/content/minimum-qualifications-0</a>
Fall	2011	Hot Topics in Minimum Qualifications Related to Title 5	<a href="http://asccc.org/content/hot-topics-minimum-qualifications-related-title-5">http://asccc.org/content/hot-topics-minimum-qualifications-related-title-5</a>



## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Internal Process Committee Policies		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: III. E	
		Attachment: YES / NO	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	J. Bruno	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

**DESIRED OUTCOME:**

**To review and approve policies on Open Meetings and Publication Guidelines. To approve consultation with a nonprofit attorney to help the Executive Committee develop effective policies and processes.**

**BACKGROUND:**

*The Internal Process Committee has been tasked with revising existing and developing new Executive Committee policies. The IPC submitted policies for review and approval at the January and February meetings but the agenda item was either tabled or the Executive Committee was unable to reach a decision. At the January meeting, Steve Bruckman, the Chancellor’s Office attorney, informed members that it was his opinion that the Executive Committee is not required to adhere to the Bagley Keene Act or the Brown Act. As a result of this conversation with Mr. Bruckman, the Executive Committee tasked the IPC with developing a philosophy statement and policy on Open Meetings. At the January/February meeting, the IPC brought forward a Statement on Openness, Transparency and Accountability and an outline for an Open Meeting Policy. The members spent 45 minutes discussing two areas of the outline – Public Comments and Minutes – but were unable to reach consensus on what should be contained in the policy.*

*It was suggested that IPC seek the advice of a nonprofit attorney in developing policies especially around open meetings. There was an interest that we craft policies that will allow us the flexibility of a senate but still meet our responsibilities of a nonprofit. Although the formal motion failed it seemed like a good idea to investigate the possibility to help the Executive Committee to move forward. While investigating this suggestion, one individual – Mark Alcorn – came highly recommended by Jonathan Lightman, FACCC executive director. After conversations with Mr. Alcorn, I believe it would be helpful to have him share his expertise on nonprofit board responsibilities and effective policies with the Executive Committee and respond to questions directly. Mr. Alcorn is available to attend an Executive Committee and consultation with Mr. Alcorn should help the Executive Committee provide IPC with clear direction on policy development.*

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

*Finally, drafts of the following documents are provided to the Executive Board for reference and comment:*

*New Policies:*

*Philosophy Statement on Openness, Transparency and Accountability and Open Meeting Policy*

*Revised Policies:*

*Publication Guidelines*

*Additionally, the IPC is seeking direction on revisions, if necessary, to the Elections Procedure Manual.*



## **PUBLICATIONS GUIDELINES**

DRAFT

December 6, 2013

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) produces its publications to provide statewide communication between ASCCC and local academic senates or other equivalent organizations in order to coordinate the actions and requests of the faculty of the California community colleges and to reflect the official views or position of the Academic Senate on statewide and local issues.-

~~**Purpose:** To improve and strengthen communication between the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the local academic senates and to reflect the official views or position of the Academic Senate on Statewide statewide and local issues.~~

### Purpose

Publications, written or electronic, are designed:

- To improve and strengthen communication;
- To showcase academic research;
- To highlight the many creative talents of community college faculty;
- To promote discussion on academic and professional topics; and;
- To ensure clarity and professionalism, especially of adopted papers.

### Development of a Position Paper

~~All pPosition papers may must originate in Academic Senate committees as a result by of a resolution or ASCCC paper adopted from during a plenary session. Resolutions can be generated by the Senate committees, Executive Committee, or Senate grant advisory groups. Once Those initiated, -passed by a plenary session calling for an Academic Senate position on a particular subject will follow these steps will be followed:-~~

1. The Executive Committee shall review the resolution for feasibility. On rare occasions, if the call for a paper is deemed not feasible, the Executive Committee shall report its decision and rationale to the delegates via Rostrum article, President's Update, or breakoutnext plenary session through its Resolution Status Report, a document that offers follow-up on resolutions passed at the previous plenary session and on any resolutions still unresolved from previous sessions. -If deemed feasible, the Executive Committee shall assign the position paper either to a standing committee, a task force, or to an ad hoc committee, or ASCCC grant advisory group.

~~2. As part of the review of the resolution calling for the position paper, the Executive Committee shall normally communicate to the committee assigned to write the paper the direction which the position paper shall take; the Executive Committee may also suspend such direction, pending the findings of needed study, research, or surveys.~~

2. After appropriate study and deliberation, the assigned committee group shall communicate to the Executive Committee using the ASCCC Prompts for Paper Development

(See Appendix 1). These paper prompts provide background information including resolutions, feasibility, research needed, as well as a proposed approach or direction for the paper. Once the Executive Committee approves the approach, the next step is for the group to ~~the~~ proposed an outline for the paper with and include any significant background information. Drafts require at least two readings before approval by the Executive Committee. All drafts must be submitted through the normal agenda process.

~~During a full, substantive review at an Executive Committee meeting, Executive Committee members will return the outline or paper with their comments. Input from appropriate persons in the field on draft position papers may also be sought at the direction of the Academic Senate President.~~

~~Drafts require at least two readings before approval by the Executive Committee. Ideally, all drafts will must be received in time to be submitted through the normal agenda process. However, any drafts emailed to members must be received at least three days before the meeting.~~

3. During a full, substantive review at an Executive Committee meeting (the first reading), Executive Committee members will provide written and oral feedback regarding the outline. It is important for Executive Committee members to provide detailed feedback on the outline as this document will drive the work of the group. The group will not be well served if significant changes in direction are provided at a later date or during the next reading. Input from appropriate persons in the field on draft position papers may also be sought. However, draft papers should not be circulated to others outside of the Executive Committee or the group as this might cause confusion in the field.

~~At its the first reading, a position paper shall be reviewed in detail by the Executive Committee. Three actions are likely at the first-reading stage: (1) A vote will determine if the paper is ready to advance for a second reading. (2) If the suggested changes are substantive enough, the paper shall be returned to the ~~committee~~ group for additional revision and then resubmitted to the Executive Committee for further review. Only when ~~determined by vote of approval~~ will a paper be advanced to a second reading and, its consideration by the field and proposal for adoption. (3) The general direction or findings of a paper may call for radical revision, necessitating a delay in its progress.~~

Sections of position papers or their outlines that have yet to be approved by the Executive Committee may be presented to plenary sessions for discussion only, not adoption. Such papers are to be marked "Draft For Discussion Only; Not an Official Position Paper of the Academic Senate" and shall bear the name of the writing group, the chair, and contributors to the draft.

4. At ~~its~~ the second reading, a position paper shall be reviewed only for minor technical changes. Approval by majority vote is required to advance the paper for adoption at the next plenary session.

~~Sections of pPosition papers or their outlines that have yet to be approved by the Executive Committee may be presented to plenary sessions for discussion only, not adoption. Such papers~~

are to be marked "Draft For Discussion Only; Not an Official Position Paper of the Academic Senate" and shall bear the name of the writing committee group, the committee's chair, and contributors to the draft.

Position papers that have been approved by the Executive Committee must be included in a mailing for the plenary session at which they will be considered for adoption. The vote of approval by the Executive Committee constitutes a resolution for adoption of the position paper by the plenary body. Papers will be considered the position of the Academic Senate only when adopted by a plenary body. These papers are marked "for adoption..."

All documents submitted for Academic Senate publication will follow the style sheet. Publications, written or electronic, are designed:

- To improve and strengthen communication;
- To showcase academic research;
- To highlight the many creative talents of community college faculty;
- To promote discussion on academic and professional topics.
- To ensure clarity and professionalism, especially of adopted papers.

### **Authority/Responsibilities**

The Publications Committee is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. The Publications Executive Director Committee has is responsibility for the publication development and distribution of all Academic Senate publications, i.e. journals, newsletters, or articles, printed or electronic, representing the viewpoint of the Academic Senate. The President will make the final approval of all Academic Senate publications. After adoption of the paper, the Executive Director will review the document and work with the chair of the group to finalize the document for publication. At this point only typographical corrections or clarification can be made. Any changes other than these types will need to be reviewed by the Executive Committee and may ultimately need to go back to the body for correction. The Publications Committee will review, evaluate, and select final contributions for all authorized Academic Senate publications, written or electronic, with recommendations to be forwarded to the President to ensure that all material is appropriate for distribution under the name of the Academic Senate. Layout and production decisions will be the responsibility of the Executive Director working in conjunction with the Creative Director.

The Executive Director works with the Publications Committee Executive Committee the Creative Director to develop timelines for submission, production, and distribution. The Executive Director may also assist in editing or revising as directed by the Executive Committee Publications Committee and/or the President. The Publications Committee NOTE: As you can see below, the responsibilities probably need to be divided between Exec or Exec/Exec Director/President. The responsibilities include:

- Soliciting contributions from the President, Executive Committee, and Community College Faculty.
- Developing timelines for submissions.
- Making recommendations on printing and distribution process.
- Making recommendations for layout and design.
- Attending Publications Committee Meetings as needed.



- Consulting on all preparations for the production of the *Rostrum* and *The Forum* prior to final approval by the President.

### **Editorial Guidelines for the *Rostrum***

- The *Rostrum* is a quarterly publication of the official voice of the Academic Senate, which provides information content to inform faculty and reflects the Academic Senate's position on Statewide about statewide and local issues as well as academic and professional matters. The articles published in the *Rostrum* do not necessarily represent the adopted positions of the Academic Senate. The Executive Committee will submit the majority of contributions for each edition and these articles primarily will reflect statewide activities and issues. *The Rostrum* may reflect the ideas and opinions of a diverse statewide faculty with submission from the field and as such any faculty may submit an article for publication.
- Articles are on topics that concern the academic and professional life of California community college faculty.
- Articles are short and clearly written, usually of no more than 1500 words.
- All articles must be of general interest to community college faculty.
- The Publications Committee Chair *Rostrum* content editor (faculty Executive Committee member) or the copy editor (Executive Director), in consultation with the President, may edit or rewrite articles for accuracy, tone, consistency, or length. Significant changes will be cleared with the author before publication.
- Letters to the Publications Committee ASCCC and unsolicited articles by faculty members are invited/welcomed.
- Manuscripts will be evaluated for appropriateness and interest.
- Deadline dates will be published and included on the Academic Senate website.
- There will be four (4) *Rostrums* produced and distributed each year, two of which will be devoted to reporting on fall and spring plenary sessions.
- Each issue of the *Rostrum* will be entered/published to on the Internet.

### **Other Official Publications Documents**

The *Rostrum* is the an official Academic Senate publications. Recommendations for the development of "other" publications official documents must be reviewed/considered by the Publications Committee ASCCC Executive Committee for publication. The Executive Committee may direct the initiator to take a resolution forward to delegates for deliberation. In rare instances, the Executive Committee can consider other official documents that are not adopted positions of the Senate. In this case, an agenda item will be brought forward to the Executive Committee with a rationale about why the information should be an official document of the Senate without a resolution.

The Executive Committee will use the following criteria in when cConsidering if an "other" document should be an official document of the Senateation will be based on the following eriteria:

- Publication budgetary constraints
- Requests from California community college faculty
- Duplication of existing Academic Senate publication format and information
- Impact on Timeline considerations



- ~~Production logistics~~Resources
- ~~will~~Potential for eliciting cause confusion (duplicating or contradicting)
- ~~goes~~Contrary to against an existing ASCCC position
- ~~May~~undermines the work of the Senate with system partners
- ~~May be p~~rescriptive in nature and undermines the principle e in nature that it goes against the tenet of local control
- ~~Is~~timeliness or timelessness of issue or topic and/or timeless

Recommendations for the establishment of procedures and guidelines will be submitted by the initiator. ~~The initiator for the development of “other” publications must submit the ASCCC Prompts for Paper Development.~~ Upon the Executive committee’s recommendation, the proposal will be forwarded to the President for consideration as an official Academic Senate publication.

### **Publication Guidelines**

All documents submitted for Academic Senate publication will follow the style sheet.

Publications, written or electronic, are designed:

- To improve and strengthen communication;
- To showcase academic research;
- To highlight the many creative talents of community college faculty;
- To promote discussion on academic and professional topics.
- To ensure clarity and professionalism, especially of adopted papers.

## APPENDIX 1:

### ASCCC Prompts for Paper Development September 25, 2013

The purpose of this pPaper-topie:

Proposed completion date:

1. Is this a new paper, a revision of, or an update to an existing senate paper?
2. Does the resolution ask for a paper? If so, please copy and paste the resolution below. If no, skip to question number 4.
3. Are there other resolutions or senate publications relevant to this effort? Are there other resources that should be taken into consideration when developing the paper?
4. If the paper is requested by resolution, do you believe that the paper as requested by the resolution is feasible? Yes      No
  - If no, why do you believe the paper is not feasible?
  - Would a white paper, Rostrum article, session breakout, or some other form of communication to the field be more appropriate or effective?
  - If the paper is feasible but the resolution does not provide clear direction, how will you find the focus? What information or direction will you need from Exec to complete the work?
5. If the paper is not requested by resolution, what is the justification for writing the paper? Where and how did the idea for the paper originate?
6. List the main points, topics, or section headers of the paper or a narrative describing the approach to the paper. Please describe any relevant data to be included in the content of the paper or data that is necessary to complete the paper. You may include this information in outline form if appropriate.
7. Do you plan to include appendices in the paper? If so, what type? Provide an example, if appropriate.
8. Do you need to gather information from the field (i.e., in the form of a survey or other) to inform the content of the paper?
9. Do you have other information, comments, questions, or concerns?

## Publications Style Sheet: Using Appropriate Modifications of APA Style Manual

*The purpose of this quick style sheet is to make drafting papers easier for committee members and the publication process easier for the Academic Senate Office. To ensure timely and professional dissemination of our documents in both draft and final forms, we assist our readers when we provide similar appearances of our drafts, regardless of authorship. This document will offer you guidelines as you begin and as you divide your labors, reminding you of the final form toward which you aspire. Doing it "right" from the beginning will save you time both prior to adoption and after session as it heads for publication. Correcting the format before circulation saves your readers--on Exec and in the field--from spending time on editorial rather than substantive comments. Ultimately, your adopted document will not be accepted for publication unless it achieves these minimal standards, common in our profession and familiar to you.*

ITEM	DETAIL	ILLUSTRATION
Margins	1"	
Font	<i>Times New Roman</i>	This is Times New Roman font. All illustrations in this column use this font to distinguish it from the details in left columns.
Size	12 pt.	
Indents	<i>It is not necessary to indent the first line of each paragraph, since paragraph spacing (see below) creates the necessary visual separation between paragraphs</i>	
Paragraph Spacing	<i>Single space body text.</i>	<u>Drafting Stages</u>
▪ Text	<i>Double space between paragraphs.</i>	1 If possible, during the drafting stage, it is often useful to
	<i>Turn on automatic numbering mechanism; number consecutively throughout all pages (e.g., 1-2000)</i>	2 number each line automatically. This technique enables your
	<i>Do not justify right margins.</i>	3 readers to comment quickly and eases discussion.
▪ Segments		4
		<u>Preparing the Final Draft for Publication</u>
		The approved final draft for submission will return to single spaced text.
Titles	<i>Segments subheadings will help make these transitions.</i> <i>CENTERED ON TITLE PAGE IN UPPERCASE</i>	TITLE IS CENTERED IN UPPERCASE: SO IS ANY ELEMENT FOLLOWING THE TITLE'S COLON
Levels of Heading	<i>First Level Header</i>	First Level is Flush Left, Upper and Lower Case
	<i>Second Level Header</i>	Second is Also Flush Left but is Underlined Too:
	<i>Third Level Header and Subsequent Levels</i>	Publication specialists will change font sizes and other strategies to indicate subsequent levels. word, ending with a period.
Running Headers	<i>Clearly indicate draft status, abbreviated title, and perhaps indicating its number or date</i>	Academic Senate Technology Committee <b>DRAFT #6 10/31 Technology for Us 13</b>
▪ Draft		
▪ Final Version	<i>Shortened title + page</i>	Technology for Us 22

ITEM	DETAIL	ILLUSTRATION
In-Text Citations	<i>In-text citations, using the author's last name followed by date</i>	According to Levin (1999), new faculty members "are seldom prepared for their first assignments" (p. 98).
Footnote/ End Notes	<i>Use automatic end note or footnoting in Word; use "insert" function to place number close to referred element</i>	Though less frequently used, footnotes or endnotes can provide correlative information that, if included in the body of the text, would interrupt the flow of the argument. If using in-text citations, citations are not necessary in footnotes, according to experts <sup>1</sup> .
Use of • Bullets • Numeration • Other symbols	<i>Using these visual cues can help your reader identify key ideas; please work with the office staff in final drafting stages if you wish to include these features. Keep the following points in mind when working with bulleted or numbered texts.</i> • <i>Try to use the same bullet style throughout the publication.</i> • <i>Try to make the items parallel in their form (e.g., all verb forms, only nouns, prepositional phrases, etc.)</i> • <i>Use the bullet or numbering icon to line up the text beneath the bullet as it appears here.</i> • <i>Use bulleted or numbered lists sparingly as they decrease the flow of the document.</i>	Authors wishing to use bullets should work on these features: • use a complete sentence to precede the introductory colon; • make all elements parallel in construction; • use all complete sentences (capitalized and followed with a period as you see in the column to the left) or, following a colon, begin with lower case letters and separate with semicolons as used in this list; and • conclude the list with a period.
Tables/Figures/ Illustrations or Visuals	<i>Tables should follow the same layout as the rest of the publication. Avoid using tables in landscape layout when the rest of the document is vertical.</i>	Tables, are generally labeled as Table 1, Table 2, etc., with a clear label and title above the illustration; the source appears below the table in a note such as the following. <i>Note: From "Strategies 2000," by N. Meyerson, 1999, The Journal of Business Communication, 39, p. 240.</i>  Sketches, pie-charts and other visuals are usually listed as figures, as in Fig. 22. The label and caption appear below the illustration, flush left.
Spacing	<i>Avoid two spaces after a period, column, etc.</i>	Two spaces after a period is a holdover from the days of monospaced fonts, like Courier and typewriters. They helped signal a pause. With proportional fonts, it's unnecessary and can make text hard to read.

<sup>1</sup> For a more thorough treatment of this information, consult D. Hacker's exercises at [www.dianahacker.com/writersref](http://www.dianahacker.com/writersref)



ITEM	DETAIL	ILLUSTRATION
Quotation Marks	Avoid straight quotation marks, if possible.	Most word processing programs, give you the option to use curly quotes. These may also be called smart quotes or typographer's quotes. In Word, these adjustments can be made through "Tools," "AutoCorrect" and "Autoformat" options.
<b>Ordering the Document</b> <i>The contents appear in the following order.</i>		
Title Page	List Committee members for year(s) during which publication was written. The committee chair should always be listed first and identified as its chair. List college affiliation for each member, and identify title of any administrator (Vice President of Instruction) or student (CaiSACCC)	
Table of Contents	Omit page numbers; the Publications Specialist will provide them during publication; list subheadings as they appear in the text, if used. Make sure the contents' headings and subheadings are consistent with the table of contents.	
Abstract	Provide a 150-200 word synopsis of paper's purpose, any noteworthy methodology, the major content areas and general findings.	
Body Text	Refer to any initiating resolution(s)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Introduction</li> <li>▪ Main Body</li> </ul>	May have separate sections with subheadings	
Recommendations to Local Senates	Always required; each recommendation draws upon specific comments contained or implied in the body of the paper and identifies responsible party	
End Notes	If endnotes were used rather than footnotes, they appear here.	
References	Alphabetic, bibliographic entries for all works actually used and cited in the text.  Note the hanging indent and modified-APA formatting of titles. Actual number of indented spaces will be fixed at publication.	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (2003a). <i>Consultation Council Task Force on Counseling</i> . Sacramento: Author. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (2003b). <i>The Impact of Computer Technology on Student Access and Success in the California Community Colleges</i> . Sacramento: Author. Heur, R.J., Jr. (1999). Keeping an open mind. In <i>Psychology of intelligence analysis</i> (chap.6). Retrieved July 7, 2001, from <a href="http://www.cia.gov/csi/books/19104/art9.html">http://www.cia.gov/csi/books/19104/art9.html</a>
Works Consulted (may or may not be present)	Bibliographic entries here include only those used for background and of use to others but not cited or used in the body of the text	
Glossary (use is optional)	Alphabetical order	
Appendices (use is optional)	Labeled A-Z, AA-ZZ, must be referenced specifically in the text	

ITEM	DETAIL	ILLUSTRATION
optional)	text body and provide citation information on that Appendix page	
<b>Miscellaneous Stylistic Features</b>		
Using Quotations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contextualizing</li> </ul>		In quoting longer passages of four or more typed lines, be certain to introduce or contextualize the forthcoming passage, then provide a marking indentation, as appears in <i>A Survey of Effective Practices in Basic Skills</i> (ASCCC, 2003):
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Block Quotation</li> </ul>	<p><i>Block quotations, dropped down and indented as the model indicates, do not have quotation marks before or after the text. The spacing indicates to the reader what occurs.</i></p>	<p>We began to acknowledge that we were now thinking from the merged view of the interconnections of teaching the reading/writing process. We had transformed our perspectives and our beliefs to the integrated model. (p. 6)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Single Quotations</li> </ul>	<p><i>Single quotation will be contextualized and distinguished by quotation marks but will reflect the grammatical context of the sentence.</i></p>	<p>Don't worry about additional stylistic features such as spacing or italicizing your quotations; those elements will be considered by the Publications Specialist. As Hacker (2004) would argue, the main purpose of using a quotation is to clarify whose views are being shared, and "which ideas are so remarkable as to require a signal that the ideas are not your own" (p. 328).</p>
Gender-Neutral Language, Plurals		By using plural nouns ( <i>they, all, many</i> ), writers help readers avoid confusing he/she pronoun shifts, or verb agreement problems. Whatever pronoun is selected, authors will seek consistency throughout the text to avoid gender-loaded language.
Spell-check and proof document prior to any circulation	<i>Need more be said?</i>	
Numbers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 10 and less</li> <li>▪ &lt; 10</li> </ul>	<i>Use words for numbers ten and less than ten, numerals for numbers 11 and greater. Do not begin a sentence with a numeral--spell out or reorder the wording.</i>	Only four students in that particular major eventually transferred to that university, although 1,037 students indicated their intent to do so when they first registered. Five hundred students later declared a similar major at other universities.
Abbreviations	<i>Use the full term completely at its first appearance in the text; then use the acronym only throughout the remainder of the text.</i>	The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has taken no official position on this specific proposal. However, four ASCCC papers offer relevant recommendations: first . . .



## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Operational Oversight Committee		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: IIII. F.	
		Attachment: YES / NO	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	J. Bruno	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	
		Information	X

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

**The Executive Committee will review the Operational Oversight Committee’s recommendations on the Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate.**

### BACKGROUND:

*As directed by Resolution 1.02 Sp13 and with feedback from the body at a breakout held during the fall 2013 plenary session, the Operational Oversight Committee has developed an evaluation process for the Academic Senate. The resolution requires that the task force’s recommendation be brought to the spring 2014 plenary session for adoption. The Executive Committee requested review of the process at the January/February meeting.*

*Please note: The Operational Oversight Committee will be meeting on February 19<sup>th</sup> to refine the process and policy. The document will be sent to the Executive Committee shortly thereafter.*

#### **1.02 Sp13 Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate**

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

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

---

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



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

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

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





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Governor's Budget Proposal		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: III. G.	
		Attachment: YES / NO	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	
		Information	X

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

**The Executive Committee will discuss elements of the proposed budget to shape a response and subsequent changes in the next months**

### BACKGROUND:

The governor has proposed a significant amount of new funding for the system. But is it in the right places? Where should the funding go in order to support positions of the Senate? Do we favor one time funds at this point in time, or do we argue for more on-going funding ?

To help support our conversation, here is Vice Chancellor Dan Troy's message to the BOG:

#### Budget Update: 2014-15 Governor's Budget

Fueled by a more positive economic climate – notably the strength of the stock market – and the revenues generated by Proposition 30, the Governor's proposed budget for the 2014-15 fiscal year would expedite the system's recovery from the deep reductions of the recent economic downturn. While there are still many details to be examined in the coming days and weeks, what follows are key highlights of the Governor's proposal.

#### State Resources

The general fund revenues for the state are estimated at \$108.7 billion and expenditures of \$106.7 billion, leaving a balance of approximately \$1.9 billion. The estimated general fund revenues would exceed 2007-08 amounts for the first time since the onset of the great recession. Despite this

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

positive news, the Governor Brown, both in the budget summary and in his press conference, took great pains to point out several reasons for caution, including standard recessionary cycles, the short term nature of Proposition 30, outstanding state debts, and a tax system heavily reliant on capital gains.

## Education Highlights

Proposition 98 - The approved budget for 2013-14 set the K-14 minimum guarantee at \$55.3 billion. For 2014-15, that Governor estimates the guarantee at \$61.6 billion - a year over year increase of about 11.4%. Additionally, as the budget finds that the guarantee for the current and prior years was underfunded, \$3.3 billion in additional one-time K-14 resources are provided to settle up the difference. As noted below, the Governor proposes to primarily use these one-time resources to pay down deferral obligations.

California Community Colleges - The chief budget highlights as they pertain to the CCCs include:

- Access - \$155.2 million to fund a 3% restoration of access. This would allow colleges to add approximately 70,000 students (headcounts). The budget proposes that the Board of Governors adopt a formula for local growth allocations that gives priority to districts "identified as having the greatest unmet need in adequately serving their community's higher educational needs." The budget summary states that all districts will be eligible for expanded access and that districts will eventually be restored to pre-recession levels.
- COLA - \$48.5 million to fund a statutory COLA of 0.86%.
- Student Success - \$200 million to support student success programs and strengthen support for underrepresented students. This includes \$100 million for the Student Success and Support Program and \$100 million to close gaps in access and achievement for underrepresented students groups, as identified in Student Equity Plans.
- Deferred Maintenance and Instructional Equipment - \$175 million to be evenly split between deferred maintenance and instructional equipment. These dollars are available on a one-time basis.
- Deferrals - \$235.6 million in budget year funding to pay down deferrals. Combined with \$356.8 million proposed in one-time funds for this purpose, this would completely eliminate the system's inter-year deferrals.
- Proposition 39 - \$39 million in funds owing to Proposition 39 to address energy efficiency projects and workforce development.

- Improving Statewide Performance – \$2.5 million is provided to provide local technical assistance to support implementation of effective practices in all districts, with priority placed on underperforming districts. Additionally, the Chancellor’s Office, will receive \$1.1 million and 9 new positions to aid this effort by developing indicators of student success and to monitor performance.
- Flexibility - The Governor proposes to allow districts to reallocate up to 25% of funds from select categorical programs (EOPS, CALWORKs, and the Basic Skills Initiative) to other federal, state, or local programs to meet the needs of underrepresented student groups as identified in Student Equity Plans.
- RDAs - The Governor proposes to improve the stability of the base apportionment by moving up the deadline for determining the amount of backfill funding necessary to resolve shortfalls stemming from RDA funds. This should help to resolve deficits prior to the end of the fiscal year rather than after the fact. The Governor proposes to initiate this change in the current year, and he provides \$38.4 million for 2013-14 and \$35.6 million for 2014-15 to account for the shift.
- Apportionment stabilization - As you may know, Proposition 30 requires that each district receive at least \$100 per FTES from the Education Protection Account created by the ballot initiative. This resulted in additional unfunded obligations to districts that would not have otherwise received state General Fund. The administration proposes to fund these obligations not only for 2014-15 and subsequent years, but also to backfill obligations from 2012-13 and 2013-14. The Governor attempts to further stabilize the base apportionment by estimating local obligations for FTES stability and restoration costs provided in statute. Broadly, these changes are intended to mitigate structural deficits that have plagued the system in recent years.
- Adult Education - The Governor reiterates his commitment to provide funding in the 2015-16 budget to implement to plans being developed by regional adult education consortia.
- Innovative Models of Higher Education – \$50 million in one-time funding (non-Proposition 98) is proposed for incentive awards that recognize models of innovation in higher education that 1) increase the number of students earning bachelor’s degrees, 2) increase the number of bachelor’s degrees earned within four years, and 3) ease transfer the state’s education system.

The Governor does not propose to raise student fees, nor does he propose to fund FTES on completion or to require all students seeking fee waivers to complete a FAFSA. Further, the Governor states the intent to devise a plan in the 2015-16 fiscal year that will resolve the CalSTRS fund shortfall within 30 years.

UC and CSU - The Governor continues the four-year investment plan begun in 2013-14 by funding 5% increases in general fund support for UC and CSU. This equates to an increase of \$142.2 million each for the UC Regents and the CSU Board of Trustees. The universities are expected to adopt three-year sustainability plans that set targets for key measures. Further, the Administration reiterates its expectation that current tuition and fee levels are maintained through 2016-17.

K-12 - The Governor proposes to continue making progress toward implementing the newly instituted Local Control Funding Formula. Ongoing K-12 per pupils funds rates expenditures increase to \$9,194 in 2014-15, up from \$8,469 in the current year. The Governor proposes to eliminate year over year deferrals in K-12 just as he does for the Colleges.

CalSTRS – Among the concerns expressed by the Governor include the state’s long-term unfunded liability of \$80.4 billion to CalSTRS. Governor Brown states his intention to develop a plan, commencing in 2015-16, will retire this liability over 30 years. While no specifics are proposed, the summary documents suggest increased contributions on the part of the employers, employees and the state to be phased in over time.

Constitutional Amendment – The Governor announced his intention to propose constitutional amendment strengthen the state’s Rainy Day Fund that was established in 2004 by Proposition 58, though no language has yet been provided. The amendment would base deposits into the Rainy Day Fund in relation to the percentage of general fund represented by capital gains. In years in which that percentage is 6.5% or higher, state revenues would flow into the Rainy Day Fund up to 10% of state revenues for that year.

Among the goals of the Governor’s proposal would be to smooth out the “sharp ups and downs” of Proposition 98. In the case of Proposition 98, funds that exceed amounts that would fund growth and COLA costs could be set aside and allocated in down years when Proposition 98 revenues are insufficient to fund growth and COLA costs for that year.

## Conclusion

While the proposed investment in public education is welcome news, some reasons for caution remain. As noted by Governor Brown, the state’s revenues and the Proposition 98 calculation are highly volatile due a reliance on capital gains. Both the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst’s Office note that recessions tend to occur every 5 to 7 years, and we are about 4.5 years



into a recovery. We should also remember that Proposition 30 is temporary and will begin phasing out in 2017.

There are many details to review in the coming days and weeks, but these are the major highlights. Keep in mind that we remain several steps removed from an enacted budget. The next steps include the release of budget bills, trailer legislation, and review by the Legislative Analyst's Office and by legislative committees. Revenues will be revised in May, which sets the table for the passage and approval of a final budget.

The complete budget and summary can be at <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/>.





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Senate Grants		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: III. H	
		Attachment: YES / NO	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	First Reading	
		Action	
		Information	X

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will discuss ways to 1) improve communication between grant projects and the Executive Committee, 2) establish criteria (if necessary) to determine when the Senate should pursue a grant, and 3) how to ensure that the policies of the Senate are used in completing the work of grants.

### BACKGROUND:

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

Grants are critical to the financial health of the Senate. With recently awarded grants, the Senate has been able to leverage funds and remain fiscally sound. However, grants pose other challenges to the Senate, especially with regard to protocol and positions of the Senate. This discussion may cause some policies or practices to arise that will improve the non-fiscal implementation aspects of grants.

Currently, the Senate is involved in several grants with the probability of engaging in more in 2014. Work on grants takes staff and faculty time, and the deliverables for the grant may not be directly driven by resolution or action taken by the Executive Committee. Occasionally, minutes or notes from meetings where grant work is accomplished are included in Exec agendas which help provide information about the accomplishments of faculty and policy implications. In order for Exec to be informed about such work so as to be able to answer policy questions or speak with faculty appointees about their service, better communication is desirable. What information does Exec need to know and when regarding policy matters related to work conducted through grants?

---

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

The Senate has sought grants as the principal lead or as partner in many applications over the years. For the grants pursued in recent history, if Senate positions were aligned with the goals of the grant, then the Foundation or others within the ASCCC would write and apply for such grants.

Unfortunately, in the case of the OER grant, the Senate (or ICAS) did not desire to write this grant but was directed by Senator Steinberg's office to assist. As we know from our local experience, grant deadlines are often short and timelines aggressive for submittal. Are further criteria necessary to determine when and if the Senate pursues or partners for a grant?

When faculty positions are written into grants, who appoints faculty to the work? If certain individuals are named in the grant, then the subsequent Senate president may not be able to alter those assignments. In some cases, the president is not appointing faculty to work on grants, possibly because the appointment process takes too long or may be too cumbersome. Are there alternate ways to keep true to the Senate's protocol for presidential appointments while still recognizing the special needs of fulfilling grant specifications?





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Part-time paper revision		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: III. I.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	David Morse	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval a proposed outline for the revision of the part-time paper.

### BACKGROUND:

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

Resolution 19.07 S13 called for an update of the paper *Part-time Faculty: A Principled Perspective*. In January the Executive Committee considered a proposed outline for this update and sent it back to the task force without approval. A revised outline that attempts to take into consideration the Executive Committee's feedback is attached.

---

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



## Part-Time Faculty Paper

- I. Introduction
  - a. Senate role v. union role in representing PT faculty
  - b. Update the history section – what has happened regarding PT faculty since the past paper
  - c. Have expectations of and demands on PT faculty increased?
- II. PT faculty connection to academic and professional matters – why it is important
  - a. How PT faculty involvement benefits local senates and colleges
  - b. Academic standards and accountability – pressures and need for PT involvement
- III. Participation of PT faculty
  - a. How can PT faculty be encouraged to participate in college governance or committee activities when monetary compensation may be minimal or absent?
  - b. Academic Senate membership
  - c. Committee work
  - d. Department decision-making and activities
- IV. Best Practices regarding ways to involve PT faculty
- V. PT Parity
  - a. Why PT Faculty need offices – how it serves students
  - b. Why PT Faculty need office hours – how it serves students
  - c. Access to equipment/technology
  - d. Other
- VI. Evaluation Process for Part-Time
  - a. Needs to be equivalent to FT (reference 2013 Faculty Eval Paper)
- VII. Professional development
  - a. Mentoring toward non-classroom activities and responsibilities
  - b. Mentoring toward pedagogical practice
- VIII. How did we do on the recommendations of the last paper
- IX. Conclusions and Recommendations

### Notes:

1. Consciousness of counseling faculty and librarians and of good use of data should be included throughout the paper.
2. May need to address different disciplines in some places
3. David believes he remembers a previous ASCCC document that encouraged colleges to take into consideration good part-time service to the college when making full-time hiring decisions. If David can find that reference, it will be included. If not, the committee will consider how to make the statement.







## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Consistent Messaging		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: III. J.	
		Attachment: YES / NO	
CATEGORY:	Old Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	First Reading	X
		Action	X
		Information	

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

**The Executive Committee will consider adopting consistent messaging for the ASCCC.**

### BACKGROUND:

In order to provide the most consistent messaging about the ASCCC to legislators, faculty, partners, and the greater public, Exec will prioritize how and what the messages should communicate. Common messaging will help the president with day to day work of explaining the work of the Senate. Whether written or oral communication, all messages should be consistent.

---

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





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b> Update Executive Committee Members About the December 6 <sup>th</sup> CCSF Workshop		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: III. K.	
		Attachment: No	
<b>CATEGORY:</b>	Old Business	<b>TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:</b>	
<b>REQUESTED BY:</b>	Phil Smith, Executive Committee Member	Consent/Routine	
<b>STAFF REVIEW:</b>	Julie Adams	First Reading	
		Action	
		Information	X

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

**DESIRED OUTCOME:**

The Executive Committee will be updated about the December 6th CCSF Workshop.

**BACKGROUND:**

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

On Friday, December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2013, a subcommittee of the Accreditation and Assessment Committee held a workshop for City College of San Francisco. About 55 CCSF administrators, faculty, students, and classified attended the event. Below is the day’s agenda. Workshop presenters will share experiences and answer questions from the Executive Committee about the event.

### City College of San Francisco: Collective Collaboration for a Shared Future Workshop

**Date:** December 6, 2013

**Location:** San Francisco State University, Seven Hills Conference Center

**Facilitators:** Phil Smith, *Chair*, ASCCC Accreditation and Assessment Committee  
 Beth Smith, *President*, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges  
 Scott Lay, *President/CEO*, Community College League of California  
 Kevin Bontenbal, *Academic Senate President*, Cuesta College  
 Katie Townsend-Merino, *Professor*, Psychology, Palomar College<sup>1</sup>  
 Deborah Wulff, *Vice President of Academic Affairs*, Cuesta College

**9:00-9:15 Welcoming and Opening Remarks**  
 Dr. Leslie Wong, *President*, San Francisco State University

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to circumstances beyond her control, Katie was unable to travel to the workshop. Executive Committee member Dianna Chiabotti was able to serve as a replacement for the morning portion.

Dr. Larry Hanley, *Academic Senate Chair*, SFSU  
Dr. Art Tyler, *Chancellor*, City College of San Francisco

**9:15-9:20      Ground Rules: Overview and Examples**

**9:20-9:30      Discussion of the Homework Assignment:  
What does CCSF do well?**

Prior to the workshop, participants will be emailed a question that asks, "What does CCSF do well?" On December 6<sup>th</sup>, participants will have a chance to share their thoughts about what CCSF does well.

**9:30-10:30 Yelp Reviews Activity**

Usually known for its restaurant reviews, Yelp.com also allows individuals to submit reviews about businesses, government agencies, even reviews about colleges and universities to the Yelp website. Participants will work in groups to develop a Yelp review describing what they would like CCSF to be 5 years from now.

**10:30-12:30    Technical Assistance Presentation  
with ASCCC President Beth Smith and  
CCLC President/CEO Scott Lay**

Technical Assistance is a joint program of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) and the Community College League of California (CCLC). The purpose of the program is to help districts and colleges successfully implement state law and regulations that call for effective participation by faculty, staff and students in district and college governance.

**12:30-1:00      Lunch**

Table Discussion: Thinking about the Technical Assistance presentation, what did you learn that you were surprised by?

**1:00-1:45      Governance Scenarios**

Working in groups, participants will discuss different governance scenarios using information from the Technical Assistance Presentation.

**1:45-2:30      Accreditation Challenges at Cuesta College**

Presenters from Cuesta College will discuss how they responded and addressed the Show Cause accreditation sanction they received.

**2:30-3:45      Committee/Governance Structures at CCSF:  
How Do Decisions Get Made**

Groups will diagram what they perceive the committee/governance structure at CCSF to be. Specifically, groups will identify what the major committees are at CCSF and how work and recommendations flow from one committee to the next. In addition, groups will take hypothetical issues and describe how they would move through the committee/governance structure resulting in a final recommendation/decision at CCSF.

**3:45-4:00      Closing Remarks**





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Responding to the ACCJC’s Revised Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: IV. A.	
		Attachment: No	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Phil Smith, Executive Committee Member	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW:	Julie Adams	First Reading	X
		Action	X
		Information	

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the timeline for providing public comment about the ACCJC’s revised Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and consider appropriate ways to provide information to the field, gather feedback from the field, and organize a response to the first draft.

### BACKGROUND:

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

On January 24th, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) released for first reading a revised set of Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards. The ACCJC is soliciting public comment about the revisions until April 30th. There will be two California public hearings in late April (Sylmar on April 28<sup>th</sup> and Sacramento on April 29<sup>th</sup>). As a part of its work, the Accreditation and Assessment Committee is soliciting feedback about the revised standards, with the goal of producing a comprehensive document of suggested revisions and additions. This document could provide a basis for resolutions and public testimony from the Academic Senate. Unfortunately, the ACCJC’s timeline for public comment is quite tight. To respond effectively, the Senate will have to act expeditiously and strategically. The Executive Committee will discuss options for using resolutions and other vehicles for communicating our collective suggestions.





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Executive Committee Resolutions Spring 2014		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: IV, B.	
		Attachment: <b>YES</b>	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Freitas	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	First Reading	X
		Action	X
		Information	

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will consider for approval resolutions to forward to area meetings for information.

### BACKGROUND:

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

Twice a year prior to the plenary session, committees, task forces, members of Chancellor’s Office advisory groups, and individual Executive Committee members consider current conversations and requisite positions needed to appropriately represent the Senate. The Executive Committee resolutions is one way to inform the delegates about topics that are under discussion at the state level and affords them a chance to inform those conversations. The Executive Committee will discuss resolutions to forward to the Area meetings for discussion.

---

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







**Academic Senate  
for California Community Colleges**

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

**46<sup>th</sup> SPRING SESSION RESOLUTIONS  
FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS**

***March 21-22, 2014***

*Disclaimer: The enclosed resolutions do not reflect the position of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, its Executive Committee, or standing committees. They are presented for the purpose of discussion by the field, and to be debated and voted on by academic senate delegates at the Academic Senate Spring Plenary Session held April 10-12, 2014, in San Francisco.*

Resolutions Committee 2013-2014

John Freitas, Los Angeles City College, Chair  
Kenneth Bearden, Butte College, Area A  
Dolores Davison, Foothill College, Area B  
Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, Area C  
Randy Beach, Southwestern College, Area D  
Julie Adams, ASCCC, Executive Director

## RESOLUTIONS PROCESS OVERVIEW

In order to assure that deliberations are organized, effective, and meaningful, the Academic Senate uses the following resolution procedure:

- Pre-session resolutions are developed by the Executive Committee (through its committees) and submitted to the Pre-Session Area Meetings for review.
- Amendments and new pre-session resolutions are generated in the Area Meetings.
- The Resolutions Committee meets to review all pre-session resolutions and combine, re-word, append, or render moot these resolutions as necessary.
- Members of the Senate meet during the session in topic breakouts and give thoughtful consideration to the need for new resolutions and/or amendments.
- After all Session presentations are finished each day, members meet during the resolution breakouts to discuss the need for new resolutions and/or amendments. Each resolution or amendment must be submitted to the Resolutions Chair before the posted deadlines each day. There are also Area meetings at the Session for discussing, writing, and amending resolutions.
- New resolutions submitted on the second day of session are held to the next session unless the resolution is declared urgent by the Executive Committee.
- The Resolutions Committee meets again to review all resolutions and amendments and to combine, re-word, append, or render moot the resolutions as necessary.
- The resolutions are debated and voted upon in the general sessions on the last day of the Plenary Session.

Prior to plenary session, it is each attendee's responsibility to read the following documents:

- Senate Delegate Roles and Responsibilities
- Plenary Session Resolution Procedures
- Resolution Writing and General Advice

New delegates are strongly encouraged to attend the New Delegate Orientation on Thursday morning prior to the first breakout session.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

The resolutions that have been placed on the Consent Calendar 1) were believed to be noncontroversial, 2) do not potentially reverse a previous position and 3) do not compete with another proposed resolution. Resolutions that meet these criteria and any subsequent clarifying amendments have been included on the Consent Calendar. To remove a resolution from the Consent Calendar, please see the Consent Calendar section of the *Resolution Procedures for the Plenary Session*.

- 1.01 S14 ASCCC Mission to Promote Academic Excellence
- 1.02 S14 Adopt the *Guidelines for the Periodic Evaluation of ASCCC and Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Review Criteria*
- 2.01 S14 Modify Title 5 To Allow Colleges To Be Accredited By Any Nationally Recognized Accrediting Agency
- 2.02 S14 Providing Feedback to the ACCJC about the 2014 First Reading Draft of the Revised Standards
- 2.03 S14 Prioritizing Oral Testimony to the ACCJC about the 2014 First Reading Draft of the Revised Standards
- 2.04 S14 Explore Use of Mock Accreditation Site Visits
- 7.01 S14 Participation in State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (SARA) for Distance Education Offerings
- 9.01 S14 Academic Senate Involvement in AB 86 Regional Planning Consortia
- 10.01 S14 Adopt the Discipline List Handbook
- 12.01 S14 CTE Faculty Professional Development
- 13.01 S14 Feasibility of CCC Bachelor's Degree
- 14.01 S14 Adopt the Paper *Implementing Credit by Exam*
- 14.02 S14 Local Use of Available Noncredit Progress Indicators
- 18.01 S14 Adopt the paper *Multiple Measures in Assessment: The Requirements and Challenges of Multiple Measures in the California Community Colleges*

Consent calendar resolutions in the packet are marked with a \*



TABLE OF CONTENTS

**1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE**

- \*1.01 S14 ASCCC Mission to Promote Academic Excellence .....
- \*1.02 S14 Adopt the *Guidelines for the Periodic Evaluation of ASCCC and Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Review Criteria* .....

**2.0 ACCREDITATION**

- \*2.01 S14 Modify Title 5 To Allow Colleges To Be Accredited By Any Nationally Recognized Accrediting Agency
- \*2.02 S14 Providing Feedback to the ACCJC about the 2014 First Reading Draft of the Revised Standards
- \*2.03 S14 Prioritizing Oral Testimony to the ACCJC about the 2014 First Reading Draft of the Revised Standards
- \*2.04 S14 Explore Use of Mock Accreditation Site Visits

**7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE**

- \*7.01 S14 Participation in State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (SARA) for Distance Education Offerings .....

**9.0 CURRICULUM**

- \*9.01 S14 Academic Senate Involvement in AB 86 Regional Planning Consortia.....

**10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST**

- \*10.01 S14 Adopt the Discipline List Handbook .....

**12.0 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

- \*12.01 S14 CTE Faculty Professional Development .....

**13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS**

- \*13.01 S14 Feasibility of CCC Bachelor's Degree .....

**14.0 GRADING**

- \*14.01 S14 Adopt the Paper *Implementing Credit by Exam* .....
- \*14.02 S14 Local Use of Available Noncredit Progress Indicators .....

**18.0 MATRICULATION**

- \*18.01 S14 Adopt the paper *Multiple Measures in Assessment: The Requirements and Challenges of Multiple Measures in the California Community Colleges* .....

\* Consent calendar



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS  
MARCH 21-22, 2014

**1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE**

**\*1.01 S14 ASCCC Mission to Promote Academic Excellence**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is the official representative of all community college faculty in the state, and as that representative is responsible for promoting academic excellence in policy, initiative, consultative situations, to the legislature and Board of Governors, and to the media;

Whereas, The Academic Senate mission as currently states<sup>1</sup>:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges fosters the effective participation by community college faculty in all statewide and local academic and professional matters; develops, promotes, and acts upon policies responding to statewide concerns; and serves as the official voice of the faculty of California Community Colleges in academic and professional matters. The Academic Senate strengthens and supports the local senates of all California community colleges;

Whereas, While the current mission implies that the Academic Senate actively promotes academic excellence, an explicit statement to that effect will strengthen the understanding of the work and mission of the academic senate given the competing state and national organizations that attempt to claim that they ensure academic quality in the state; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate often helps to develop and act on policies created in the state but does not always promote all policies in the state because some policies are contrary to positions of the Academic Senate;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend its mission statement to read:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges promotes academic excellence and fosters the effective participation by community college faculty in all statewide and local academic and professional matters; develops, ~~promotes~~, and acts upon policies responding to statewide concerns; and serves as the official voice of the faculty of California Community Colleges in academic and professional matters. The Academic Senate strengthens and supports the local senates of all California community colleges.

Contact: xxxxx, Executive Committee

**\*1.02 S14 Adopt the *Guidelines for the Periodic Evaluation of ASCCC and Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Review Criteria***

---

<sup>1</sup> The current Academic Senate mission statement is found at <http://asccc.org/about/mission>

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS  
MARCH 21-22, 2014

Whereas, Academic Senate Resolution 1.02 S13<sup>2</sup> directed the Academic Senate to “create a task force consisting of equal numbers of Executive Committee representatives and member delegates to develop a process of periodic institutional review for assessing the operations, processes, policies, and programs of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges including the composition of the review team, what standards of accountability will be used, what components would comprise such a review, the number of years between reviews, and how commendations and recommendations will be offered at the conclusion of the process” and that the task force’s recommendation “be presented to the body for adoption by the Spring 2014 Plenary Session so that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges can undergo and complete its first periodic review by the Fall 2014 Plenary Session”;

Whereas, In response to resolution 1.02 S13 the Operational Oversight Committee was formed and charged with developing an evaluation process for the Academic Senate, and this committee held a breakout at the Fall 2013 Plenary Session to present progress to and obtain feedback from the body that was used to inform the work of the committee;

Whereas, The deadline for completion of the first periodic review established as Fall 2014 Plenary Session would place a substantial burden on the organization and the individuals charged with completing the review, and therefore an extension of the timeline to Spring 2015 is much more reasonable; and

Whereas, Upon completion of the periodic evaluation review the Academic Senate should assess the entire process to determine what, if any, changes are required to improve the process and ensure its usefulness to the organization;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the *Guidelines for the Periodic Evaluation of ASCCC* and *Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Review Criteria*;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges undergo and complete its first *Periodic Evaluation of ASCCC* by the Spring 2015 Plenary Session; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assess the efficacy of the Periodic Evaluation of ASCCC process including the *Guidelines for the Periodic Evaluation of ASCCC* and *Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Review Criteria* after completion of the first periodic review and report back to the body any modification or adjustments by Spring 2016 Plenary Session.

Contact: Julie Bruno, Sierra College, Executive Committee

(Please see Appendix A for the full text of this document.)

## 2.0 ACCREDITATION

---

<sup>2</sup> The text of this resolution is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/periodic-evaluation-academic-senate-california-community-colleges>.



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS  
MARCH 21-22, 2014

**\*2.01 S14      Modify Title 5 To Allow Colleges To Be Accredited By Any Nationally  
Recognized Accrediting Agency**

Whereas, California Code of Regulations, Title 5 § 51016 currently requires that, “Each community college within a district shall be an accredited institution. The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges shall determine accreditation;”

Whereas, A basic criterion for participation in Federal financial aid programs is that colleges be accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency not one specific agency;

Whereas, Naming a specific accrediting agency in Title 5 is problematic because agencies may change their names, merge with other entities, or cease to be recognized, any one of such circumstances requiring a corresponding change to Title 5; and

Whereas, Naming a specific accrediting agency in Title 5 reduces the options California community colleges have to affiliate with an accrediting agency that fits their mission and circumstances (e.g., if a California community college chooses or is required to become an institution that offers multiple baccalaureate degrees, it must be accredited by an agency that has been nationally recognized to assess such institutions);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the appropriate bodies to remove references to one specific accrediting agency in Title 5 and to replace the language with a neutral statement requiring only that colleges be accredited by a nationally recognized agency.

Contact: Kevin Bontenbal, Cuesta College, Accreditation and Assessment Committee  
(This is a revised version of a resolution that Patricia Flores-Charter, Southwestern College, wanted to submit on Friday at fall session.)

**\*2.02 S14      Providing Feedback to the ACCJC about the 2014 First Reading Draft of the  
Revised Standards**

Whereas, On January 24, 2014, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) released for first reading a revised set of Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and began soliciting public comment about the draft revisions until April 30, 2014;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) appreciate the opportunity to suggest edits and comment upon the draft revised Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards; and

Whereas, To provide a comprehensive set of edits to the ACCJC, the ASCCC’s Accreditation and Assessment Committee have collected and compiled a list of stylistic, organizational, and content edits that they recommend based upon their own research and analysis as well as from the field in a single document entitled *Suggested Edits to the Draft 2014 Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards*;

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS  
MARCH 21-22, 2014

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the *Suggested Edits to the Draft 2014 Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards* and empower the Executive Committee to submit these edits on behalf of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges both in writing and through oral testimony at the ACCJC's public hearings.

Contact: Phil Smith, American River College, Executive Committee  
(Please see Appendix B for the full text of this document.)

**\*2.03 S14      Prioritizing Oral Testimony to the ACCJC about the 2014 First Reading Draft of the Revised Standards**

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) will hold a public hearing about the 2014 First Reading Draft of the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards at Sylmar, California on April 28, 2014 and Sacramento, California on April 30, 2014;

Whereas, It would be impossible to present oral testimony for all of the items in the *Suggested Edits to the Draft 2014 Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards* document in the available time; therefore, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) must prioritize those editing suggestions that have the greatest importance for faculty; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges devote its oral testimony during the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges at Sylmar, CA (April 28, 2014) and Sacramento, CA (April 30, 2014) to the following five comments and suggestions:

1. Item TBD
2. Item TBD
3. Item TBD
4. Item TBD
5. Item TBD

Contact: Fred Hochstaedter, Monterey Peninsula College, Accreditation and Assessment Committee

**\*2.04 S14      Explore Use of Mock Accreditation Site Visits**

Whereas, Preparing for accreditation site visits can be a daunting experience for most colleges;

Whereas, A possible resource for colleges is the use of mock evaluation teams, a group of accreditation-knowledgeable faculty, administrators, and staff either from the college, other colleges in the same district, or outside colleges who visit the college and provide a simulated experience of an actual site visit; and



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS  
MARCH 21-22, 2014

Whereas, Based upon the mock visit, the college may be better prepared to respond to the actual evaluation team visit;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges investigate the use of mock accreditation team visits and report back to the body by...(spring 2015? Fall 2014?) about how to use mock visits effectively including how to form mock teams, when to employ them, and what kind of feedback to request at the end of the visit.

Contact: Adrienne Foster, West Los Angeles College, Accreditation and Assessment Committee

## 7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

### \*7.01 S14 Participation in State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (SARA) for Distance Education Offerings

Whereas, Colleges and districts that enroll students living in other states in distance education courses may be required by those states to enter into state authorization agreements in order to enroll those students, which can be burdensome to institutions and can result in thousands of dollars in fees to a state, even for a single student;

Whereas, The proposed 34 CFR § 600.9(c) states:

*“If an institution is offering postsecondary education through distance or correspondence education to students in a State in which it is not physically located or in which it is otherwise subject to State jurisdiction as determined by the State, the institution must meet any State requirements for it to be legally offering distance or correspondence education in that State. An institution must be able to document to the Secretary the State’s approval upon request.”*

that if enacted will become an accreditation requirement as colleges are expected to comply with all federal regulations; and

Whereas, Participation by the State of California in the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA)<sup>3</sup>, which provides for “an agreement among member states, districts, and territories that establishes comparable national standards for interstate offerings of postsecondary distance education courses and programs,” could relieve colleges and districts of having to directly negotiate agreements with states and territories, as that would be done by the State of California on behalf of colleges and districts, and could also ensure compliance with the proposed 34 CFR § 600.9(c);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor’s Office and other state entities to analyze without delay the potential benefits and risks of participation in the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement, and report the results of the analysis to the field as soon as possible.

Contacts: Dolores Davison, Foothill College, Executive Committee and

<sup>3</sup> For more information, please go to <http://nc-sara.org>. To review the policies and standards for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements, please go to <http://nc-sara.org/files/docs/SARA-General-Policies.pdf>.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS  
MARCH 21-22, 2014

John Freitas, Los Angeles City College, Executive Committee

**9.0 CURRICULUM**

**\*9.01 S14 Academic Senate Involvement in AB 86 Regional Planning Consortia**

Whereas, In 2013 the legislature passed and the governor signed AB 86 (Education Omnibus Trailer Bill, 2013-2014) that amended California Education Code §84830 to create regional consortia to implement a plan to “better serve the educational needs of adults” in areas that include basic skills, ESL, and short-term CTE educational services; and

Whereas, AB 86 further requires an evaluation and integration of faculty professional development to achieve greater student achievement; and

Whereas, Curricular design, educational planning, student success, and faculty professional development are all part of the 10+1 academic and professional matters under the purview of local academic senates, as stated in Title 5 §53200;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to use established CB21 coding to develop the a framework for connections between credit basic skills, noncredit basic skills and adult education offerings;

~~Resolved, local academic senates are urged to evaluate the best curricular mechanisms to improve student access and success; and, [F1]~~

Resolved, [That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that local academic senates must participate in the regional planning consortia as the business of these consortia, as defined by law, is an evaluation of the academic and professional matters as detailed above] [F2].

Contact: , Noncredit Committee (or John Stanskas, San Bernardino Valley College, Executive Committee)

(Please see Appendix C for the relevant text from AB 86.)

**10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST**

**\*10.01 S14 Adopt the Discipline List Handbook**

Whereas, The body adopted resolution 10.07 S13<sup>4</sup> that directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to consolidate information related to the Disciplines List Process to ensure that all pertinent information to the process is consistent, housed in one place, and can be used by both the Standards and Practice Committee and the field;

---

<sup>4</sup> The full text of resolution 10.07 S13 is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/improvements-disciplines-list-process>



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS  
MARCH 21-22, 2014

Whereas, Resolution 10.09 S13 and amendment 10.09.01 S13, both of which were referred to the Executive Committee<sup>5</sup>, addressed concerns about the need to simplify the way discipline lists recommendations were brought to the body and to clarify the process; and

Whereas, The Standards and Practice Committee developed a Discipline List Handbook that consolidates the disciplines list process, as directed in resolution 10.07 S13, and addresses the concerns stated in the referred resolution 10.09 S13 and amendment 10.09.01 S13;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the Discipline List Handbook and implement the new Discipline List process immediately upon its adoption by the body.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, Executive Committee  
(Please see Appendix D for the full text of this document.)

## **12.0 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

### **\*12.01 S14 CTE Faculty Professional Development**

Whereas, Career and Technical Education (CTE) faculty have unique professional development needs that non-CTE faculty may not have;

Whereas, CTE faculty may have more contact hours per student per unit than non-CTE faculty, are may often be part time faculty, and thus may have less time to collaborate with colleagues in CTE programs and maintain currency in their disciplines and, given the changing dynamics of CTE and Economic Workforce Development (EWD) within California, may directly impact funding, program sustainability, and student success; and

Whereas, At the June 2013 Executive Committee meeting, due to the uncertainty of SB 70 funding for the Vocational Educational Institute, the Institute was placed on a low priority list and in January of 2014 the Executive Committee was presented with a plan to address CTE professional development needs;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges reconsider reinstating the Vocational Education Leadership Institute based on the effectiveness and attendance at the spring 2014 CTE Regional Meetings; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges make the focus of the 2015 Academic Academy Career Technical Education.

Contact: Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College, Executive Committee

**Note:** This resolution was first submitted to the body at the fall 2013 plenary session as resolution 12.02 F13. The body referred this resolution to the Executive Committee for perfecting and to be returned to the body by spring 2014 plenary. The Executive Committee

---

<sup>5</sup> The full texts of resolution 10.09 S13 and 10.09.01 S13 are found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/disciplines-list-motion> and <http://asccc.org/resolutions/amend-resolution-1009-s13>

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS  
MARCH 21-22, 2014

discussed this resolution and provided clarifying information. Given this information, the resolution was rewritten and is being brought back for consideration by the body.

### 13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS

#### \*13.01 S14 Feasibility of CCC Bachelor's Degree

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office recently released a report from the California Community Colleges Baccalaureate Degree Study Group<sup>6</sup> on the topic of expanding the mission of community colleges in the state to include the awarding of bachelor's degrees, and the report concludes with a recommendation that the topic "merits serious review and study;"

Whereas, The Academic Senate currently has an oppose position to adding bachelor's degrees to the mission of CCCs, resolution 6.01 S10<sup>7</sup> but given changes in the labor market and fewer spaces available for transfer students at CSU, faculty may want to reconsider this position;

Whereas, Any comprehensive change to the mission of the CCCs should include comment and input from many colleagues at CSU and UC, and the composition of the CCC study group that produced the report included no faculty representation from these two segments,

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly recommends that, before any action is taken to change the mission of the community colleges to include the awarding of bachelor's degrees, a comprehensive feasibility study and environmental scan by independent researchers be conducted and distributed to the colleges for information, deliberation, and further recommendations to the legislature.

Contact:, Executive Committee

### 14.0 GRADING

#### \*14.01 S14 Adopt the Paper *Implementing Credit by Exam*

Whereas, Academic Senate Resolution 9.05 F08<sup>8</sup> called for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) to "assert the right of discipline faculty to establish the content of credit by exam processes, . . ." and "research and share effective practices for credit by exam processes with local senates";

Whereas, Academic Senate Resolution 9.08 F10<sup>9</sup> called for the ASCCC to "develop and disseminate information to local academic senates regarding effective practices for using credit by exam to recognize learning gained through alternative mechanism," to "encourage local

---

<sup>6</sup> The full report is found at [http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/portals/0/reportsTB/2014\\_01\\_BacDegree\\_StudyGroup\\_WEB.pdf](http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/portals/0/reportsTB/2014_01_BacDegree_StudyGroup_WEB.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> The full text of resolution 6.01 S10 is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/opposition-proposed-modification-community-college-mission>

<sup>8</sup> The full text of resolution 9.05 F08 is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/ensuring-integrity-credit-exam-processes>

<sup>9</sup> The full text of resolution 9.08 F10 is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/credit-exam-processes>



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS  
MARCH 21-22, 2014

academic senates to ensure that students are aware of the existing mechanisms for earning credit through exam processes,” and to “recommend that local academic senates consider the needs of their local communities and strive to ensure that all appropriate exam opportunities are available”; and

Whereas, The paper *Implementing Credit by Exam* asserts the right of discipline faculty to establish the content of credit by exam processes, shares effective practices for implementing credit by exam processes with local senates, offers effective practices for using credit by exam, including ways to ensure that students are aware of mechanisms for earning credit by exam, while encouraging local senates to consider the needs of their local communities;

Resolved, That the Academic Senates for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Implementing Credit by Exam*.

Contact: Dave De Groot, Alan Hancock College, Credit by Exam Task Force ( or Lesley Kawaguchi, Santa Monica College, Executive Committee if Dave can't)  
(Please see Appendix E for the full text of this document.)

**\*14.02 S14 Local Use of Available Noncredit Progress Indicators**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted resolution 14.01 S12<sup>10</sup> that requested changes to Title 5 to include a progress indicator of Satisfactory Progress, SP, at its Spring 2012 session;

Whereas, The Chancellor's Office Scorecard currently voids all data submitted for noncredit progress, thus indicating zero achievement and success;

Whereas, The Chancellor's Office currently lacks the staff to facilitate the requested Title 5 change; and

Whereas, The Chancellor's Office is capable of collecting noncredit progress indicators, and all other progress indicators (A, B, C, D, F, P and NP) are currently defined in Title 5 for credit and noncredit courses (§55021 §55023);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to recommend policies that allow their colleges to begin the practice of assigning progress indicators to all noncredit curriculum; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to elevate the priority of the requested Title 5 change to allow for the use of Satisfactory Progress (SP) as a viable progress indicator.

Contact:, Noncredit Committee (or John Stanskas, San Bernardino Valley College, Executive Committee)

---

<sup>10</sup> The full text of resolution 14.01 S12 is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/progress-indicator-implementation-noncredit-coursework>

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS  
MARCH 21-22, 2014

**18.0 MATRICULATION**

**\*18.01 S14 Adopt the paper *Multiple Measures in Assessment: The Requirements and Challenges of Multiple Measures in the California Community Colleges***

Whereas, The Board of Governors held a study session on basic skills in March 2007, and passed a motion directing the Chancellor to “begin the process of evaluating the implementation of a system-wide uniform, common assessment with multiple measures of all community college students...”;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted the paper *Student Success: The Case for Establishing Prerequisites through Content Review* (Spring 2010)<sup>11</sup> and its recommendations included the need for a paper on multiple measures; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges through Resolution 18.01 F13 adopted the position that any common assessment system developed for use by the California community colleges should allow local control both in the selection of multiple measures for use in placement processes and in the manner in which those multiple measures are applied;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Multiple Measures in Assessment: The Requirements and Challenges of Multiple Measures in the California Community Colleges*; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to continue to engage in discussions at their colleges regarding the determination of appropriate multiple measures and placement processes that improve the success of their students.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, Executive Committee  
(Please see Appendix F for the full text of this document.)

---

<sup>11</sup> This paper is available at <http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Prerequisite-review-fall2010.pdf>



## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Distance Education as the Theme for the 2015 Academic Academy		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: IV. C.	
		Attachment: NO	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Freitas	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	First Reading	X
		Action	X
		Information	

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

**DESIRED OUTCOME:** The Executive Committee will discuss the potential for making distance education the theme for the 2015 Academic Academy, and take action if appropriate.

**BACKGROUND:**

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

The recent emphasis on increasing access to college has been primarily focused on expansion of distance education. The most concrete example in California is the establishment of the Online Education Initiative, through which CCCs may offer courses through a more robust California Virtual Campus. While many policy makers and politicians view the expansion of distance education as a means of expanding access “efficiently” (i.e. cheaply), the reality is that quality distance education requires faculty with discipline expertise who are also well-prepared to teach in the online environment.

Based on recent experiences at breakout sessions on distance education at the fall 2013 Plenary Session and at the 2014 Accreditation Institute, there is a desire for more information on a variety of topics specific to distance education, such as the regulatory and accreditation landscape, the statewide coordination of DE through the Online Education Initiative, the need for quality faculty professional development for teaching in the DE modality, the need for preparing our students for the DE environment before they take DE courses, and the requirements to provide student and learning support services in the DE environment. An Academic Academy dedicated to distance education would be beneficial and empowering to our DE faculty colleagues who are often not recognized on their campuses for the work they put into teaching DE, as well as useful for providing information to faculty who do not teach DE but would benefit from additional information about the modality (including curriculum chairs, SLO coordinators, etc).

---

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







## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Survey about recruiting, screening, and hiring FT/PT faculty		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: IV. D.	
		Attachment:	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Dianna Chiabotti, Faculty Evaluations Task Force	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information & Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval a survey to be sent to local senate presidents, to collaborate with the appropriate individuals, regarding their college's practices.

### BACKGROUND:

In completing the first resolve for S10 1.07

*Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a hiring toolkit or similar collection of resources for use by local senates that can be used to improve recruiting, screening, and hiring of full- and part-time faculty;*

The committee was unable to locate any information from ACHRO on the topic. The committee thought a survey would help gather some information.

Survey on back.

Survey on College current methods recruiting, screening, and hiring of full- and part-time faculty:

1. Does your college have an effective recruiting policy and practice?

Yes

If yes, what are key elements?

No

If not, what are some issues/concerns?

2. Does your college have an effective applicant screening policy and practice?

Yes

If yes, what are key elements?

No

If not, what are some issues/concerns?

3. Does your college have an effective hiring policy and practice?

Yes

If yes, what are key elements?

No

If not, what are some issues/concerns?

Note: We would ask the same questions for regarding FT and PT.



## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Faculty Hiring and Peer Reviews		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: IV. E.	
		Attachment:	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Dianna Chiabotti, Faculty Evaluations Task Force	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	First Reading	
		Action	X
		Information & Discussion	

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the concept of regional meetings in May on faculty recruiting and hiring.

### BACKGROUND:

In completing the second resolve for S10 1.07

*Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide professional development opportunities jointly with human resource directors and/or instructional officers at conferences or institutes about best practices for hiring diverse faculty.*

Based on the breakout at sessions in the fall and the content of the breakout at spring session the committee will provide regional trainings with ACHRO on best practices. The morning would focus on hiring best practices, and the PM would focus on Peer Review.

---







## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Campus Climate Index		Month: March 2014	
		Item No. IV. F.	
		Attachment:	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Dianna Chiabotti, Student Equity Task Force	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information & Discussion	

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

**DESIRED OUTCOME:**

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the chair of the committee calling local senates to encourage the college to complete the Campus Climate Survey.

**BACKGROUND:**

In completing the second resolve for S11 13.05

*Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local colleges to participate in the LGBT-Friendly Campus Climate Index; and*

*Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges seek, where appropriate, to use data collected through the LGBT-Friendly Campus Climate Index in the Senate's ongoing efforts to better understand and serve the needs of LGBT students.*

The committee would like to focus on encouraging campus to complete the survey.

After 10% of the campus complete the index the committee will review the scores and look for trends and needs.

---





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Event Meeting Dates		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: VI. A.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	First Reading	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Julie Adams	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	X
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Tonya Davis	Action	
		Information	

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

**DESIRED OUTCOME:**

The Executive Committee will consider for approval the Executive Committee meeting and event dates.

**BACKGROUND:**

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

At its January meeting, members requested that information be provided about the cost savings associated with holding meetings in Sacramento versus alternating North and South. Based on a review of meetings from the past three years, the following is provided to inform the Executive Committee discussion about future meeting dates/locations. Averaging the meetings North/South, holding the meetings North saves money—approximately \$1,500, which could change year to year based on the Executive Committee geographical makeup.

Members will discuss whether or not to continue to hold the Executive Meeting meetings in Sacramento or to return to alternating both north or south. In addition, members will discuss whether to hold the Academic Academy and the Vocational Leadership Institute next year.

---

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







**Academic Senate**  
for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

## 2014-2015 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING DATES

**\*Meeting will typically be on Fridays from 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and  
Saturdays from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.**

Executive Meeting	August 22 – 23, 2014	
Executive Meeting	October 3 - 4, 2014	
Area Meeting	October 17 – 18, 2014	
Session Executive	November 12, 2014	
Fall Session	November 13 - 14, 2014	
Executive Meeting	January 9 – 10, 2015	
Executive Meeting	February 6 – 7, 2015	
Executive Meeting	March 6 - 7, 2015	
Area Meeting	March 27 - 28, 2015	
Session Executive	April 15, 2015	
Spring Session	April 16 - 18, 2015	
Executive/Orientation	May 29 – 31, 2015	
Faculty Leadership Institute	June 11 - 13, 2015	North
<u>Other Events**:</u>		
Accreditation Institute	February 6 – 7, 2015	North
Academic Academy	February 20 -21, 2015	South
Vocational Education	March 12 – 14, 2015	
Curriculum Institute	July 9 – 11, 2015	South

\* Times may change based on flight schedules

\*\*Executive Committee members are not expected to attend these events.





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Leadership Institute Planning		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: VI. B.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	New Business	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	First Reading	X
		Action	
		Information	

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will discuss the June Leadership planning and give direction to the president on possible topics and presentations.

### BACKGROUND:

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

The Executive Committee will discuss planning for the upcoming Leadership Institute and provide advice to the president about theme, presentations, breakouts, etc.

---

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





**Faculty Leadership Check List**  
**Event Dates June 12-14, 2014**  
**Paradise Point Hotel & Spa, San Diego, CA.**

- Develop a theme for the event, if applicable, and finalize event specs
- Begin brainstorming ideas for break out topics. Discuss with Committee
- Submit program outline to Executive Committee for 1<sup>st</sup> Reading. Make necessary revisions. (Due February 12, 2014)
- Write a paragraph for ASCCC Website to market the event, send to Julie or Holly (Due April 7, 2014)
- Create an email to all prospective attendees advertising the event, send to Tonya or Holly (Due April 7, 2014)
- Write breakout and general session descriptions
- Start thinking of presenters for your breakouts and or General Sessions
- Recruit additional presenters and facilitators to be a part of the event. (If needed)
- Collect Presenter Travel and AV Requests and send to Tonya (Due April 28, 2014)
- Draft Final Program and send to Executive Director (Due April 28, 2014)
- Final Program to Printer's (Due May 12, 2014)
- Review presenter materials and send them to Tonya
- Turn in final presenter digital materials, breakout materials, general session materials and send to Tonya (Due May 27, 2014)
- Early Registration ends on May 27, 2014
- Shipping deadline is June 9, 2014
- Provide on-site assistance at the event if necessary
- Write thank you notes to presenters and committee members, if applicable



# LEADERSHIP EMPOWERMENT VOICE



FACULTY LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE 2013  
June 12-15, 2013 . Sheraton Grand, Sacramento



## WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12

### **12:30 p.m. Lunch at the Chancellor's Office with Vice Chancellors**

Throughout the afternoon, Chancellor's Office leaders will visit with participants and explain what their division does and how it relates to the work on our colleges.

### **5:30 p.m.**

Join colleagues for dinner, local activities, or explore the area on your own. Obtain restaurants and recreation information from the hotel staff and visit [www.Sacramento365.com](http://www.Sacramento365.com) for a schedule of local events.

## THURSDAY, JUNE 13

### **9:00 a.m. Walking Tour of Sacramento: State Capitol and Academic Senate Office**

Attendees will join Executive Committee members on a tour of the State Capitol and the Senate Office. **(Meet in the lobby of the Sheraton Grand at 8:30 a.m. sharp to walk as a group to the Capitol—tour limited to 35 participants).** Pre-registration required.

Provided by the California State Capitol Museum, this tour of our historic capitol will require participants to be able to partake of a brisk but relatively short walk. Visitors entering the Capitol building will be subject to security control measures and checks that include, but are not limited to passing through a metal detector; X-ray and visual examination of all packages; and presentation of positive identification.

### **12:00 noon. Lunch**

Gardenia Room



**1:00 p.m. General Session—Welcome and State of the Senate**

Gardenia Room

*Beth Smith*

**1:30 p.m. Bases for Academic Senates: Laws and Regulations for Senate Purview**

*David Morse*

*John Stankas*

During these challenging times, when senate purview over “academic and professional matters” may be circumvented or ignored, local senate leaders need more than ever to have a clear understanding of the law and regulation that provides the basis for our participation in governance within California’s community colleges. This session will cover what you need to know to build a strong foundation in the 10+1 areas of faculty purview and the role of the academic senate in college policies and processes.

**2:30 p.m. Break**

**2:45 p.m. Building Networks**

*Beth Smith*

**3:00 p.m. Community College Budgets**

*Teresa Scott, Yuba Community College District*

Understanding the history of community college funding is important for senate presidents as they begin the process of understanding the local college and district budgets. In this presentation, California’s unique and often challenging approach to funding community colleges will be addressed along with some tips for recognizing regular features of the local budget, reporting requirements, and how to access more information for local analysis.

**5:00 p.m. Break****5:30 p.m. No-host Reception**

Gardenia Room

Join Executive Committee members for dinner as they lead groups of attendees to local restaurants. Sign up at the registration table by 3:00 p.m. Dinner reservations begin at 7:00 p.m. Dinner is not covered by your registration and any costs incurred are your responsibility.

**FRIDAY, JUNE 14****8:30 a.m. General Session—Staying Connected to the Mothership: Who, What, Why and How of the ASCCC**

Gardenia Room

*Julie Bruno*  
*Dianna Chiabotti*

You are not alone!! Being a senate leader shouldn't be an isolating experience. Maintaining a relationship with the statewide Academic Senate is invaluable in helping you do your everyday job as a senate leader as well as being essential in ensuring that local academic senate authority is protected. What does the ASCCC do? What can you expect from the ASCCC? How do you stay connected to the ASCCC? How can you participate in activities of the ASCCC? This session will focus on building an effective and mutually beneficial relationship with the statewide Academic Senate.

**9:45 a.m. Break****10:00 a.m. First Breakout**

## NUTS AND BOLTS

**Empowering Local Senates: Resources for Developing Local Senate Authority**

Royal Room

*Michelle Grimes-Hillman  
Wheeler North*

This interactive session will assist you in assuming new responsibilities and review the resources available to help you understand the legislation and regulations that affect academic senates; your unique responsibilities as a senate president or new faculty leader; as well as suggestions for ensuring that your colleagues can be most effective in meeting their academic and professional responsibilities.

## PROCESSES

**Resolutions: Why All the Bother?**

Carr Room

*Dolores Davison  
John Freitas*

Resolutions approved by the delegates at plenary sessions are among the most significant directives the ASCCC receives. Local senates also use resolutions as a means to take policy positions, and to make recommendations on local policies and procedures. What is the statewide resolutions process? How are resolutions formulated, enacted, and tracked? How can resolutions, both statewide and locally, help direct policy and procedures at your home campus? Join a pair of self-proclaimed resolutions geeks to discuss these and other questions around resolutions.

## IN-DEPTH CONVERSATIONS

**Challenges to Higher Education Now and in the Future**

Tofanelli Room

*David Morse**Beth Smith*

The landscape for higher education faculty and students is changing due to competing and conflicting interests and priorities. Join this breakout to discuss in depth the challenges that you see to our students, colleagues and programs. Share your insights about the future challenges that are peeking over the horizon. As senate leaders, it is important to keep your eyes on emerging issues as well as on those affecting us today.

**11:15 a.m. Break****11:30 a.m. Lunch (scheduled with an extra 30 minutes to allow teams to meet)**

Gardenia Room

**1:00 p.m. Second Breakout**

## NUTS AND BOLTS

**Budget 101—A Primer**

Royal Room

*Lesley Kawaguchi**Phil Smith*

As a senate leader, you may not understand the basics of your district's budget. Do not be dismayed. Even seasoned accountants might find them confusing. What is a CCFS-311? P3? General Funds? Reserved Funds? Come learn the faculty role in the budget process and the key fiscal planning basics you need to unlock budget mysteries.



## PROCESSES

**Faculty Qualifications, Equivalencies, and Assigning Courses to Disciplines**

Carr Room

*Dan Crump**Michelle Grimes-Hillman*

Academic standards and state statute and regulations require that qualified faculty teach all courses. As senate president, you may have to resolve process and implementation issues for determining faculty qualifications, equivalencies, faculty service areas and course assignments within a variety of disciplines. Come learn about these issues and more.

## IN-DEPTH CONVERSATIONS

**Growing a Strong Senate Family Tree**

Tofanelli Room

*Kim Harrell**John Stanskas*

Are the same handful of faculty filling all the leadership roles on your campus? What are the barriers that prevent new faculty from taking on greater responsibility and what can you do about faculty who are reluctant to move out of leadership roles? When do you know it is time to move on? Come join us for a discussion about methods for growing a strong senate family tree. Learn why leadership succession and widespread faculty engagement are the Miracle-Gro® for a healthy senate and institution as a whole!

**2:15 p.m. Break**

**3:00 p.m. Third Breakout**

## NUTS AND BOLTS

**Meetings, Motions and Manipulations: Deliberative Process at its Best (or Worst)**

Royal Room

*Kim Harrell**Wheeler North*

Organized bodies are formed to serve a purpose; processes are then adopted to assure effective progress while protecting the rights of participants and members. This breakout will focus on best practices and resources to run productive meetings and to ensure representatives carry out the business of the people in a fair and open manner. Topics include parliamentary processes, ground rules, laws affecting how we conduct meetings, and some strategies to help you thrive as a leader.

## PROCESSES

**Accreditation: 2014 and Beyond**

Carr Room

*Dolores Davison**Phil Smith*

A topic of concern on virtually every California Community College campus is accreditation, and concerns over sanctions, recommendations, and the new standards remain a high priority for senate leaders. What are the issues facing colleges? What changes will the new standards bring? How can senate leaders work with the campus community to ensure the best possible results of the accreditation process?

## IN-DEPTH CONVERSATIONS

**Drive Thru Education?: The Associate Degree and the Completion Agenda**

Tofanelli Room

*Julie Bruno**Cynthia Rico*

More and more public debate on education is focused on minimizing unit accumulation while accelerating time to degree completion. This framing of higher education affects the perceived value of a college degree—or does it? Are we doing our students a disservice if we attempt to adhere to the “completion agenda”? Is a degree more than just an accumulation of units? If so, what is its value and can that value be measured? How do you ensure the instructional quality and integrity of a college degree? Join us for a candid discussion about the value of a degree in today’s society.

**4:15 p.m. Break****4:30 p.m. Table Discussions and Problem-Solving in Specified Categories**

Participants will select up to four tables to visit and discuss the topics listed below.

**Table Topics:**

Access to and Use of Data

Board Policies and Admin Procedures

Curriculum Issues

Developing Processes

Governance Challenges

History of AB 1725

Legislation

New Title 5 Regulations for Student Success Support Program and Funding

Online Issues

Professional Development

Scorecard

Senate/Union Relations

**5:45 p.m. Dinner on your own**

## **SATURDAY, JUNE 15**

**8:30 a.m. Fourth Breakout**

NUTS AND BOLTS

**Whose Role Is It? The Senate's? The Administration's? The Board's?**

Royal Room

*Dianna Chiabotti*

*Cynthia Rico*

Senates, administrations, and boards each have roles to play in policy development and policy implementation processes. How do you know who has what role? Should we rely primarily or mutually agree? Have you read your college's Board Policy on the Senate? This breakout will be an interactive session exploring the roles each plays on our colleges and why knowing the role is essential in being an effective senate.



## PROCESSES

**Program Initiation and Discontinuance**

Carr Room

*Dan Crump**Lesley Kawaguchi*

Prop 30 and the May Revise have stopped a lot of bloodletting, but they do not make everything rosy. Colleges are still taking a close look at the viability of many programs, especially in the career technical education areas. Yet other programs are being proposed (sometimes in response to grant opportunities or legislatively-driven mandates). Does your college have policies and processes in place for informing and making these decisions? Are they being followed? What is the senate's role in these decisions? Join us for a discussion about the issues surrounding program creation and discontinuance in these uncertain times.

## IN-DEPTH CONVERSATIONS

**Ethical, Credible Senate Leaders**

Tofanelli Room

*John Freitas**Beth Smith*

Senate leaders have the opportunity to model professional, dignified leadership at our colleges. But staying on the high road when leading colleagues can be challenging. People may perceive sinister goals from your actions, instead of the noble goals that drive you as a leader, and your actions are often challenged. Join this breakout for a deep discussion of how to maintain your integrity (and sanity!) while serving your faculty colleagues. Bring your ideas on what it means to be an ethical and credible leader, and join us for a conversation on how we as leaders can do the best possible job we were elected to do.

**9:45 a.m. Break****10:00 a.m. General Session—Views of Participatory Governance**

Gardenia Room

**12:00 noon Adjournment**

## **2013-2014 Incoming ASCCC Executive Committee**

*President: Beth Smith, Grossmont College*

*Vice-President: David Morse, Long Beach City College*

*Secretary: Julie Bruno, Sierra College*

*Treasurer: Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College*

*Area A Representative: Kim Harrell, Folsom Lake College*

*Area B Representative: Dolores Davison, Foothill College*

*Area C Representative: Lesley Kawaguchi, Santa Monica College*

*Area D Representative: Cynthia Rico, Sand Diego Mesa College*

*North Representative: Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College*

*North Representative: Phil Smith, American River College*

*South Representative: John Stanskas, San Bernardino Valley College*

*South Representative: John Freitas, Los Angeles City College*

*At-Large Representative: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College*

*At-Large Representative: Dan Crump, American River College*

*Executive Director: Julie Adams*



## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Preliminary Program Notes for Curriculum Institute		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: VI. C	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:		TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Stankas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	X
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will discuss and consider for approval the Curriculum Institute Program.

### BACKGROUND:

---

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





**Curriculum Check List**  
**Event Dates July 10-12, 2014**  
**Location, TBD**

- Develop a theme for the event, if applicable, and finalize event specs
- Begin brainstorming ideas for break out topics. Discuss with Committee
- Submit program outline to Executive Committee for 1<sup>st</sup> Reading. Make necessary revisions. (Due March 26, 2014)
- Write a paragraph for ASCCC Website to market the event, send to Julie or Holly (Due April 7, 2014)
- Create an email to all prospective attendees advertising the event, send to Tonya or Holly (Due April 7, 2014)
- Write breakout and general session descriptions
- Start thinking of possible presenters for your breakouts and or General Sessions
- Recruit presenters and facilitators to be a part of the event
- Preliminary Speaker list to President and Executive Director (Due April 21, 2014)
- Submit program draft to Executive Committee for 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading (Due May 14, 2014)
- Provide program draft to Executive Committee for 2<sup>nd</sup> reading at the Executive Committee's May meeting. Make necessary revisions.
- Collect Presenter Travel and AV Requests and send to Tonya (Due May 27, 2014)
- Draft Final Program and send to Executive Director (Due June 2, 2014)
- Final Program to Printer's (Due June 9, 2014)
- Review presenter materials and send them to Tonya
- Turn in final presenter digital materials, breakout materials, general session materials and send to Tonya (Due June 23, 2014)
- Early Registration ends on June 30, 2014
- Shipping deadline is July7, 2014
- Provide on-site assistance at the event if necessary
- Write thank you notes to presenters and committee members, if applicable



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

**BREAKOUT SESSION 1**

**THURSDAY 10:00 – 11:30**

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

*Newbie*  
*Statewide Issues*  
*Other*  
*Newbie*  
*DE Strand*

**WELCOME**  
**LUNCH**  
**KEYNOTE ADDRESS #1**

**THURSDAY 11:45 – 1:45**

**BREAKOUT SESSION 2**

**THURSDAY 2:00 – 3:30**

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

*Newbie*  
*Newbie*  
*Statewide Issues*  
*Noncredit*  
*CTE*  
*Discussion*

**BREAKOUT SESSION 3**

**THURSDAY 3:45 – 5:15**

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

*Newbie*  
*Newbie*  
*Statewide Issues*  
*C-ID*  
*CTE*  
*Discussion*

**NO HOST RECEPTION**

**THURSDAY 5:15 – 6:30**

**DINNER ARRANGEMENTS**

**BREAKFAST**

**FRIDAY 8:00 – 9:00**

**BREAKOUT SESSION 4**

**FRIDAY 9:00 – 10:15**

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

*Newbie*  
*Statewide Issues*  
*C-ID*  
*DE*  
*Other*

**BREAKOUT SESSION 5**

**FRIDAY 10:30 – 11:45**

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

*Staff*  
*Newbie*  
*Noncredit*  
*CTE*  
*Discussion*

**LUNCH**  
**KEYNOTE #2**

**FRIDAY 12:00 – 1:30**

**BREAKOUT SESSION 6**

**FRIDAY 2:00 – 3:30**

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

*Newbie*  
*Newbie*  
*Staff*  
*C-ID*  
*CTE*  
*Discussion*

**BREAKOUT SESSION 7**

**FRIDAY 3:45 – 5:15**

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

*Newbie*  
*Noncredit*  
*Newbie*  
*DE*  
*C-ID*  
*Discussion*

**DINNER ARRANGMENTS**  
**KARAOKE/DANCE PARTY**

**FRIDAY 8:00 – 11:00PM**

**BREAKFAST****SATURDAY 8:00 – 9:00****BREAKOUT SESSION 8****SATURDAY 9:00 – 10:30**

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

**KEYNOTE #3****SATURDAY 10:45 – 12:15****CLOSING REMARKS****NOTES ON POSSIBLE KEYNOTE ACTIVITIES**

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

**NOTES ON BREAKOUTS**

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

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







## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Accreditation Institute and Academic Academy		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: VI. D.	
		Attachment: No	
CATEGORY:	First Reading	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	John Stanskas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	X
		Information	X

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will discuss the Accreditation Institute and Academic Academy.

### BACKGROUND:

The Executive Committee will solicit feedback from the members who attended February events and identify what worked well and what we might improve for next time. The Executive Committee should solicit from members and staff regarding the ease or difficulty of coordinating two events during February and evaluate if a more appropriate schedule is desirable or possible. The Executive Committee may take action to move one of these events or keep them in the same calendar position based on discussion.

---

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





## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Board of Governors/Consultation Council Meetings		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: VII. A.	
		Attachment: YES	
CATEGORY:	Executive Committee Discussion Items	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Beth Smith/David Morse	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Tonya Davis	Action	
		Information	x

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

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

### BACKGROUND:

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

Full agendas and meeting summaries are available online at:

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

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

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







## Executive Committee Agenda Item

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

Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

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

### BACKGROUND:

In past meetings, the Executive Committee has indicated an interest in knowing more about the C-ID and TMC efforts and requested that Bruno and Pilati give a presentation at a future meeting. Additionally, the Executive Committee stated that it would like to discuss the relationship between the Executive Committee and the C-ID.

### Update on ICW:

The following items and issues were addressed at the January 30<sup>th</sup> ICW meeting:

- In response to SB440, approved a working definition of “Area of Emphasis” codified in policy. This allows ICW to explore possible Area of Emphasis degree options including Ethnic Studies and Exercise Science/Allied Health. Additionally, CSU has expressed interest in exploring the possibility of a general science Area of Emphasis. All options are under review and ICW hopes to move forward with one or more TMCs to satisfy this new mandate.
- The ICW Model Curriculum Policy was approved and two new acronyms were added to the lexicon:
  - CCCMC – Intrasegmental Model Curriculum
  - ISMC – Intersegmental Model Curriculum
- Disciplines that fit the ISMC model include Nursing, Information and Communication Technologies, and Engineering. Vetting of the Nursing model curricula closed on February 10<sup>th</sup>. Vetting of ICT closed on February 24<sup>th</sup>.

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

- An ICW Statement on the General Education Component of Associate Degrees for Transfer was adopted which provides students with the flexibility needed to meet various educational goals as well as meet the 60 semester unit mandated for ADTs in SB1440.
- The effort to approve model catalog language for ADTs using IGETC for STEM is on hold until the ICAS IGETC Standards subcommittee approves and incorporates IGETC for STEM into the IGETC Standards. In addition, while ICW has established that students have a choice of transfer GE patterns (per the ICW statement referenced above) and may select a pattern that requires more than 60 units to complete an ADT, the CCC Chancellor's Office has yet to formally concur with this interpretation of SB 1440. On February 11, 2014, the final appointment was made to the ICAS IGETC Standards subcommittee and a meeting to incorporate the IGETC for STEM language is anticipated in the near future.
- A draft MOU between the CSU and the CCC is under discussion at ICW.
- Julie Adams drafted an excellent memorandum that provides a comprehensive summary of the current funding sources of C-ID as well as the future costs of the C-ID effort and the implementation of SB1440 and SB440. The memorandum was distributed and discussed at ICW.

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



## Executive Committee Agenda Item

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

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

Written reports from the Executive Director, Foundation President, committees, task forces, liaisons, and grants are provided for informational purposes.

### BACKGROUND:

The following reports are included with this this item. The public can pull any item from this section for discussion.

1. Executive Director
2. Foundation Report
3. Committee Reports
  - a. Accreditation and Assessment Committee, P. Smith
  - b. Internal Process Committee, Bruno
  - c. Operational Oversight Committee, Bruno
  - d. Professional Development College Task Force, Grimes- Hillman
  - e. Standards and Practices Committee, Grimes-Hillman
4. Task Force Reports
  - a. Distance Education Task Force Report, Freitas
5. Liaison Reports
  - a. TTAC Report, P. Smith
6. Grant and Project Reports

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



## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Executive Director Report of Activities		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: <b>V. A. i.</b>	
		Attachment: No	
CATEGORY:	ASCCC Written Reports	TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Julie Adams	Consent/Routine	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Holly Macriss	First Reading	
		Action	
		Information	X

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The Executive Committee will be informed about the executive director's activities since January 21st.

### BACKGROUND:

Follow up from the January/February Executive Committee agenda:

- Perkins Funding: In communicating with the Chancellor's Office regarding the use of our Perkins 1B funding, the grant language is flexible enough that we can use the funding to send CTE faculty to the Academic Academy Institute, Spring Session, and Leadership. However, we cannot use the funds after June 30, 2012.

### Events Registration

#### Event Registration (as of February 14, 2014):

- Accreditation 2014= 160 registrants (final count)
- Academic Academy 2014= 94 registrants
- Faculty Leadership = 10 registrants
- Spring Plenary = 67 registrants
- Curriculum Institute = 100 registrants

### Grants

#### C-ID (1440/ICW/SCP)

- Assisted in planning the January meetings, which included working with staff to drafting the agenda; discussing agenda items and needed action with Pilati and Bruno; finalizing agenda; and attending the meeting; and reviewing minutes.

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



- Worked with staff to identify technology needs and meet with the new technology programmer.
- Discuss related issues with Chancellor’s Office staff and other interested constituents.
- Staff highlights include:
  - Coordinating ICW, C-ID, and SCP committee meetings for Spring 2014; ICAS meetings in February, April, and June
  - Ongoing faculty recruitment work with Articulation Liaison
  - Coordinating upcoming CORE/FDRG In-Person meeting in March 2014
  - Coordinating meetings for new FDRGs—Biotechnology and EMS
  - Coordinating meetings for after TMC/MC vetting – Nursing, Nutrition/Dietetics, and Child and Adolescent Development
  - Working with C-ID Faculty Coordinator on on-going issues and C-ID improvements
  - AO Subgroup weekly meetings – facilitated agenda creation and notes for subgroup members
  - C-ID website updates including new content on the home page, updated information to include Policies, TMCs/ MCs that are vetting
  - Working with new C-ID programmer for website updates and troubleshooting issues with CMS
  - Ongoing work with Articulation Officers and their submissions into the C-ID system
  - Drafting C-ID newsletter for February
  - Support the C-ID/SCP/1440 work as needed to facilitate the work of the projects. Examples including following up with faculty via email or phone, preparing documents, contacting senate presidents for recommendations for faculty appointments, research and troubleshoot, and other support activities as necessary.

SCP

- Worked with marketing firm and Articulation Officer to finalize online counseling tool and marketing.
- Served as the connection between the work of C-ID and SCP.
- Staff highlights:
  - Facilitated the Programs of Study vetting Ag and Film, Television, and Electronic Media
  - Coordinating convening of FDRG for March 28.
  - Attending meetings and responding to requests for information about SCP

<b>Committees, Task Forces, and Advisory Groups</b>
---

Committee Support

- Prepared for IPC meetings by drafting historical information to begin the conversation about possible policy changes.
- Worked with S&P to finalize draft Disciplines List Handbook.
- Worked with OOC members on the next steps for OOC.
- Worked with the Foundation on future fundraising activities.

### Executive Committee Agenda

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

### Other

#### ICAS

- Worked with staff to finalize the ICAS meeting agenda and minutes for review by the three chairs. Attended the meeting.

### Administration

- Financial:
  - The transition to the Tax Office is going really well. Many of you might have noticed a note from Bill.com regarding your expenses and the ability for us to send funds directly to your account. We believe this is a real plus for this new arrangement. Staff is in the process of reviewing procedures and policies to see if any updates are necessary given this new service.
  - I have been working with the Tax Office CFO to set up meetings to discuss higher level transition issues and will be setting up an appointment with our auditor to run through some of the changes.
  - Continue to work on updating accounting policies to reflect new procedures with the Tax Office.
- Events:
  - Worked with staff on upcoming Institutes— Accreditation and Academic Academy – and the plenary session.
  - Worked with Creative Director, president, institute chairs, and staff to coordinate program process for these events.
  - Staff highlights:
    - Supported events by updating the website, registration, onsite facilitation, contract management, and other details related to event planning and coordination;
    - Facilitated the regional meetings;
- Awards:
  - Worked with staff to oversee the awards process
  - Staff highlight:
    - Drafted Board of Governor’s Agenda item for the Hayward Award
    - Submitted item to the BoG liaison for the agenda.
  - Contacted Board of Governors nominees with the results of the Executive Committee decision, which included an invitation to volunteer at the state-level to gain more experience.
  - Sent letter to the Governor providing him with the names of the Senate’s nominees.

- Office:
  - Continue to look for new office space. As noted previously, we have two options: either stay at the same location and renegotiate the rent or locate a smaller location. We have begun site visits and have found a couple of properties that we are considering. Both locations are in Natomas (Garden Highway area) and have many benefits (free parking, reduced rate-\$1.65 versus \$2.25 sq. ft., easy access to the freeway, and close to hotels). Updates will be provided to the Executive Committee as we move forward with securing a space.
  - Continued working on CEO succession plan.
  - Staff highlights:
    - Processed about \$100,000 in C-ID stipends and related W-9s.
    - Day to day activities in support of the Senate and its grants including processing payments, receivables, coordinating and staffing meetings, etc.

---

West Los Angeles College  
President's Conference Room  
CE Building  
9000 Overland Avenue  
Culver City, CA 90230-3519  
January 10, 2014  
10:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

*Academic Senate for California Community Colleges*

# Accreditation and Assessment Committee *MINUTES*

---

## Preliminaries

### 1. Call to Order

Accreditation and Assessment Committee Chair Phil Smith called the meeting to order at 10:31 a.m. Additional Committee members present were:

- Kevin Bontenbal, Library, Cuesta College (via CCCConfer)
- Roberta Eisel, English, Citrus College
- Adrienne Foster, Education, West Los Angeles College
- Fred Hochstaedter, Monterey Peninsula College
- Norberto Quiroz, Counseling, Santa Rosa Junior College (via CCCConfer)
- Adam Wetsman, Anthropology, Rio Hondo College

### 2. Approval of the Agenda

Phil proposed adding an agenda item entitled *Accreditation Timeline* after *Recent Accreditation Developments*. The Committee agreed and the agenda was approved as amended.

### 3. Public Comment Period (3 minutes per speaker)

None.

### 4. Remaining Meeting Schedule for 2014

Committee members discussed timeframes for the next meeting. There was a consensus that there should be a committee meeting in March to discuss how the Institute went and to plan for spring plenary. Phil will send out a scheduling request to the Committee via doodle.com with some possible dates.

## Discussion Items

### 1. 2014 Accreditation Institute

#### (a) Travel Arrangements

All the Committee members who are able to participate in the Accreditation Institute are planning to arrive Thursday night before the beginning of the Institute. Although Committee members are booking their registration and travel through the ASCCC website, Phil was asked to send an email on behalf of the group about the desire to arrive the evening before the Institute.

#### (b) Opening General Session Presentation

In preliminary planning for the 2014 Accreditation Institute at our last meeting, the Committee decided to do the opening general session *Remembering the Importance of Quality, Accountability, and Student Success: Why Accreditation Matters* as a group. The Committee reviewed the program description below and used that to generate ideas for the breakout.



From restaurant ratings to medical licenses to peer reviewed studies, we rely upon and experience accountability to standards in a myriad of ways. This general session examines the continuum of methods that we employ at our colleges to maintain and assure the quality of our educational programs, including the institutional accreditation process. Understanding how accountability systems may be structured and implemented to promote quality and student success is the foundation for developing effective and sustainable accreditation practices.

Based upon the description, the Committee developed a set of points and ideas to use for the opening general session. Phil recorded the ideas and will send them to the group for additional feedback. These ideas will be used to design an activity and PowerPoint presentation for the first general session.

(c) **Revised Standards Presentation**

Phil reported that the presenters for the second general session had changed due to ACCJC scheduling conflicts. The Committee discussed ways to analyze the current Standards and the first draft of the Revised Standards. Committee members agreed to help with the analysis as soon as the Revised Standards come out, tentatively expected soon after the January 8-10 meeting of the Commission.

(d) **Breakout Planning and Updates**

As a group, the Committee reviewed each breakout session for the correct presenters and descriptions. It also provided an opportunity to get a status update on each breakout. Facilitators were asked to contact presenters as soon as possible if they had not done so already.

2. **Recent Accreditation Developments**

Phil provided a brief report about the December 6th accreditation workshop at City College of San Francisco. The Committee discussed the U.S. Department of Education decision to give ACCJC one year to address concerns and come into compliance with the Criteria for Recognition, the California state superior court decision to enjoin ACCJC from terminating CCSF's accreditation until the trial is concluded, and the ACCJC Commission's release of the Revised Standards.

3. **Accreditation Timeline**

The Committee agreed that the Accreditation Timeline had been useful and felt that it should continue to be updated and continued into the new year.

4. **Brainstorming Ideas for Plenary Resolutions**

The Committee reviewed a resolution suggested by a local senate leader at last fall's plenary entitled *Work to Modify Title 5 Language About Accrediting Agency*. The Committee agreed that the overall idea merited discussion at the spring plenary but had some ideas for strengthening the resolution. Members Kevin Bontenbal and Robert Eisel agreed to review the resolution and suggest edits.

As for other plenary resolutions, the Committee felt that we should wait and see what issues, if any, emerge from the Accreditation Institute.

5. **Brainstorming Ideas for ASCCC *Rostrum* Articles and Plenary Breakout Sessions**

As for *Rostrum* articles and Plenary breakout session topics, the Committee felt that ideas may emerge from the Accreditation Institute and that we should wait before trying to draft something.

**Announcements**

1. Accreditation Institute, February 7-8, 2014, Marriott La Jolla Hotel.



2. General Education Institute, February 21-22, 2014, Napa, CA.
3. ASCCC Area Meetings March 21st (Areas A & B) or 22nd (Areas C & D), 2014  
(Locations vary, contact area representatives.)
4. ASCCC Spring Plenary Session, April 10-12, 2014, SFO Westin, Burlingame, CA.



Internal Process Committee  
Minutes  
December 6, 2013  
12:00 – 5:00 pm  
ASCCC Offices

Present: Julie Adams, Julie Bruno, Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Lesley Kawaguchi

Scribe: Julie Bruno

- I. Approval of the Agenda with modifications
- II. Approval of the Minutes – November 1, 2013
- III. Announcements and General Information - none
- IV. Policy Revisions
  - a. Paper prompts and Publication guidelines (Publication Guidelines)
    - i. Committee reviewed and made significant changes to the document.
    - ii. **Action:** This document will be submitted to the Executive Committee January meeting.
  - b. Elections Process (Election Procedures, Plenary Presentation and Checklist)
    - i. The committee reviewed D. Morse's notes from the plenary breakout.
    - ii. Committee members decided that there was not enough information or direction to make changes to the process.
    - iii. Committee members found the checklist to be valuable for the Elections Chair.
    - iv. **Action:** Julie A will revise the checklist and bring back to the next meeting
    - v. **Action:** Julie B. will bring forward an agenda item to the January/February Executive meeting to obtain direction from the Executive Committee.
  - c. Listserv policy and area handbook (Listserv Appendix)
    - i. The committee reviewed this document and made minor revisions.
    - ii. **Action:** This document will be submitted to the Executive Committee January meeting.
  - d. Ethics Policy and Conflict of Interest (Executive Committee Policies)
    - i. The committee reviewed this document and made modifications. The committee believes that more work needs to be done.
    - ii. **Action:** The committee will work on this policy during the next meeting.
  - e. Honoring Faculty Leaders (Executive Committee Policies)

- i. The committee reviewed this policy and revised to expand actions for honoring faculty including contributing to the foundation.
- ii. **Action:** This document will be submitted to the Executive Committee January meeting.

V. New Policies

- a. Vendors at Senate Events (Vendor Policy)
  - i. Committee members reviewed the survey from plenary. There were no comments from attendees on the vendors.
  - ii. **Action:** This document will be submitted to the Executive Committee January meeting.
- b. Evaluation Process for Executive Director - tabled
- c. Communication (Internal and External Communication, Email, and Social Media)
  - i. The committee discussed revising the Internal and External Communication policy to include use of social media and email.
  - ii. **Action:** The committee will work on this policy during the next meeting.
- d. Grievance policy
  - i. Committee members thought it would best create a policy to address violations of ASCCC policies including ethics, harassment, etc.
  - ii. **Action:** The committee will work on this policy during the next meeting.
- e. Policy on posting PowerPoint presentations - tabled

VI. Other

- a. Public relations – Kawaguchi has been asked to bring forward an agenda item to the January Executive Committee meeting on the use of gifts for public relations.

VII. Next meeting: TBD

**Operational Oversight Committee**  
**Monday, December 16, 2013**  
**Minutes**  
**9:00am - 11:00pm**

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

- I. The Agenda was approved
- II. The October 31, 2013 meeting minutes were approved
- III. Plenary Breakout Debrief –
  - a. Committee members discussed the fall plenary breakout on the proposed Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate. Morse and Smith were tasked with taking notes on attendee comments while the other committee members presented during the breakout.
  - b. Morse reviewed his notes on attendee feedback at the breakout
    - i. Proposal is too complicated. The domains did not seem to make sense. The audience encouraged the committee to be more direct and to have fewer domains or standards.
    - ii. OOC needs to focus on whether the senate is accomplishing its goals and purpose. The rest of the domains did not seem to interest the audience much.
    - iii. The audience was very clear that they felt the focus should be on the executive committee and the senate. They explicitly said that the executive director should not be the focus.
    - iv. Some questions were raised as to how often this review should happen. It appeared that most did not feel it needed to happen every year or even every other year.
    - v. The idea that our non-profit status or seeing ourselves as a board has any relevance to the process was contradicted by the President, and the audience was clearly not concerned with that idea either.
    - vi. Some suggested that we should work off the mission statement rather than the domains.
    - vii. The list of questions under each domain was seen as too complex.
    - viii. No real consensus seemed to exist regarding how the evaluators should be selected. Inclusion of some people from outside seemed to be received fairly favorably. Again, the overall impression was that the proposal was overcomplicated, but the audience was focused more on the content of the evaluations than the evaluators.
    - ix. In general, attendees appeared to be less concerned about the committee following the original resolution exactly. The audience approved of the concept of an evaluation but not of



- the specific content of the resolution, which was at one point characterized as “the wrong resolution.”
- x. The only consensus that came out of the breakout was that those in attendance did not approve of the proposal and wanted something far more simple and focused that would deal with the actions and effectiveness of the Executive Committee and put the other aspects of the proposal aside.
- c. Committee members agreed with the notes and related additional impressions of the feedback from attendees
    - i. Proposal was too complicated
    - ii. Attendees not consistent in complaints but unanimous in advocating to “keep it simple”.
    - iii. Create a brief review to see if Exec is doing its job to meet the mission and serve the faculty.
    - iv. Process should be simpler and more focused than presented
    - v. It appeared that most attendees had not read the “Code of Ethics”. Consider renaming the document and publicizing widely.
    - vi. Committee members felt defensive at first but did agree that the process is more complex than it needed to be.
    - vii. Need to focus on central interests - Is Exec doing the work faculty wants? Is the work effective?
    - viii. Attendees consistent in not liking what the committee proposed.
  - d. One committee member argued for caution in allowing a small group of attendees at a breakout drive all changes to the proposal.
  - e. A committee member questioned if OOC can change the direction of a resolution without specific action from the body? (i.e., do we need a new resolution?)

#### IV. Next Steps -

- a. The committee will develop a plan to address the concerns by the breakout attendees at the next OOC meeting.
- b. The following ideas were discussed
  - i. It was determined that a holistic approach is needed.
  - ii. Focus on the mission of ASCCC
  - iii. Keep the process more open-ended
  - iv. Create areas for evaluators to provide feedback
  - v. Compress into more concrete areas such as combining some of the domains
  - vi. Focus on the mission and determine how the operations, processes, policies and programs align with the mission
  - vii. Focus on what works and what needs improvement
  - viii. Include a self-evaluation of Exec in the process
  - ix. Provide a list of things to consider
  - x. Provide resources
  - xi. Give Evaluators some direction and definition

- xii. The resolution may be interpreted in different ways
    - xiii. Don't make the process look like accreditation
  - c. The committee should consider the following when revising the proposal
    - i. Resolution timeline
    - ii. Choosing evaluators- a random drawing was proposed at the breakout and the committee members like this idea
    - iii. Product – include the commendations and recommendations, if there are any
    - iv. Self-evaluation of Exec must be prominent in the process
    - v. Methods for the evaluators – interviews, documents. Since we are a public organization most, if not all, documents are available on the website
    - vi. Budget for the evaluators
  - d. Conclusion - what is needed is a holistic review that determines if processes, policies, programs and operations align with the organization's mission. The process should provide definition but should not be prescriptive. Evaluators should have the flexibility to create a review that will serve the institution well.
- V. Next Meeting – Tuesday, January 28, 2014 from 11-5 at the ASCCC Offices.  
(Note: This was rescheduled to Monday, January 27<sup>th</sup> from 11:30 to 5:30 at the ASCCC Offices.)

### **Resolutions assigned to the OOC**

#### **1.02 Sp13 Periodic Evaluation of the Academic Senate**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **1.04 Sp 13 Academic Senate Annual Report on Accomplishments and Operations**

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

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

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

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

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

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

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







# Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

---

Meeting Notes  
Professional Development College Task Force  
September 3, 2013 (10AM-12PM)  
CCCConfer

Attended: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Julie Adams, Dolores Davison, David Morse, Don Gauthier

- I. Introductions
- II. Review resolution:
- III. Background (Julie)
  - a. JA provided history and background
- IV. Vision of the PD College (Julie)
  - a. JA introduced some ideas for discussion
    - i. Resources could be generated: Webinars, Power points
    - ii. Great for part-time faculty
  - b. A plan (and timeline) will need to be developed
    - i. Plan might include phases of implementation
    - ii. Members describe the need to material creation sustainable (make it part of regular work load)

Next Steps and meeting dates

- c. PD College ideas for topics/modules should be sent to JA by September 30.
- d. JA will draft of a plan outline
- e. Members will meet F2F at the ASCCC offices on October 11 around 10ish (depending on flights) to review plan outline of modules/ideas to present at a Fall session breakout
  - i. What kind of training could we offer?
  - ii. Who is our audience?
  - iii. Could we partner with CSU to offer credit) or with @One?
  - iv. How we use it and make it effective
  - v. Can we partner or use CO Webinars?
  - vi. Can create a modules and offer credit?
- f. MGH will send travel form to DG





# Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

## Professional Development College Task Force

Friday, 11 October 2013, 10:00 – 3:00

### Minutes

---

Present: Michelle Grimes-Hillman (chair), Julie Adams (CCC Confer), Dolores Davison, Don Gauthier, David Morse

Notetaker: Dolores Davison

Minutes from 3 September 2013 meeting approved.

#### Modules:

- Instead of looking at topics, perhaps look at strands (basic skills, new faculty, good practices for development of ADTs): which of these modules would have certification, and would parts of them be at the Leadership Institute?
- Start with structure and then work from there on populating content (look at Santa Rosa's part time faculty program and use some of their effective ideas and make them generic; modeling ideas statewide; 3CSN, LACCD's model, variety of places that we could draw content from); part time website as formatting model.
- Start out with structure: look at what CSU will work with (who can we partner with: CSU senate?; @One, CCC Confer, CCLC): reach out to partners that are already doing what we want to do in those areas. Since we do the institutes, we could stream videos and use those as a teaching device; put out a call for modules so we can look for other groups who might want to participate (CCCCO); award winners for exemplary programs, diversity award winners, etc.

#### Breakout:

- Two major intents: 1. get people excited about the program, and 2. get examples for modules and other things that people want in the program (David working on description); introduction and then brainstorm ideas (flip charts, threads, etc), meet briefly afterwards to put everything together (give groups modules to include pieces, give an example of leadership as a module)
- Use this as an opportunity to recruit volunteers and/or participants?

#### Going forward:

- Draft the structure, come up with the modules (example: leadership).
- Start at institute in June, module at plenary, maybe one over summer on technical assistance or Disciplines list
- Track at fall session for new leaders, including pricing structure (may or may not include plenary registration)
- Determine if there are the other groups we want to partner with (ie, technical assistance with CCLC, how can we pull in @ONE, etc)
- Where is this going to be housed (website, budgeting, etc); whole new logo and website? Could we take over 4faculty.org (talk to Riverside?) We would need to ensure that there is some sort of quality control. Look at universities with current programs and see how things are structured, modules, other components (UCD, CSUN, others; even if they are graduate programs, we can look at the kinds of things they are offering and go from there)
- Go through PPTs from last year: putting PPTs online under professional development, go through past PPTs from leadership and plenary

Timeline:

- After plenary, start putting together a plan for leadership; start in June and end in June (begins with people that are brand new at leadership and then using them the following year to report out how things worked)
- Pilot model would be ready to be launched at June (tape first session at leadership); pre-session with the people who have enrolled in the college (leadership as part of the module, not the entire thing); networking involved in this as well
- Continuing Ed and moving this into a formal professional development certificate; could be offered through any of the colleges with fee based
- Once we have structure set up it will be easier to establish content (timeline, specifics of certificates, awarding of credit; what is the distinction between us awarding credit versus a certificate)
  - University of Laverne model (pieces of modules with unit values, how to structure (many modules equal certificate, etc); meeting on December 4 in Long Beach at 3pm

Agenda item for January:

- Assignments for other exec members leveraging current committee work, breakouts, etc on specific topics
- Pilot for June (leadership): roll out an outline at spring plenary 2014 to gauge interest, fix any holes

Modalities:

- Online, face to face, live streaming video, webinars; how would they get credit in sections other than in face to face?;
- How would we handle:
  - Grading
  - Fees
  - Min quals?

Next Meeting: Wednesday, 4 December, 3pm, in Long Beach (David's house)

Adjourned at 1:15pm

Standards and Practices Committee:

Notes

January 14, 2014

CCCConfer

Present: Julie Adams, Julie Bruno, Kale Braden, Dan Crump

Recorder: Michelle Grimes-Hillman

- I. Approval of minutes – November 19
  - a. Notes were approved
- II. Norming Hayward Award
  - a. Members discussed norming and categories of the rubric. Members were asked to consider if rubric changes would be necessary for the next award process
- III. DL Handbook – Review Exec comments
  - a. Discussed changes
  - b. Kale B will consider and draft timeline information that would be useful to the proposal authors
  - c. Julie A will draft a flow chart for inclusion
  - d. Members will discuss Exec recommendations on January 28; Julie B and MGH will draft changes and send to the group February 4
- IV. Spring Session Topics/Resolutions
  - a. Suggested topics:
    - i. MQ breakout
    - ii. DL Handbook and Process (will need a resolution)
    - iii. Awards: PT/FT Hayward, Diversity recipient, and Exemplary presentation







## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: Distance Education Task Force Report		Month: February/March 2014	
		Item No:	
CATEGORY:		Attachment: <b>NO</b>	
		TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:		Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :		Action	
		Information	X

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

**DESIRED OUTCOME:** The Executive Committee will be updated on the activities of the Distance Education Task Force and the outcomes of the February 21, 2014 meeting.

**BACKGROUND:**

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

The Distance Education Task Force met by CCC Confer on February 21. The main objectives of the meeting were to review the status of action items from the January 24 meeting, to review the approved outline for the DE paper and to assign tasks and timelines for completing the first draft.

NOTE: Because the agenda item submission deadline is before the scheduled meeting of the DE Task Force, the written report will be distributed to the Executive Committee after February 21.

---

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



## Executive Committee Agenda Item

SUBJECT: TTAC Report		Month: March 2014	
		Item No: VII. C. 5. a.	
		Attachment: <b>NO</b>	
CATEGORY:		TYPE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION:	
REQUESTED BY:	Phil Smith and John Freitas	Consent/Routine	
		First Reading	
STAFF REVIEW <sup>1</sup> :	Julie Adams	Action	
		Information	X

*Please note: Staff will complete the grey areas.*

**DESIRED OUTCOME:** The Executive Committee will be receive an update from J. Freitas and P. Smith on the February 13 Technology and Telecommunications Advisory Committee (TTAC) meeting.

**BACKGROUND:**

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

TTAC held its second meeting of the academic year on February 13 in Sacramento. The committee received updates and reports on the CCC technology initiatives and projects.

NOTE: This agenda item was submitted before the TTAC meeting as the agenda submission deadline was before the meeting was held. J. Freitas and P. Smith are the Executive Committee representatives and will provide the body with a written report prior to the February/March meeting.

---

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





## Report on TTAC Meeting, February 13, 2014

Submitted by John Freitas and Phil Smith

(Please see the attached TTAC Agenda for background information)

### 1. System update from Patrick Perry, Erik Skinner and Bonnie Edwards

- E. Skinner updated the committee on the Governor's proposed budget for 2014-2015. The highlights were: 3% growth for 2014-2015, COLA of 0.86%, Student Success funding of \$100 M for SSSP and an additional \$100 M for closing achievement gaps (student equity). Of note was the possibility of a change in the matching fund requirements for the colleges to reduce the amount of match they have to provide (currently 3:1 match).
- There were questions about the equity plan funding. It was noted by E. Skinner that the student equity plans will likely take the form of real work plans that colleges will need to follow. The funding is planned to be ongoing. How funding is to be distributed will be determined by the CCCCCO, but the current budget bill language requires disbursement based on need.
- P. Perry announced that the CCC Foundation was awarded a Kresge Grant of \$2.5 M over 5 years (?) to create local student success assistance centers. This dovetails with a proposal from the Dept. of Finance to create FCMAT-like bodies for the CCCs to help colleges identify and address problems before they become serious. Individuals recalled similar technical assistance teams that visited colleges in the past. It was noted that these teams will consist of experts across the state, not just Chancellor's Office staff. Prop 98 funds may also be used to fund this.
- Updates on legislation: AB 743 on Common Assessment is now funded. (We may need to update the body about this development. It's not clear if everyone is aware that we may all have a set of common assessment instruments soon. Phil asked about required use of vendors; P. Perry believes that vendor is sufficiently general as to encompass the CCCCCO's efforts and doesn't necessarily have to be an outside, commercial vendor.) SB 520 (Steinberg) is a two-year bill that is still looming; it needs to be watched. AB 1100 (Levine), the CA Teleconnect Fund stalled in Assembly Appropriations Committee over concerns over need. PUC may address this as they review the CTF regulations this year. SB 1052/1053 funding has been slow to come in. OER has received a Hewlett Foundation grant of \$500 K.
- Updates on CENIC were provided by B. Edwards: The State Librarian has joined in as a partner. Public libraries will be linked into the broadband network, and their participation (paying \$4.5 M) will help keep CENIC costs stable for the CCCs. In some cases, the libraries will "come in behind" one of our colleges, requiring an agreement between the two parties if troubleshooting of the network is needed. The fiber optic build out for the Central Valley Next Generational Infrastructure Project is on track to be completed for the majority of Central Valley colleges early this year (Feb-April 2014). The Northern California Fiber

Build Application is not yet funded, although the Golden Bear Broadband alliance has received the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity from the CPUC, which will allow it to be the utility that operates. Will know by late June about funding. For more information about CENIC, go to [www.cenic.org](http://www.cenic.org).

2. TTIP (Telecommunication and Technology Infrastructure Project) Update was presented by Bonnie Edwards

- TTIP is preparing for about \$1.4 M equipment replacement cost for 2014-2015.
- Secondary circuits were cancelled during the budget crisis; TTIP has not yet moved to restore those. It is going to the Dept. of Finance to try to get more funding for this.
- After June 30, 2014, EduStream Project no longer funded by TTIP. Streaming/storage will be provided by 3CMedia Solutions for an anticipated cost savings of \$250 K.
- 3CMedia Solutions will provide video conferencing instead of the Imperial County Office of Education. Cost will be \$40 K instead of the current \$250 K.
- It was pointed out that governing boards need to adopt information security policies. The CCLC is working on a draft board policy/administrative procedures that boards can adopt. The recent major security breach in the Maricopa Community Colleges system network is a cautionary tale.
- CCCApply: using open source software now. 32 colleges have implemented the new software; 50 more in the pipeline and hoping for 70-80 colleges using the new version by June. There has been positive feed back from students. The new CCCApply has been made available to the colleges for free.
- eTranscripts: As of 2012-2013 85 CCC, UC, CSU and private colleges were using the service.
- @ONE faculty training classes: 90% fill rate, 75% completion rate.
- Cal-Pass Plus: it was noted that this data could be used as a multiple measure, perhaps.

3. Grants Projects Governance update was presented by Bonnie Edwards

- The governance structure for the Online Education, Education Planning and Common Assessment Initiative grants was reviewed.
- TTAC will be the primary advisory body over these initiatives.
- There will be steering committees for each initiative, and steering committees are envisioned to have workgroups to deal with the detail work. The existence of smaller, focused work groups will provide more opportunities for involvement from the field.
- There will be three advisory/steering committees that will work with TTAC and the project steering committees to provide support: Professional Development, Technology Advisory (will be SAC), Student Services and Usability.
- There is an Educational Collaborative body that appears in between TTAC and the steering committees. It consists of project managers and CCCCO staff from

academic affairs and student services. While this was described as a technical coordination body, it is unclear if this is a resource body, or a “gatekeeper” between the steering committees and TTAC. This needs to be clarified.

4. Grant Initiative – Common Assessment/Multiple Measures initiative update presented by Kim Sorey and Tim Calhoon
  - K. Sorey and T. Calhoon presented on the purposes of the Common Assessment Initiative. See the TTAC agenda for a summary of their presentation. The PowerPoint is also available.
  - The key objective is to develop a general purpose assessment platform for both assessment prep and assessment.
  - Interesting note: Colleges are supposed to use the common assessment to receive the SSSP funds. Is the field aware of this? (Possibly a Rostrum article?)
5. Grant Initiative – Education Planning initiative update presented by Tim Calhoon.
  - Please see the TTAC agenda for more information; the PowerPoint is also available.
  - The key objective is to develop a student portal that uses student information (such as CCCApply information) that creates a “personalized” structured pathway to help students develop their education plans. Colleges could integrate the portal into their local systems.
  - This will handle 1M + users.
  - Expanding eTranscript and to make it available to colleges for no cost.
6. Grant Initiative – Online Education initiative update presented by Joe Moreau.
  - Please see the TTAC agenda for more information; the PowerPoint is also available.
  - OEI will primarily focus on courses supporting ADTs, but other degree applicable courses will be supported.
  - Basic skills instruction will be supported, but perhaps more through tutorial support than course offerings.
  - The first steering committee meeting is April 4, perhaps near LAX.
  - There are plans for town hall-like “discovery sessions” for May that will get input from the field (not quite clear yet).
  - Initial group of consortium colleges may be identified by early summer (as a goal).
  - Bill Scroggins expressed surprise that the OEI description had virtually no information/planning around the common course management system (CMS); it seems central from earlier TTAC thinking and planning and yet we did not hear about it. (Note: There may be a disconnect since those discussions were before the grant was awarded. Joe Moreau may not have been aware of those discussions.)

7. SAC update was presented by Tim Calhoon. This was very brief due to lack of time. See the TTAC agenda for background.

8. Annual TTAC Retreat: The TTAC Retreat is planned for May 22-23 in San Diego. The possible issues/topics are listed in the TTAC agenda.

## Telecommunications and Advisory Committee

Will meet on  
**February 13, 2013**  
**10:00 a. m. – 3:00 p.m.**

at

### Four Points Sheraton Hotel Sacramento Airport

4900 Duckhorn Drive  
1590 Harbor Island Drive  
Rivers East Conference Room

Airport Shuttle available: Call (916) 263-9000 when you arrive

CCC Confer – Meet & Confer Login Information:  
Call 913-312-3202 or (888) 886-3951 and connect to [www.cccconfer.org](http://www.cccconfer.org)  
Participant Passcode:  
720089

	10:00-10:15	TTAC Member Update and Introductions	Welcome	Patrick Perry
1	10:15 – 11:00	System Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Budget</li><li>• Legislative</li><li>• CENIC</li></ul>	Information	Patrick Perry/Erik Skinner / Bonnie Edwards
2	11:00-11:30	TTIP Updates	Information	Bonnie Edwards
3	11:30 – 12:00	Grant Governance	Information	Bonnie Edwards
	12:00 – 12:30	Lunch		
4	12:30- 1:00	Common Assessment Initiative Grant	Information	Ken Sorey / Tim Calhoon
5	1:00 – 1:30	Education Planning Initiative Grant	Information	Tim Calhoon
6	1:30- 2:00	Online Education Initiative Grant	Information	Joe Moreau / Tim Calhoon
	2:00 – 2:15	Break (place holder)		
7	2:15 – 2:45	SAC Report	Information	Tim Calhoon
8	2:45 – 3:00	TTAC Retreat -Location -Agenda: Planning	Information	Bonnie Edwards
	3:00	Wrap and Close	Action	Bill Scroggins



## *Welcome*

### **TTAC Member Update**

#### *Robert Coutts*

CESA Representative  
President, CSEA Chapter 101

#### *Linda Michalowski*

Vice Chancellor of Student Services

### **New Project Directors**

Joe Moreau, Foothill-DeAnza  
Online Education Initiative

Jim Lanich and Ken Sorey  
Cal-Pass Plus and Common Assessment

### **New TRIS staff**

Gary Bird  
Technology Unit

**Action: Informational Update**

**Presentation:** *Patrick Perry, Vice Chancellor TRIS  
Erik Skinner, Deputy Chancellor  
Bonnie Edwards, Technology Director*

**Issue:** TTIP operating with a \$15,790,000 budget for 2013-14, no proposed increase in TTIP funding in Governor's 2014-15 proposed budget. Funding for Online Education, Education Planning and Common Assessment was made available in the 2013-14.

**Background:**

The 2013-14 budget brought additional funds to the California Community Colleges to implement initiatives supporting Student Success and Online Education and delivered via technology.

Governor released his 2014-15 proposed budget, which continued support for student success.

2013-14 set minimum guarantee at \$55.3M

2014-15 set minimum guarantee at \$61.6M, increase of 11.4%

**Analysis:****Budget and Initiatives**

- 2013-14 Budget
  - Online Distance Education Initiative: \$16.9M one-time and \$10M on going
    - Grant awarded to Foothill-DeAnza CCD, in partnership with Butte CCD
    - Grant commencement date December 1,2013
  - \$50M augmentation to Student Success and Support Services
    - To build out local resources to support the student success initiative.
    - \$14M for statewide initiatives: Education Planning and Common Assessment
    - Education Planning grant awarded to Butte CCD
    - Common Assessment grant awarded to Butte CCD, partnership with Cal-PASS Plus and Saddleback college.
    - Grant(s) commencement date December 1,2013
- 2014-15 Proposed Budget
  - \$200M investment in Student Success
    - \$100M for the Student Success and Support Program
    - \$100M to close the achievement gap per student equity plans
  - Flexibility
    - The Governor proposes to allow districts to reallocate up to 25% of funds from select categorical programs to other federal, state, or local programs to meet the needs of underrepresented student groups as identified in Student Equity Plans.

**Legislation**

**This year, 2013-14:** Major activity occurred through the budget this year for the Online Education Initiative and the funding of the Student Success Act of 2012 (Education Planning and Common Assessment). Common Assessment, AB743 signed in 2011.

**SB 195 (Liu)** – higher education goals. This bill was just signed by the Governor. It sets three broad goals for the segments of higher education and specifies that metrics be developed to monitor progress on them. It allows that the metrics be derived from publically available (existing) data sources. This bill started off with stronger language but was watered down as it went through the process.

**SB 520 (Steinberg)** – online education. This bill created a grant program for faculty to develop online courses but provided for partnerships with outside online providers and had no funding. It was made a “two-year” bill in the Assembly Higher Education Committee. It could be revived next year or amended into something different so we will keep a close eye on it.

**AB 1100 (Levine)** – CA Teleconnect Fund. The CCCCO was the sponsor of this bill which lifted the cap on CTF reimbursements for community colleges. It stalled in the Assembly Appropriations Committee because of concerns of whether it is necessary at this time. This issue is supposed to be taken up by the PUC as they review CTF regulations this year.

### **From last year, 2012-13**

**SB 1052 & 1053 (Steinberg)** created the CA OER Council and Library for open textbooks. It was signed last year and took effect in January. The Council Members have been chosen by the Academic Senates but funding has been slow to come in. The money provided for this program in last year’s budget required a match of private funds.

### **CENIC Update**

- **Fiber Build-out Project:** The Central Valley Next Generation Infrastructure Project will increase the availability of broadband networking in 18 counties in California’s central valley: Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, El Dorado, Fresno, Kings, Kern, Mariposa, Merced, Madera, Nevada, Placer, Tuolumne, Tulare, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Sutter and Yuba. More info at: <http://www.cvngbip.org/>
  - **Status of Project:**
    - **Initial estimate:** Scheduled to complete February 2013 but services will be offered immediately as sections of the infrastructure are completed.
    - **Current status:**
      - San Joaquin Delta and Merced College – Operational
      - Estimated Completion for majority of Central Valley Colleges: February – April 2014
- **Northern Fiber Build Application:**
  - **Current Status: not funded**
  - Golden Bear Broadband, an alliance of Native Business Enterprises and Siskiyou Telephone Co., should learn in late June whether it got the California Advanced Services Fund grant.
  - The project has not been funded but the CPUC is award GBB with a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN). A CPCN is required of a utility before any facilities for telecom services can be built.
  - CENIC helped to write the initial planning grant but is no longer directly involved with the project.
  - Colleges benefiting if approved: Butte College, College of the Redwoods, Lassen College, Mendocino College (Ukiah, Willits, and Lake), Shasta College, College of the Siskiyous, and Yuba Community College District (Woodland, Williams and Windsor)
  - The money would allow the company to install complete, affordable and diverse broadband capability across the 16 counties.
  - The project would require up to 33 new Golden Bear Broadband fixed wireless towers to extend the broadband’s reach.
  - The application says 631,402 households, about 40 percent of the 1.6 million residents in the 16 counties, are underserved or not served “in terms of provider choice and speed.”

**Recommendation:** This is an informational update.

**TTIP Updates**

Item 2

**Action: Informational Update****Presentation:** *Bonnie Edwards*

**Issue:** In 2009-10 TTIP experienced a 42% reduction in funding. The TTIP budget was reduced to 15.29M and continues to operate at the 2009-10 funding level. The program continues to successfully implement and support statewide technology projects. Operating with a flat budget, the program continues to look for cost savings.

**Background:**

The partnership with CENIC continues to prove beneficial for the CCC's by driving connectivity costs down. Nevertheless, other cost pressures are impacting TTIP, such as higher taxes and equipment replacement costs. TTIP is preparing for 1.4M equipment replacement cost in 2014-15. The Central Valley fiber project was originally scheduled to complete in February 2013 but is now projected to complete April 2014. The cost savings generated by the fiber project were expected to help bolster services.

**Grants and Projects:****Analysis:**

TTIP has taken the following direction as it relates to funding:

- TTIP increased the amount of funds in the equipment replacement account.
- TTIP is not approving bandwidth increases unless the price point is neutral or negative.
- TTIP has not moved to restore cancelled secondary circuits.
- After June 30, 2014, TTIP will no longer fund the EduStream Project.
  - Storage and streaming services will be provided by 3CMedia Solutions
- Stopped funding video conferencing through the Imperial County Office of Education
  - 3CMedia Solutions will provide this service
- Implemented an open source version of CCCApply.

TTIP Projects continue to expand and provide services and support to the CCC's.

**Recommendation:** Provide an informational update.



**Informational**

*Presentation: Bonnie Edwards*

**Issue:** The Chancellor's Office has awarded grants for three major initiatives and has developed a governance structure to support the successful implementation of the new initiatives.

**Background:**

On December 1, 2013, the Online Education, Education Planning and Common Assessment Initiative grants went into effect. The three initiatives have joint project oversight at the Chancellor's Office with TRIS technology staff serving as the grant monitor.

All Request for Applications (RFA's) provided explicit direction to leverage existing TTIP technology services. This direction requires collaboration between new and existing committees and projects.

**Analysis:**

Following are the key elements of the governance structure:

- TTAC will act as the primary advisory committee over existing TTIP projects and the new initiatives.
- Cross-pollenate the steering committees with members from other stakeholder committees.
- A steering committee will be created for each of the projects: Common Assessment, Education Planning and Online Education.
- Workgroups will be created to perform specific and required tasks.
- Workgroups may be dissolved once they have completed their task, or if warranted, morph into a steering committee.
- All three of the initiatives have need of professional development, technology and usability review. As a result, a committee for each of these areas will be created and will support all projects.

**Professional Development:**

- Online Teaching Certification: Currently offered by @One. The plan is to partner with an existing educational institution to train faculty.
- Hire a Director of Professional Development to oversee all three grants.
- @One serve as a broker/facilitator of professional development offerings.

**Technology Advisory Committee:**

- SAC (Systemwide Architecture Committee) will serve in this capacity. Additional experts will be brought in as needed.

**Student Services and Usability Steering Committee:**

- Identify student services offerings that should be available to students
- Ensure consistency and "user-friendliness" of the platform/initiative tools.

**Recommendation:** Informational update



**Informational**

**Presentation:** *Key Sorey and Tim Calhoon*

**Issue:**

The Common Assessment Initiative grant was awarded to Butte-Glenn CCD (CCC Technology Center) in partnership with San Joaquin Delta College (CalPASS Plus), and Saddleback College. Progress to date, Status, Next Steps and the Project timeline will be discussed.

**Background:**

California's Community Colleges face the challenge of accurately assessing and placing the growing numbers of students seeking entrance and the common assessment system will offer students test preparation tools, result in reduced test taking, provide more diagnostic guidance for course placement and enable students to apply the results of a placement test at multiple community colleges if they choose.

In addition, multiple measures of placement (using a common assessment as well as certain high school data such as course taking, tests and grades) is increasingly becoming both mandated and desirable for colleges to use in order to better inform placement practices.

**Analysis:**

The project work began December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013. Hiring is underway for leadership and staff for the effort. Nominations for the overarching CAI Steering Committee are complete and a date has been set in March for the kick-off meeting. The project team is working on environmental scans to find out how our colleges assess students for placement and what other states and systems are doing to address this area.

Next steps will be to assemble the workgroups and working steering committees for Math, English, and ESL tests, Multiple Measures, and an Assessment Platform. These committees will develop requirements and send Requests for information (RFI) out to vendors. Where appropriate they will develop new elements or conduct Request for Proposal (RFP) processes to select various technology and content elements.

Meanwhile, Cal-PASS Plus and the RP Group are underway on a project to build a data warehouse and analytic tools to better inform multiple measures of student placement at community colleges. RP Group is leading a system wide analysis of multiple measures using Cal-PASS Plus data and building on their previously completed STEPS research. The results will serve to build the analytic tools provided through the project. All community colleges have been asked for their approval to have current and historical placement data from COMPASS and ACCUPLACER triggered to the data warehouse directly from College Board and ACT and the data transfer is expected to occur by the end of February. Ten pilot colleges have also been invited to participate in order to provide input on development of the analytic tools and to pilot the tools on their colleges. The user interface and predictive models are scheduled to be ready by the fall. It is intended that the work on multiple measures will be integrated into the Common Assessment Initiative moving forward.

**Recommendation:** Informational Update.

**Informational**

**Presentation:** Tim Calhoon

**Issue:**

The Common Assessment Initiative grant was awarded to Butte-Glenn CCD (CCC Technology Center) Progress to date, Status, Next Steps and the Project timeline will be discussed.

**Background:**

The education planning system will develop and use centralized and integrated technology to better guide students to define and achieve their educational goals, ultimately reducing the amount of unnecessary courses taken by students due to lack of planning. The project will provide more students with education planning and degree audit services while streamlining the process for students, faculty and staff.

**Analysis:**

The project work began December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013. Hiring is underway for leadership and staff for the effort. Nominations for the overarching EPI Steering Committee are complete and a date has been set in March for the kick-off meeting. The project team is working on environmental scans to find out how our colleges address education planning and what other states and systems are doing to address this area.

Next steps will be to assemble the workgroups and working steering committees for education planning/degree audit and the student services/student portal. These committees will develop requirements and send Requests for information (RFI) out to vendors. Where appropriate they will develop new elements or conduct Request for Proposal (RFP) processes to select various technology and content elements.

**Recommendation:** Informational Update.

**Informational****Presentation:** *Joe Moreau and Tim Calhoon*

**Issue:** The Online Education Initiative(OEI) grant was awarded to Foothill-DeAnza CCD, in partnership with Butte-Glenn CCD. Progress to date, Status, Next Steps and the Project timeline will be discussed.

**Background:**

The OEI will expand the California Virtual Campus (CVC) which is a catalog of online courses from accredited colleges in California. The project will establish an online course exchange (Exchange) in the CVC for California Community College (CCC) students. The proposed program is designed to increase the number of college associate degree graduates and transfers to four-year colleges and improve the retention and success of students enrolled in online courses offered through the Exchange. The online course exchange within the CVC is the result of the Governor's Online Education Initiative funded in the 2013-14 State of California Budget for \$16,910,000.

The OEI will enable students from any participating college to enroll in and complete a course from another participating college and easily apply that course towards completion of a degree at their home college. The Online Education Initiative will allow students to find, register and complete courses at any California Community College participating in the initiative. The goal is to increase access to open courses from across the state to provide students with opportunities to faster degree completion. The Online Education Initiative seeks to improve the graduation and transfer rates of CCC students.

**Analysis:**

The project work began December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013. Hiring is underway for leadership and staff for the effort. Nominations for the overarching OEI Steering Committee are complete. The project team is working on environmental scans to find out how our colleges across the nation have addressed online education.

Next steps will be to assemble the workgroups and working steering committees for instructional standards and LMS selection. These committees will develop requirements and send Requests for information (RFI) out to vendors. Where appropriate they will develop new elements or conduct Request for Proposal (RFP) processes to select various technology and content elements.

**Recommendation:** Informational Update.

**Informational****Presentation:** *Tim Calhoon***Issue:**

This is an informational update on SAC's recent efforts to further information security and assurance at the colleges, lower technology purchasing costs through economies of scale, and provide advisory governance for systemwide initiatives.

**Background:**

Surveys of the colleges reveal that most have insufficient information security practices to properly defend critical systems in today's high risk environment.

Surveys also reveal a strong desire by CTO's to improve information assurance by implementing Disaster Recovery and Backup into the Cloud.

Colleges typically do not achieve economies of scale during annual purchasing cycles and a system to reveal high demand systems may facilitate bulk purchasing agreements.

The need exists in the EPI, CAI, and OEI grant initiatives to coordinate technology and have governance across the grants.

**Analysis:**

SAC developed a CCC Information Security Board Policy and associated CCC Information Security Standard to address insufficient information security practices at the colleges. The Board Policy is currently under review at the CCLLeague for inclusion in their standard Board Policy offering. In addition the Information Security Advisory Committee (ISAC) is developing recommended controls and procedures to support the Standard.

SAC's investigation of Disaster Recovery/Backup to the Cloud with the goal of facilitating cost savings for the Colleges lead to a proposal for a data center in Phoenix with direct connection to the CENIC network. SAC proposed to have the CCC Technology Center and members from SAC pilot a solution with the provider. Unfortunately the provider has come back with costs that will not work and the committee will continue to try to find a solution.

SAC is pursuing a plan to survey the colleges in the spring to find out what equipment is budgeted for purchase. If economies of scale can be identified and a bulk purchasing looks practical, SAC will work with CCC Foundation to get purchasing contracts in place.

SAC has agreed to serve as the primary for the Technology Advisory Committee to the CAI/OEI/EPI initiatives. To this end they have begun to review related technology offerings and have provided feedback on environmental scans to the colleges.

**Recommendation:** Informational Update.

**Discussion****Presentation:** *Bonnie Edwards*

**Issue:** TTAC's Annual Retreat will be May22-23 at Town & Country Resort and Convention Center  
500 Hotel Circle, North San Diego

**Background:** TTAC uses the two-day retreat to develop a plan related to important issues facing the community colleges. Last year's retreat focused on the Governor's Online Education Initiative. TTAC developed a set of recommendations that need to be considered and/or addressed by the initiative.

**Analysis:**

What issue or issues are facing the community colleges that need to be addressed? These issues could be related to the three new initiatives, existing projects, technology planning, etc.

This time will be used to gather input as we structure the retreat agenda.

*Possible Issues/Topics*

What should we do to make these projects successful?

- Professional Development
  - Credit for prior learning (for faculty)
  - Certification/who's/curriculum/levels
- Project implementation
  - Issues related to: Design, development, pilot, implementation
- Marketing / Communication
- Research
  - Common Core, multiple measures, Career vs. college readiness
  - Are the initiatives successful?
- Orientation Module – what should it include, how to get buy-in
- Common Assessment Instruments – how to get the most involvement and still move-forward?
- Online Education Consortium agreements – details



# Telecommunications & Technology Advisory Committee (TTAC)

2013-2014 Membership

[ttac@listserv.ccnnext.net](mailto:ttac@listserv.ccnnext.net)

## ACADEMIC SENATE

Michelle Pilati (Co-Chair)  
Psychology  
Rio Hondo College  
3600 Workman Mill Road  
Whittier, CA 90601  
562-463-7448  
[mpilati@riohondo.edu](mailto:mpilati@riohondo.edu)

Beth Smith  
President ASCCC  
Grossmont College  
8800 Grossmont College Drive  
El Cajon, CA 92020-1799  
619-644-7893  
[beth.smith@gcccd.edu](mailto:beth.smith@gcccd.edu)

Phil Smith  
Math/Instructional Technology  
American River College  
4700 College Oak Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95841  
916-484-8393  
[smithp@arc.losrios.edu](mailto:smithp@arc.losrios.edu)

John Frietas  
Chemistry  
Los Angeles City College  
855 N. Vermont Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90029  
323-953-4000 ext. 2605/2469  
[freitaje@lacitycollege.edu](mailto:freitaje@lacitycollege.edu)

Michelle Priest  
Biological Science  
Compton College  
1111 E. Artesia Boulevard  
Compton, CA 90221  
310-900-1600 ext. 2314  
[mpriest@elcamino.edu](mailto:mpriest@elcamino.edu)

Morrie Barembaum  
Astronomy  
Santiago Canyon College  
8045 E. Chapman Avenue  
Orange, CA 92869  
714-628-4895  
[barembaum\\_morrie@sccollege.ed](mailto:barembaum_morrie@sccollege.ed)

## CAPED

Tim Kyllingstad  
Sr. Tech Support Specialist IT  
Cerritos College  
11110 Alondra Blvd.  
Norwalk, CA 90650  
562-860-2451 ext 2168  
[tkyllingstad@cerritos.edu](mailto:tkyllingstad@cerritos.edu)

## CBO

Steve Crow  
Vice President, Business & Financial Affairs  
Southwestern College  
900 Otay Lakes Road  
Chula Vista, CA 91910  
619-482-6311  
[scrow@swccd.edu](mailto:scrow@swccd.edu)

## CCCCSSAA

Mandy Davies  
Vice President, Student Services  
Sierra College  
5000 Rocklin Road  
Rocklin, CA 95677  
916-660-7301  
[mdavies@sierracollege.edu](mailto:mdavies@sierracollege.edu)

Dennis Bailey-Fougner  
Vice President, Student Services  
Cabrillo College  
6500 Soquel Drive  
Aptos, CA 95003  
831-479-6527  
[debailey@cabrillo.edu](mailto:debailey@cabrillo.edu)

**CCLCCC**

Tim Karas  
Dean of Instruction  
Mission College  
3000 Mission College Blvd.  
Santa Clara, CA 95054  
408-855-5164  
[tim.karas@wvm.edu](mailto:tim.karas@wvm.edu)

**CCC RP Group**

Gregory Anderson  
Vice President of Instruction  
Cañada College  
4200 Farm Hill Boulevard  
Redwood City, CA 94061  
650-306-3298  
[andersong@smccd.edu](mailto:andersong@smccd.edu)

**CEO**

Dr. William Scroggins (Co-Chair)  
President/CEO  
Mt. San Antonio College  
1100 N. Grand Avenue  
Walnut, CA 91789  
909-274-4250  
[bscroggins@mtsac.edu](mailto:bscroggins@mtsac.edu)

Linda Thor  
Chancellor  
Foothill-De Anza District  
12345 El Monte Road  
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022  
650-949-6100  
[thorlinda@fhda.edu](mailto:thorlinda@fhda.edu)

**VACANT**

**VACANT**

**CISOA**

Jay Field  
Associate Vice President, IITS  
Long Beach City College  
4901 East Carson Street  
Long Beach, CA 90808  
562-938-4280 office  
[jfield@lbcc.edu](mailto:jfield@lbcc.edu)

Wei Zhou  
Vice President, Instruction  
Cuyamaca College  
900 Rancho San Diego Parkway  
El Cajon, CA 92019  
619-660-4226  
[wei.zhou@gcccd.edu](mailto:wei.zhou@gcccd.edu)

**CISO**

Paul Bishop  
Vice President, Information Technology  
Santa Barbara City College  
721 Cliff Drive  
Santa Barbara, CA 93109  
805-965-0581 Ext 2213  
[pwbishop@sbcc.edu](mailto:pwbishop@sbcc.edu)

**CSEA**

Robert Coutts  
CSEA Chapter 101  
Citrus College  
4575 N. Ramona Ave #11  
Le Verne, CA 91750-3275  
626-914-8608  
[rcoutts@verizon.net](mailto:rcoutts@verizon.net)

SAC – SYSTEMWIDE ARCHITECTURE COMMITTEE  
(Committee Chair)  
& TTIP-NORTH DIRECTOR & Executive Director of  
Education Planning and Common Assessment

Tim Calhoon  
Director, CCC Technology Center  
Butte College  
3536 Butte Campus Drive,  
Oroville, CA 95965  
530-879-4091  
[calhoonti@cccnex.net](mailto:calhoonti@cccnex.net)

Online Education Initiative(OEI) Director

Joe Moreau  
Executive Director, OEI  
Foothill-De Anza Community College District  
12345 El Monte Road  
Los Altos Hill, CA 94022  
[moreaujoseph@fhda.edu](mailto:moreaujoseph@fhda.edu)  
650-949-6120 office

FCCC

Joseph Quintana  
Vice President, Program Development  
Foundation for CCC  
1102 Q Street  
Sacramento, CA 94814  
916-325-0120  
[jquintana@foundationccc.org](mailto:jquintana@foundationccc.org)

CCCCO/TECHNOLOGY, RESEARCH AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS DIVISION (TRIS)

Erik Skinner, Exec. Vice President, Programs  
CCC Chancellor's Office  
1102 Q Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
916-323-7007  
[eskiner@cccco.edu](mailto:eskiner@cccco.edu)

Bonnie Edwards, Technology Director  
CCC Chancellor's Office  
1102 Q Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Office: 916-327-5899  
Cell: 916-207-6675  
FAX: 916-327-5899  
[bedwards@cccco.edu](mailto:bedwards@cccco.edu)  
Cindy McCartney, Project Manager

TTIP-SOUTH DIRECTOR

Blaine Morrow  
Director, CCC Confer, @ONE for Training & 3C Media  
Palomar College  
365 S. Rancho Santa Fe Road  
San Marcos, CA 95965  
530-879-4091  
[bmorrow@palomar.edu](mailto:bmorrow@palomar.edu)

Cal-PASS Plus Director

Ken Sorey  
2300 N Street, Suite 3  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
(916) 498-8980  
[ken@edresults.org](mailto:ken@edresults.org)

SSCCC

Omar Paz, Student Representative  
Santa Rosa Junior College  
(707) xxx-xxxx  
[omarpaz93@gmail.com](mailto:omarpaz93@gmail.com)

Patrick Perry, Vice Chancellor, TRIS  
CCC Chancellor's Office  
1102 Q Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
916-327-5912  
[pperry@cccco.edu](mailto:pperry@cccco.edu)

Gary Bird, System Software Specialist II  
CCC Chancellor's Office  
1102 Q Street  
Sacramento, CA  
Office: 916.327.5904  
Cell: 916-204-1744  
[gbird@cccco.edu](mailto:gbird@cccco.edu)

Butte-Glenn Community College District  
CCC Technology Center  
3536 Butte Campus Drive  
Oroville, CA 95965  
Office: 530-879-4082  
FAX: 530-895-2881  
[mcartneyci@cccnex.net](mailto:mcartneyci@cccnex.net)

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS DIVISION**

LeBaron Woodyard  
Dean, Instructional Programs and Services  
CCC Chancellor's Office  
1102 Q Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Office: 916-445-1780  
[lwoodyar@cccco.edu](mailto:lwoodyar@cccco.edu)

**STUDENT SERVICES AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS**

Linda Michalowski  
Vice Chancellor, Student Services and Special Programs  
CCC Chancellor's Office  
1102 Q Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Office: 916-327-5361  
[lmichalo@cccco.edu](mailto:lmichalo@cccco.edu)

[ttac@listserv.ccnex.net](mailto:ttac@listserv.ccnex.net)

