

Senate **Rostrum**



Student Centered
Funding and Curriculum:
Keeping It Student Centered
page 2

Legislation and
the ASCCC p3

Where We Are
with AB 705 for
Mathematics
and English p6

NONCREDIT DISTANCE EDUCATION: DEMISTIFYING THE MYTH	9
LOOKING AT EQUIVALENCY DIFFERENTLY	11
THE CALIFORNIA ONLINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND ITS NEED FOR AN ACADEMIC SENATE	14
WHAT'S FACULTY-DRIVEN ABOUT GUIDED PATHWAYS?	18
STRATEGIC GOVERNANCE IN GUIDED PATHWAYS IMPLEMENTATION	21
AND MORE ...	

Student Centered Funding and Curriculum: Keeping It Student Centered

by **Ginni May**, ASCCC Treasurer, Curriculum Committee Chair

and **John Stanskas**, ASCCC President

The Student Centered Funding Formula was enacted through the Governor’s 2018-19 Budget Trailer Bill on June 27, 2018.^[1] The formula retains 60% of the total allocation to a district based on full-time equivalent students, or FTES. It then has 20% of the allocation based on Pell Grant eligibility, nonresident tuition exemptions, or eligibility for a fee waiver. The new funding formula uses the remaining 20% to reward college districts for progress on student success measures. Thus, the first 80% of a college’s funding is about access and reaching out to first generation and low-income students, and robust dialog should continue in order to ensure that these important aspects of funding not be subsumed in chasing points for the last 20%. Nevertheless, most of the discussion across the state has been about how the 20%-performance funding metric can be maximized.

Below are the success or performance metrics from the trailer bill language for funding community college districts:

[1] http://dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer_Bill_Language/documents/CommunityCollegeStudent-FocusedApportionmentsFormula_001.pdf

Clearly, colleges and districts have more incentive to award the Associate Degree for Transfer over a local associate or baccalaureate degree and, when possible, to award multiple degrees or certificates to a single student, depending on how courses may be double-counted for additional degrees and certificates.

For example, a student that majors in physics could earn a local associate degree in physics as well as an ADT and local associate degree in mathematics by choosing elective courses carefully, then transfer to the University of California. Such a motivated student might reasonably be expected to complete both transfer-level math and English during the first year. Thus, this student would have provided 14.5 points for the college or district. However, taking a closer look at what the student has earned, one might ask whether the degree in mathematics really adds value to the student’s education. After all, much of the major coursework required for an associate degree in mathematics is usually also required for an associate degree in physics. While some differences exist at the lower division level for the two majors, the real difference

Completion Benchmark	Points Awarded to College District
Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT)	4 (per degree)
Local Associate Degree or Baccalaureate Degree (excludes ADT)	3 (per degree)
Certificate of Achievement (16 or more units)	2 (per certificate)
Transfer-level math and English within 1st year	2 (per student)
Transfer to a four-year university ^[2]	1.5 (per student)
Nine or more CTE units	1 (per student)
Obtains a regional living wage within one year of community college completion	1 (per student)

[2] *The Chancellor’s Office may reduce a community college district’s transfer points if a community college district enters into, or expands, a transfer partnership with a private for-profit college that has not demonstrated a track record of providing its students with a baccalaureate degree that leads to the majority of the private for-profit college’s baccalaureate degree program students obtaining a regional living wage within one year of completing the degree program.*

in mathematics and physics degrees surfaces at the upper division level when students begin taking courses at a four-year institution.

Another example could be a student that earns both a certificate of achievement and a local associate degree in nursing. The requirements for these awards would include at least nine CTE units. Furthermore, the student might complete transfer-level math and English during the first year and then be hired for a job following graduation, making a living wage. This student would earn 9 points for the district, but, again, one might question whether the certificate adds any value for the student that has earned the degree. Since nursing is a CTE degree, the CTE units would be double-counted, again earning the college additional points without additional benefit to the student.

Some problematic issues have surfaced regarding the limitations on data collection and the letter of the law. For example, a student who completes transfer-level mathematics and English in the first year of enrollment but finishes English in one district and math in another does not add points under that metric for either district. The same scenario is true for a student that completes nine CTE units in different districts. Another problem that has arisen is that a student who begins college in the spring term must still complete transfer-level English and mathematics by the end of the academic year to earn those points for the college. Additionally, a dual enrollment student who completes college-level English or mathematics while still a high school student does not generate any points for the college either.

Other problems with the performance metrics may also arise. Some smaller colleges may be disadvantaged because they cannot offer both an ADT and a local associate degree that corresponds to the ADT. Many colleges discontinued such local degrees to simplify degree pathways. In contrast, some colleges have the advantage of robust degree audit programs that are able to alert students and counselors as to degrees the student may be able to earn quickly.

The performance metrics also bring back into discussion a much-discussed topic from the past: auto-awarding of degrees. While auto-awarding might earn additional points for colleges under the new funding formula, it may also cause problems for students. The previous example of the student whose true community college goal was an ADT in physics might be instructive in this situation as well. At the end of two years, the student may have earned enough units and taken the appropriate courses to earn an associate degree in mathematics, and

the college would therefore auto-award the degree. The student's true educational goal was to take courses for one more year to fulfill the lower division degree requirements for physics so that the student could transfer to a baccalaureate program. However, since the student now has an associate degree, the student must meet with a counselor and possibly file an appeal in order not to risk financial aid implications. At this point, the student might more easily just transfer, but he or she would not be as competitive in terms of transfer to the four-year institution for physics since the lower division course requirements would have not been satisfied.

One may ask what the harm would be in boosting the points awarded to a college district if doing so does not negatively affect students. The harm would be to the system. The California community colleges have finite funds available through Proposition 98. Larger or more savvy colleges may be able to leverage the funds and the formula more easily than other colleges. Thus, the funding would no longer be based on student success but rather on curriculum and budget processes.

Local academic senates, curriculum committees, and discipline faculty need to be cognizant of curricular changes that are made simply to boost the college or district budget but that might not be of value to the educational goals of students and that might, in some cases, create additional difficulties for students. Good practices should be carefully sought, employed, and modified as needed for awarding associate degrees, for guiding students as appropriate through transfer preparation when the University of California, California State University, or other transfer institutions do not require an associate degree, for awarding multiple degrees or certificates to a single student, and for increasing the number of students that complete transfer-level math and English during the first academic year.

As colleges and districts consider ways to maximize their budgets under the Student Centered Funding Formula, they must be certain to keep their focus truly student centered. Curricular changes should be made with the students' educational goals and best interests at the forefront. From a curricular and academic perspective, the student in nursing or other CTE discipline should not be intrinsically more or less valued than the physics student or other transfer students. Curriculum committees and academic senates should evaluate these issues and determine the best design to serve their students and communities at large, and they should always remember that 80% of the funding formula is about access and service. 🐦

Legislation and the ASCCC

by Dolores Davison, ASCCC Vice President and Legislative and Advocacy Committee Chair

Anyone who grew up watching *Schoolhouse Rock* has a pretty straightforward idea of how bills become laws – an idea is proposed, a legislator brings it forward, and it is either voted up or down. While the truth is much messier and contains far more steps, this basic sequence reflects how legislation travels through the cycle to end up on the governor’s desk to either be approved or vetoed. Over the past few years, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has been much more involved in tracking and supporting or opposing legislation, and with the end of the two-year legislative cycle for 2017-18 in sight, local senates should be aware of how the ASCCC takes positions on bills, some of the bills that garnered the attention of the ASCCC, and their outcomes.

Bills that are relevant to the California community colleges in areas of academic and professional matters, or the 10+1, are monitored by the ASCCC Legislative and Advocacy Committee as well as the Executive Committee. Each month, the chair of the Legislative and Advocacy Committee—traditionally the ASCCC Vice-president—provides an update to the Executive Committee on bills that are working through the cycle, that have been introduced, or that have reached a conclusion.

The Legislative and Advocacy Committee also recommends to the Executive Committee which bills to watch and which may have a potential impact, either positive or negative, on the California community college system as a whole. Because the ASCCC is a resolution-driven body, support for or opposition to bills usually comes through the plenary sessions and through resolution. For example, Senate Bill 1009 (Wilk, 2018) and Assembly Bill 1935 (Irwin, 2018), both focused on

areas of tutoring and apportionment. However, the senate bill was more expansive in its initial version, including allowing for self-placement of students and providing apportionment for basic skills tutoring as well as regular tutoring. As a result, at the Spring 2018 Plenary, the delegates voted to support SB 1009 and remained neutral on AB 1935. The assembly bill was then modified to reflect some of the ASCCC interests, and when the senate bill was held in suspense—meaning that it was essentially dead for the cycle—the Executive Committee agreed that supporting the assembly bill would be acceptable given that the two bills had become much more aligned. Ultimately, AB 1935 (Irwin, 2018) was also moved to the suspense file, meaning that other methods, including possible new legislation, would be necessary to achieve what the bill had sought.

The Legislative and Advocacy Committee also recommends to the Executive Committee which bills to watch and which may have a potential impact, either positive or negative, on the California community college system as a whole.

Bills also can change completely during the legislative cycle, which is why all bills listed in resolutions are referenced as of the date of the writing of the resolution. For example, AB 809 (Quirk-Silva, 2018) began as a bill intended to ensure that veterans have priority registration in the California community colleges and California State Universities; however, midway through the cycle, the bill instead became the Cyber Secure Youth Act, specifically about grades K-12. Prior to the change, the ASCCC was tracking AB 809; after the change, while the bill might still have some relevance for some programs, it was not a bill that required consistent monitoring.

The ASCCC was particularly interested in a number of bills in the most recent legislative cycle. One was AB 1805 (Irwin, 2018), which involved the publication of placement policies for California community colleges as well as a reporting out of placement results. This bill was tied to AB 705 (Irwin, 2017), and while the ASCCC had opposed AB 705 prior to it becoming law, the plenary delegates did not take a position on AB 1805, and that bill was signed into law by the governor on September 19, 2018. Two other bills of interest to the ASCCC were SB 1071 (Roth, 2018) and AB 1786 (Cervantes, 2018). Both of these bills call for work around credit for prior learning: Roth's bill focused specifically on credit for prior learning for military veterans, while the Cervantes bill was much broader in its scope. While the initial ASCCC position was in opposition to the Cervantes bill, that opposition was based on other aspects of the bill, including the creation of a statewide articulation officer; once that language was dropped, the ASCCC was more than willing to work with the Chancellor's Office and other interested stakeholders to ensure that, if passed, the bill would be faculty-driven. Both the Roth bill, which specifically called for the ASCCC to work with the Chancellor's Office, and the Cervantes bill were signed into law on September 20, 2018. Finally, SB 1406 (Hill, 2018), which called for an extension of the baccalaureate pilot program, was signed into law on September 20, 2018 as well.

While these bills offer very specific examples of the types of legislation that the ASCCC Legislative and Advocacy Committee and the ASCCC Executive

The ASCCC Legislative and Advocacy Committee will continue to track bills of interest to the faculty around the state and will keep local senates informed of all significant developments.

Committee track, recent monthly reports have also included a wide range of others– bills on mental health counselors (SB 968, Pan, 2018), part-time office hours (AB 310, Medina, 2018), and online application processes (AB 3101, Carrillo, 2018). Some of these bills might not appear to be part of the 10 +1 areas under the purview of the Academic Senate as listed in Title 5, but they touch more broadly on academic and professional matters and are therefore of interest to the faculty of the California community colleges and to the ASCCC. The current legislative cycle ended on September 30, 2018, at which point the governor must sign or veto all bills on his desk. A new legislative cycle then begins, with new bills introduced after the first of the year. The ASCCC Legislative and Advocacy Committee will continue to track bills of interest to the faculty around the state and will keep local senates informed of all significant developments. 🐦

A Year Later: Where We Are with AB 705 for Mathematics and English

by **Craig Rutan**, Secretary and ASCCC Lead for AB 705 Implementation

In October 2017, Governor Brown signed AB 705 (Irwin) into law and fundamentally changed how assessment, placement, and basic skills instruction would happen in the California community colleges. At the time of the law's signing, no one really knew how it would be implemented and what the impacts would be on colleges. While many unanswered questions still remain, we now have a much better sense of what colleges are required to do and the different options that they have available as they implement the law locally.

PLACEMENT IN MATHEMATICS AND ENGLISH

AB 705 requires colleges to use high school performance data—overall GPA, courses taken, or course grades—to be the primary measure when placing students, if transcript data is available. If official transcript data is not available, colleges can use self-reported information that can be collected by CCCApply or as part of a guided self-placement process.

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges published a joint *memo* (bit.ly/2Jd25EY) on July 10, 2018 that outlined default placement for transfer-level composition, statistics and liberal arts mathematics, and business and STEM mathematics courses. All of these default placement recommendations require colleges to place transfer-directed students with an 11th grade high school GPA—no matter what that GPA may be—into transfer-level courses unless the college can demonstrate that

placing the students into a pre-transfer level course gives them at least as good of a chance of passing a transfer-level course in one year.

For any student without transcript data, colleges can use guided self-placement to place students into courses. At its meeting on September 7, 2018, the ASCCC Executive Committee approved three documents for distribution related to guided self-placement and steps that colleges might consider including in their local processes. No statewide guidelines have been created for guided self-placement, so each college may develop a process that is designed to meet the needs of its own student population. The Executive Committee believes that several specific steps of guided self-placement would benefit all students. Those steps

No statewide guidelines have been created for guided self-placement, so each college may develop a process that is designed to meet the needs of its own student population.

include career counseling, identifying a major or metamajor, clarifying the student's educational goals, and reviewing the coursework that the student has previously completed.

A YEAR AND THE CLOCK

AB 705 requires colleges to maximize the likelihood that students enter and complete a transfer-level course in mathematics and English in one year. For the purposes of AB 705, one year is defined as two semesters or three quarters. Therefore, colleges cannot place a transfer-directed student more than one level below transfer except in some limited circumstances.

Many questions have arisen about the clock and whether colleges will be penalized if a student does not pass a transfer-level course within one year. Colleges are required to develop placement systems and curricular sequences that align with legal requirements. If a student chooses to enroll in a basic skills course that prevents him or her from completing a transfer-level course in one year or if the student does not pass the transfer-level course within the one year window, the college will not be held responsible. The college cannot guarantee that student will pass, and colleges have limits as to how much they can control student behavior.

CONCURRENT SUPPORT

The default placement rules mention that concurrent support is recommended or strongly recommended for students with a GPA below 2.6 in English, 2.9 in statistics or liberal arts math, or 2.6 in STEM, as well as for STEM students whose high school math course was below the level of calculus. Concurrent support could include redesigning existing courses to increase the number of hours in the classroom and embedding the support, creating either credit or noncredit co-requisite support courses, or increasing access to learning centers, supplemental instruction, directed learning activities, and tutoring. Some of these options already exist at many campuses and will only need to be adjusted or expanded to support the new course placement structure. Other options will require the development of new curriculum, which means having those new and revised courses passed in time for the next college catalog.

The majority of community college students are attending college part-time, and co-requisites could increase a 4-5 unit course to a 6-8 units.

Questions have also arisen regarding the use of co-requisites, and colleges will need to determine if such courses make sense for their students and how they will be implemented. Co-requisite support can be offered as credit or noncredit courses and, per the *FAQ* (bit.ly/2q8cpWj) published in August, both versions can be required if the college can demonstrate that the co-requisite increases the likelihood that a student will pass the transfer-level course. Whether colleges require co-requisites, whether they choose to use credit, noncredit, or both, and how many units or hours each co-requisite course contains are all local decisions, and colleges must determine the best ways to serve their specific student populations. The majority of community college students are attending college part-time, and co-requisites could increase a 4-5 unit course to a 6-8 units. If a student takes 12 units and a math or English course makes up more than 50% of those units, the student could lose financial aid eligibility if he or she has to drop that course or does not pass it at the end of the semester. This possibility might lead colleges to consider noncredit co-requisites, and using those types of courses certainly has advantages, such as saving students money and not causing them to accumulate additional units, but a noncredit co-requisite still represents additional hours that a student must spend in the classroom and does not count toward the number of units a student must take to maintain financial aid eligibility. None of these potential challenges means that colleges should not implement the co-requisite model, which has been shown to be effective, but colleges should be aware that the model may not be the best choice

for every student. Colleges will want to implement multiple types of concurrent support that will allow all students to be as successful as possible.

ELIMINATION OF BASIC SKILLS

When the default placement rules were published, some colleges interpreted them to mandate that all basic skills courses should be removed from college catalogs. Even if a college is not able to place as many students into basic skills courses, some students may prefer to take a basic skills course and some students will need basic skills courses. Students might make this choice for many reasons. They might have been away from school for so long that they do not feel comfortable going straight into a transfer-level course. They might be unable to commit to the number of hours required for the transfer-level course with a required co-requisite, but they may feel comfortable taking the transfer-level course alone. Taking a basic skills course is not the only way to address issues like these, but colleges should consider keeping the option open to students who wish to choose it.

Coupled with the possible deletion of basic skills courses, questions have been asked about whether non-transferable prerequisites should be removed. This question is difficult to answer today, and the answer might change in another year. CSU Executive Order 1100 removed the explicit requirement that any course approved for CSU GE Breadth Area B4 must have a prerequisite that traced back to intermediate algebra, but some majors at the CSU are still looking at whether they want to create an intermediate algebra requirement. The IGETC standards allow for alternative prerequisites for statistics, but

Coupled with the possible deletion of basic skills courses, questions have been asked about whether non-transferable prerequisites should be removed.

other quantitative reasoning courses do not appear to have this flexibility. Additionally, changes to prerequisites are considered a substantial change by many universities and may trigger a re-evaluation of course-to-course articulation agreements. Finally, the prerequisites on existing C-ID descriptors have not been removed, so colleges that delete such prerequisites could lose their C-ID designations, and approval of their Associate Degrees for Transfer could be impacted. As of today, too many unknowns remain for colleges to start deleting prerequisites, but this situation might change in the near future. Colleges are encouraged to wait for more definitive information stating that deleting pre-transfer prerequisites will not carry negative impacts.

CURRICULAR INNOVATIONS

The July memo made clear that AB 705 is a call for colleges to develop innovative ways of serving the needs of students. Implementation of different types of concurrent support is one type of innovation, but many colleges have discussed other alternatives. These ideas include creating redesigned basic skills courses, creating stretch courses, integrating supplemental instruction, or embedding tutors in the classroom. Each of these options has advantages and disadvantages, but colleges might consider them as possibilities that would support the needs of some students. Faculty should have discussions about all of the options available and which ones they would like to try. No one knows exactly what will work for each student and each community, so colleges should be open to trying different options and be willing to make additional changes after fall 2019.

SUMMARY

We certainly know more about what AB 705 means for our colleges than we did a year ago, but many questions still need to be answered. We hope that some of those questions will be answered before fall 2019, such as whether colleges will have access to transcript data for all current high school students, but others might take years to answer, such as whether all basic skills instruction should be removed from the community colleges. The Academic Senate will continue to work with the Chancellor's Office to ensure that colleges have the maximum amount of flexibility possible under the law, allowing them to develop new strategies to support the needs of all students. 🐦

Noncredit Distance Education: Demystifying the Myth

by Cheryl Aschenbach, ASCCC North Representative

Noncredit education is gaining recognition in the California Community College System as more colleges understand laws and regulations around the development and use of noncredit curriculum. Equalized funding for career development and college preparation (CDCP) noncredit courses means more colleges can choose to offer noncredit curriculum in situations where it is best for students or for a program without sacrificing apportionment funding.

The choice between offering what is best for students or a program and offering what is most cost advantageous for a college is one reason that very little noncredit distance education (DE) exists in the California Community College System. According to the CCC Chancellor's Office Datamart, only 112 noncredit DE FTES were earned system-wide in 2016-2017, in contrast to 158,294 credit DE FTES. While distance education comprised 14% of all credit FTES earned over this period, far less than 1% of all noncredit FTES earned were in distance education. Further, noncredit interactive distance education, or internet-based DE, was less than 0.001% of all system-wide FTES, further proof that noncredit distance education is severely underutilized.

Most administrators and faculty involved with noncredit instruction believe that noncredit distance education is not cost advantageous and cannot be considered for instructional delivery. This belief stops conversations about noncredit DE quickly because it is deemed too expensive, especially when compared with CDCP noncredit taught live in person and with credit distance education. However, this common belief may be more reflective of a long-perpetuated myth than of reality.

One must first consider whether distance education by law and by regulation is allowed to include noncredit instruction. Code of Federal Regulations Title 34, Education §602 defines distance education as "education that uses one or more of the technologies listed ... to deliver instruction to students who are separated from

the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously." In the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges' Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions from May 2017, distance education is defined "for the purpose of accreditation review as a formal interaction which uses one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and which support regular and substantive interaction between the student and the instructor." Neither of these definitions includes any mention of limiting distance education to credit instruction only.

If one is still hesitant to consider the potential for noncredit distance education courses in the absence of any limitations on DE as credit-only, the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH) provides the permissive justification one might need: "Both credit and noncredit courses may be offered through distance education" (53). The PCAH further notes that "noncredit courses may be offered via distance education" (113) pursuant to Title 5 sections 55200-55205 and 58003.1(f)(2). Based on federal regulations, Title 5, and PCAH guidance regarding distance education, any and all sections of distance education are subject to the same expectations for regular and substantive contact between an instructor and students and the same requirement for separate approval of distance education sections through local curriculum approval processes; this standard applies to both credit and noncredit, as both may clearly be offered through distance education.

Apportionment for noncredit courses is based on total hours of student attendance rather than census. As noted in the CCC Chancellor's Office 2008 Distance Education guidelines, "Contact hours of enrollment in noncredit courses, except for noncredit courses using the Alternative attendance accounting procedure described in subdivision (f)(2) of section 58003.1, shall be based upon the count of students present at each course meeting" (16). The Distance Education Guidelines explain,

consistent with Title 5 §58003.1(f)(2), that “For purposes of determining weekly student contact hours, the procedure consists of adding together the total hours of instruction or programming, plus any additional ‘regular effective contact’ as described in section 55204, plus any outside-of-class work noted in the course outline of record and approved by the curriculum committee, and then dividing that sum by 54.” The calculation requires three elements, two of which are not usually defined for noncredit and which are then overlooked when estimating potential FTES generation in a noncredit DE course: regular effective contact and outside-of-class work.

As Dr. LeBaron Woodyard, Dean of Educational Programs and Professional Development at the CCC Chancellor’s Office, explained at the 2018 Curriculum Institute, faculty and administrators need to look more closely at the factors used to calculate apportionment for noncredit distance education courses using the required calculation for independent study (Student Attendance Accounting Manual, p. 3.13). While noncredit may not seem to have values for two of the three elements, and capturing positive attendance in an online class may seem impossible, the independent study attendance calculation used for noncredit distance education provides solutions.

Chapter 3 of the Student Attendance Accounting Manual provides information and examples for computing weekly student contact hours (WSCH) and FTES for a noncredit distance education course. This formula involves two steps: computing the WSCH and then computing FTES. The WSCH factor is calculated using the following three elements:

a) “The total number of hours of instruction or programming to be received by students in the class.” This number should be the total hours noted on most existing noncredit course outlines.

b) “The number of hours expected for any outside-of-class work (as noted in the approved class outline).” These hours are not usually included on a noncredit course outline because of the commonly held belief that homework cannot be assigned in a noncredit course, but this belief is inaccurate. The key is that this information must be captured on a course outline of record and often is not for noncredit courses. A college could choose to note this information, though, particularly on DE addendums for noncredit courses.

c) “Any instructor contact as defined by Title 5 §55376(b).” This element includes regular effective or regular and substantive contact and may include meetings with students, face-to-face course orientations, proctored assignments with

an instructor rather than a proctor, and more, as long as these hours are defined and totals noted on the course outline or a DE addendum.

Looking at these three elements and considering that two often are computed using values of zero (0) because they are not included on a course outline or are not considered valid for noncredit, one can start to see how the results can look more advantageous, and the possibilities are worth calculating a little further.

Once total hours are calculated, they are divided by 54 to produce the WSCH factor. The number 54 is used because it equates to a unit of credit similar to that used in credit DE. Once the WSCH factor is computed, the FTES must be computed. At this point, one must again think differently about noncredit DE than face-to-face noncredit, especially since FTES for noncredit courses are usually calculated using positive hours. For noncredit DE, FTES are calculated by capturing enrollment at first and second census. First census is counted at 20%, or 1/5 of the class, and second census is counted at 60%, or 3/5, of the class. To calculate FTES at first census, one needs to multiply the WSCH factor as outlined above by the number of students enrolled at the 20% point of a class and then by a standard calculation factor of 17.5. This formula results in the total student contact hours at first census. The calculation must be done again using the number of students enrolled at second census. The student contact hours from first and second census should then be averaged and divided by 525 to determine the total number of FTES for the course.

Taking into consideration the different calculation for FTES used for noncredit DE versus regular noncredit courses and then considering the additional elements of outside study and contact with an instructor as factors in the total number of hours equation, noncredit distance education begins to look more inviting financially. For those interested in examples of the calculation, they are provided on page 3.13 of the Student Attendance Accounting Manual^[1]. Dr. Woodyard will also be explaining the calculation at a future Noncredit First Friday Webinar, a joint effort of the CCC Chancellor’s Office, Association of Community and Continuing Education, and ASCCC. 🐦

[1] http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/FinanceFacilities/FiscalServicesUnit/StudentAttendanceAccountingManual.aspx#Attendance_Accounting_/FTES

Looking at Equivalency Differently: Rethinking Equivalency to General Education

by **Cheryl Aschenbach**, ASCCC North Representative
and **Rebecca Eikey**, ASCCC Area C Representative

Whether one thinks that colleges use equivalency effectively or not, the reality is that Education Code requires colleges to have a process that allows for applicants to demonstrate equivalency to the minimum qualifications: “The process, as well as criteria, and standards by which the governing board reaches its determination regarding faculty members shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board” (Education Code §87359 (b)). With this legal requirement, colleges should not be ignoring the need for equivalency processes, nor should they settle for a process or an attitude that does not give real consideration to applicants who apply using equivalency.

One reason that colleges may not use equivalency effectively is because of the difficulty of determining what discipline-specific coursework, knowledge, training, or experience is equivalent to the major preparation within a degree, and even more difficult is determining what combination of elements is equivalent to the general education coursework required within a degree. Another reason is that faculty may be unwilling to consider anything less than academic preparation based on their own experiences as students. As a result, equivalency as practiced is rarely much more than a debate about degree titles rather than an examination of the many ways in which an applicant may have prepared to teach community college students.

One may easily stand among faculty colleagues who, like most, arrived to academia via a sequence of demanding undergraduate and graduate academic experiences and argue that nothing can be equivalent to the expected degree except similar coursework or a degree with a different title. Much more difficult is to set aside bias learned from a position of privilege during the journey through academia and open minds to the idea that life and work-based experiences may also effectively prepare candidates to teach California’s 2.1 million community college students.

In response to the Strong Workforce Task Force recommendations, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office constituted a workgroup, the CTE

As a result, equivalency as practiced is rarely much more than a debate about degree titles rather than an examination of the many ways in which an applicant may have prepared to teach community college students.

MQ Workgroup, that includes faculty appointed by the ASCCC and representatives appointed by the chief executive officers, chief instructional officers, and human resource officer organizations. The charge of the workgroup is to examine ways to address two specific SWTF recommendations:

13. Increase the pool of qualified CTE instructors by addressing CTE faculty recruitment and hiring practices.
14. Consider options for meeting minimum qualifications to better integrate industry professionals who possess significant experience into CTE instructional programs.

Equivalency is seen as one strategy for addressing both of these recommendations. Improving hiring practices around equivalency has the potential to increase the number of faculty who qualify for hiring pools but who would not be included in the pool if only degree-based minimum qualifications are recognized. Many industry professionals do not have the degrees expected to meet minimum qualifications and currently are not considered qualified in many districts because equivalency is not given any merit despite proven expertise in a field. Increasing the use of equivalency could help these professionals qualify to teach at community colleges.

Faculty need to consider equivalency differently in order to expand hiring pools. First, faculty should be more willing to engage in conversations around equivalency. Even when colleges are having local conversations and utilizing equivalency, they are often hesitant to share practices with other colleges for fear others will not see equivalency in the same way. Second, faculty need to be more willing to consider life- and work-based training or experiences as equivalent to the discipline-specific preparation as well as the general education preparation expected in a degree.^[1]

As demonstrated by past resolutions and *Rostrum* articles, most recently Resolution 10.05 Spring 2017^[2], faculty across the state have asked the ASCCC to provide guidance around equivalency. While equivalency processes are locally determined, system-wide concerns exist about using equivalency without guidance. Faculty and districts may be hesitant to hire faculty whom they fear may later be viewed as

not equivalent under external examination, such as in regard to ACCJC Accreditation Standards III.A.1 and III.A.2. Having a faculty member deemed not qualified potentially jeopardizes the standing of units earned by students and apportionment earned by the college. Faculty should engage in conversations around what is expected for equivalency in an effort to open minds to the idea that equivalency can be more than coursework documented on a transcript; it can be documented through supporting trainings one has participated in, delivery of instruction in other environments, or receipt of industry credentials or certifications. For more applicants than are currently considered, these experiences are at least equal, and often greater than, the minimum qualifications as met through coursework and degrees.

Faculty need to be more willing to consider life- and work-based training or experiences toward equivalency, both for discipline-specific preparation and for general education. To help colleges consider ways in which non-academic experiences may be considered for equivalency, the CTE MQ Work Group has developed General Education Equivalency Examples (GEEEs). The GEEEs offer Title 5 information about each general education area required in a local community college degree, general ideas about what kinds of experiences might be considered for equivalency to coursework in that area, and then discipline—and industry-specific ideas for equivalency for the general education area. The

Faculty need to be more willing to consider life- and work-based training or experiences toward equivalency, both for discipline-specific preparation and for general education.

examples are intended as ideas to consider and use in building conversation locally, and they are still being developed.

ASCCC and Chancellor's Office staff presented at the CCC Association of Occupational Educators (CCCAOE) conference in October, where they shared the work done with the GEEEs to date and collected feedback on additional ideas for existing disciplines as well as for disciplines for which examples have not yet been developed. The ASCCC and the Chancellor's Office will again partner for a general session activity at the ASCCC Fall Plenary to solicit more ideas as well as collect feedback regarding the viability of the examples already collected. Meanwhile, the CTE MQ Workgroup will continue to refine the examples based on feedback.

By spring, the GEEEs will be further refined based on both career technical education faculty feedback and arts and sciences faculty feedback. The ASCCC and the Chancellor's Office will then be coordinating small-scale regional visits to colleges to meet with faculty senate and minimum qualifications leaders, CTE faculty, human resource staff, and others involved in local equivalency review and decisions to discuss ways in which each college might update policies and practices around equivalency and to discuss ways in which the GEEEs could be used as a tool locally to better utilize equivalency processes and to increase consideration of candidates who do not meet minimum qualifications through traditional coursework.

These efforts are in no way an attempt to lower the minimum qualifications or standards for hire. In the paper *Equivalency to the Minimum Qualifications* from Spring 2016, the ASCCC notes that "[t]he Academic Senate has consistently supported the following basic principles for granting equivalency:

Equivalent to the minimum qualifications means *equal* to the minimum qualifications, not *nearly equal*.

The applicant must provide evidence he or she has attained the breadth of coursework or experience equal to the general education component of an earned associate's or bachelor's degree.

The applicant must provide evidence he or she has attained the skills and knowledge provided by specialized coursework required for the degree listed in the Disciplines List.

Faculty members exemplify to their students the value of an education that is both well-rounded and specialized and has consistently defined associate's degree parameters. Faculty should act as models for students by demonstrating a breadth of general education knowledge and a depth of knowledge that is discipline specific." (1)^[3]

Rather than lowering standards, the current work of the ASCCC in collaboration with the Chancellor's Office and the CTE MQ Workgroup is an effort to expand hiring pools by opening minds to the potential that a person can be well qualified to teach, especially in career technical education disciplines not requiring a master's degree or for which a master's degree is not available, without traditional academic preparation and that alternate experiences or training may contribute to the depth of discipline-specific knowledge and breadth of general education knowledge expected with an associate's degree. This work is also an effort to ensure that CTE students have access to a broader pool of well-qualified experts in a given field or discipline.

The ASCCC encourages all faculty to have an open mind about equivalency. When given a chance, faculty should review the GEEE and provide feedback. Faculty should talk with local senates about local equivalency processes and attitudes toward equivalency. Faculty and others involved in evaluation of candidates as qualified should join the ASCCC and Chancellor's Office for regional meetings to talk further with local and regional colleagues about ways in which life – and work-based experiences may be considered for equivalency. All faculty should be a part of opening minds and opening hiring pools by looking differently at equivalency.

[1] For a few specific examples of ways to apply equivalency more broadly, see the article "Understanding and Navigating the Equivalency Process: A CTE Faculty Perspective" in the February 2017 Rostrum at <https://asccc.org/content/understanding-and-navigating-equivalency-process-cte-faculty-perspective>

[2] <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/equivalency-resources-local-senates-0>

[3] https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/equivalency_paper.pdf

The California Online Community College and its Need for an Academic Senate

by **Geoffrey Dyer**, ASCCC Area A Representative

In April 2018, delegates to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' Spring Plenary Session acted together to voice their opposition to a fully online, one hundred and fifteenth community college through Resolution 6.02 S18, which was adopted by acclamation.^[1] Nonetheless, the 2018-2019 California state budget created the California Online Community College (COCC), with the budget trailer bill language amending and creating sections of the California Education Code. In accordance with Education Code §75003, the California Community Colleges Board of Governors is the governing board of the new college. The California Online Community College is slated to have three programs developed by July of 2019 and students enrolled by the end of 2019.^[2] To many, this timeline may seem ambitious for a new college intended to operate differently from our system's existing colleges, but academic senate leaders and faculty around the state may be asking themselves various more immediate and practical questions regarding who will create, review, and approve the curriculum for the California Online Community College, who will ensure that faculty will make policy recommendations on academic and professional matters before those pressing deadlines, and, in short, who will act as the California Online Community College's academic senate.

Many faculty are profoundly troubled by the creation of the COCC, feeling that their collective voice—not only through the most current ASCCC resolution but also multiple prior, related positions^[3]—has not been heard. Now that the California Online Community

College is a reality, with program pathways already announced and related one-time, competitive CVC-OEI grants for colleges to allow students of the COCC to continue their studies in one of those pathways, the challenge emerges of ensuring that an academic senate acts appropriately in accordance with Title 5 §53200 for this new college, now formally recognized as part of our system. Along with a tangible sense of disenfranchisement over the decision to create the new college, faculty leaders should be concerned about the potential of practices that develop there to impact the rest of the system. The need for faculty stewardship over academic and professional matters for the COCC transcends the college itself. An immediately obvious short-term solution, one which the language of the California Education Code itself supports,^[4] is for the California Community Colleges Board of Governors to engage the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges as the academic senate of the California Online Community College until such a time that faculty for the COCC can establish their own academic senate.

CURRICULUM, INCLUDING ESTABLISHING PREREQUISITES; DEGREE AND CERTIFICATE REQUIREMENTS; AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

The California Online Community College, according to the current budget summary, will offer information technology and medical coding as two of its three programs. The COCC's FAQ contains a broader list that the Chancellor's office is exploring, "including

advanced manufacturing, healthcare, the service sector, in-home support services, and child development.”^[5] Faculty and academic senate leaders may wonder how the programs were identified in the absence of faculty for the COCC, given that it is a California community college and that program development is an academic and professional matter.

^[6] The ASCCC paper *Effective Practices for Educational Program Development* discusses in-depth the matter of faculty centrality in the creation of educational programs^[7].

While this issue raises philosophical chicken-before-egg questions, new education code language does set clear parameters for the types of offerings the college will provide and how those offerings relate to the guiding principles of the COCC. Education Code §75001 establishes that the COCC’s programs will be “focused on providing industry-valued credentials compatible with the vocational and educational needs of Californians who are not currently accessing higher education.” Additionally, the guiding principles of the COCC include “offering working adults additional access to affordable, quality higher education opportunities with labor market value, especially industry-valued credentials based on competencies leading to employment, earnings gain, or upward mobility in the workplace, and not just courses leading

As this work progresses toward creating curriculum and recommending programs for approval, faculty have the hope and expectation that the 10 + 1 will be honored—which, of course, cannot occur without an academic senate.

to degrees and certificates.”^[8] The careful inclusion of this last phrase to capture courses that could meet the purposes of the COCC but that do not lead to degrees or certificates is notable in the context of the Student Centered Funding Formula, which financially incentivizes Associate Degrees for Transfer above skills builders. The language does not exclude courses that do lead to degrees and certificates, especially in context of the newly announced \$35 million in one-time funding for competitive grants for community colleges to facilitate students of the COCC continuing their studies at an existing California community college.^[9] Clearly, careful decisions impacting not only the California Online Community College but other colleges in the system are being made or have been made about program development—at least insofar as beginning to identify the programs—without the input of faculty or an academic senate. As this work progresses toward creating curriculum and recommending programs for approval, faculty have the hope and expectation that the 10 + 1 will be honored—which, of course, cannot occur without an academic senate.

GOVERNANCE OF THE COCC, THE NEED FOR AN ACADEMIC SENATE, AND SYSTEM-WIDE IMPLICATIONS

At its August 6, 2018 meeting, the California Community Colleges Board of Governors acted in accordance with newly revised California Education Code §75003 to create, from among their membership, an Executive Committee for the Online Community College District. Among the committee’s responsibilities are “[P]olicies for and approval of courses of instruction and educational programs” and procedures “to ensure the right of the college’s academic senate to make recommendations in areas of curriculum and academic standards.”^[10] The duties of the Executive Committee of the California Online Community College seem in many ways consistent with duties of existing district governing boards, but their work cannot move forward as it does in established districts without faculty or an academic senate with which to consult.

As with the identification of information technology and medical coding as two of the three initial credentials or program pathways, other aspects of

the direction of the California Online Community College for which one would expect academic senates traditionally to make recommendations or at the very least weigh in appear to have already been determined. One example is the Budget Trailer Bill Language that “Upon the Establishment of an Academic Senate for the California Online Community College, the faculty shall review the Online Education Initiative Protocols for Online Content and adopt as appropriate.” Along the same lines, the COCC is birthed in the CVC-OEI ecosystem, in that the COCC will use and contribute to the development of the CVC-OEI’s resources.^[11]

The COCC is designed to offer courses using competency-based education, in contrast to traditional approaches to curriculum in the California Community College System. Creating curriculum in this manner touches on various aspects of academic senate purview as defined in Title 5 §53200, such as curriculum, grading policies, and standards and policies regarding student preparation and success. The newly created California Education Code §75001(d)(2)(A) requires that such “Competencies shall be established with the advice of appropriate faculty. . .” Given that the new college is part of the community college system, the decisions made around the development of how to administer competency-based education hold the potential to have far-reaching, system-wide effects, especially in relationship to how other community colleges are expected and incentivized to provide venues for students of the new college to continue their studies.

One significant concern is how the developed curriculum of the COCC will align with or lead to certificate or degree completion at existing California community colleges. The objective for existing colleges to develop curriculum extending on the COCC’s pathways can be found in the approved California 2018-2019 budget, which includes “\$35 million one-time Proposition 98 General Fund for community college districts to develop online programs and courses that lead to short-term, industry-valued credentials, or enable a student enrolled in a pathway developed by the California Online Community College to seek continued education through pathways offered by an existing community college.”^[12] This funding seems to blur the line, if such a line ever existed, dividing the target population of the new college and our system’s existing population, since it incentivizes existing districts to create the same type of programs that the

Faculty experts must be actively engaged with these issues in an effort to prevent critical decisions regarding courses, programs, and competency-based education from being made without recommendations from faculty.

COCC will offer. In addition, the emphasis on enabling students from the COCC to continue their pathways at an existing college presents unique, system-wide challenges as well: If programs at existing colleges are developed to complete the pathways established at the new college, colleges must also ensure that those programs are accessible to all other students. Questions remain as to whether the pathways necessarily begin at the COCC, and, if not, whether the COCC will actually be serving a different population. And since the COCC will use competency-based education, colleges must wonder whether programs developed under the special one-time funding at existing colleges will be expected to operate in the same way. Faculty experts must be actively engaged with these issues in an effort to prevent critical decisions regarding courses, programs, and competency-based education from being made without recommendations from faculty.

A POSSIBLE SHORT-TERM SOLUTION, BORNE OUT OF ISSUES

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges may be uniquely poised to address these needs, given that it is California’s only academic senate that represents all of the community colleges. California Education Code §70901(b)(5)(B) reads, “The Board of Governors may enter into a direct contract

with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges for the purpose of supporting statewide initiatives, projects, and programs within the purview of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.”^[13] Numerous issues that fall under the purview of academic senates have arisen regarding the COCC, which has burst onto the educational landscape without its own academic senate. The ASCCC is the only faculty body currently in a position to fill this void for the new college until the COCC can create its own local senate.

The California Online Community College was created despite the urging of many stakeholders in the community college system, program pathways for the COCC have been identified in advance of its having an academic senate, competitive CVC-OEI grants have been budgeted for community colleges to develop online courses and pathways to serve continuing students of the new college, and the curricular design of competency-based education for the new college may have implications for the entire California Community College System. For these reasons, faculty throughout the state of California must act quickly and emphatically to urge the Board of Governors to recognize the ASCCC as the acting academic senate of the California Online Community College and to establish a permanent academic senate for the COCC as expeditiously as possible. Decisions that have the potential to radically transform California community colleges are already being made or have been made through the changes to the California Education Code created by the Budget Trailer Bill and the adoption of the current state budget. Although nearly all faculty organizations opposed the creation of the COCC, the online college has been created despite all objections, and now the community college system must do all it can to ensure the success and proper operation of the COCC for the sake of its students and of the entire system. Spilt milk may merit tears, but it does not absolve faculty of the responsibility to continue to assert the role of academic senates or the Board of Governors of its responsibility to recognize that role. 🐭

- [2] *California 2018-2019 Budget Summary, Higher Education, page 41, <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2018-19/pdf/Enacted/Budget-Summary/HigherEducation.pdf>*
- [3] *Using System Consultation and Faculty Input to Address Expansion of Online Education, Resolution 7.10 F17, <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/using-system-consultation-and-faculty-input-address-expansion-online-education>; Expanding Competence-Based Education through an Online Consortium, Resolution 13.01 S18, <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/expanding-competency-based-instruction-through-online-consortium>; Expand System-wide Online Educational Opportunities, Resolution 9.02 F17, <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/expand-system-wide-online-educational-opportunities>*
- [4] *§70901(b)(5)(B), California Education Code, https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC§ionNum=70901*
- [5] *Frequently Asked Questions, Online Community College from the California Community Colleges, page 3, <https://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/Portals/6/docs/OCC/FOCC-FAQs.PDF>*
- [6] *§53200, California Code of Regulations*
- [7] *Effective Practices for Educational and Program Development, page 15, <https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Effective%20Practices%20Paper%203.12.18.pdf>*
- [8] *California Online Community College Act, California Budget Trailer Bill, page 7, http://www.dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer_Bill_Language/documents/CaliforniaOnlineCommunityCollege_001.pdf*
- [9] *Approval of Contracts and Grants, California Community Colleges Board of Governors Agenda Item 2.1, September 18-18, 2018, pages 7-8, https://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2018_agendas/September/2.1-Contracts-Grants-September-2018.pdf*
- [10] *Establishment of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, California Community Colleges Board of Governors Agenda Item 7, August 6, 2018, https://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2018_agendas/August/Item-7-Establishment-of-the-Executive-Committee.pdf*
- [11] *California Online Community College Act, California Budget Trailer Bill, pages 9-10, http://www.dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer_Bill_Language/documents/CaliforniaOnlineCommunityCollege_001.pdf*
- [12] *6870: Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, Enacted 2018-2019 California State Budget, Education, page 2 <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2018-19/pdf/Enacted/Governors-Budget/6000/6870.pdf>*
- [13] *California Online Community College Act, California Budget Trailer Bill, page 3, http://www.dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer_Bill_Language/documents/CaliforniaOnlineCommunityCollege_001.pdf*

[1] *Opposition to the Proposed California Online Community College District, Resolution 6.02 S18, <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/opposition-proposed-california-online-community-college-district>*

What’s Faculty-Driven About Guided Pathways?

by Jeff Burdick, ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force

Guided pathway frameworks are designed to help students successfully move from their previous school or employment into college and on to a goal: a certificate, degree, transfer, or discrete set of skills. Student involvement is essential so that every element of a framework will be focused on student success. In the April 2018 *Rostrum*, Julie Bruno, then the ASCCC president, wrote about the involvement of students in governance and explained the legal foundation for their involvement under Education Code and Title 5 §51023.7, which contains the “9+1” areas in which student voice must be included.^[1]

Most of the items listed in the 9+1 overlap with faculty purview over academic and professional matters as delineated in the 10+1 areas of academic senate purview in Title 5 §53200.^[2] This overlap drives student-centered elements of curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, educational program development and maintenance, standards and policies regarding student preparation and success, governance structures, policies for professional development, processes for program review, and processes for institutional planning and budget development. In short, the faculty purview over academic and professional matters governs nearly every element of guided pathways framework design and implementation.

In addition to the clear designation of faculty primacy in Title 5, the authors of *Redesigning America’s Community Colleges* point out that faculty and staff involvement is essential for success: “To develop and sustain an effective guided pathways model, a college

needs a critical mass of faculty and staff excited about the process, ready to collaborate with one another to achieve larger goals, and willing to engage in inquiry, reflection, and ongoing improvement” (144).^[3]

Faculty involvement in leadership for design and implementation of guided pathways is both legally mandated and desirable. This position is further supported by ASCCC resolution 17.02 (Fall 2017), which directs that the ASCCC “affirm the right of local academic senates and senate leaders to play central roles in the development of all elements of a guided pathways framework . . . that are relevant to academic and professional matters.”^[4]

These various statements all lead to the same conclusion, which has been repeated in multiple venues around the state: the design and implementation of a college’s guided pathways framework must be faculty-driven. While each college will determine its own governance structure in accord with its own mission, values, and culture, the key to a successful framework and implementation is the faculty, who work most closely with students and have the 10+1 responsibilities for student success.

Some colleges may choose to work within existing governance structures with specific tasks assigned to committees, task forces, or ad hoc groups; other colleges may choose to create a separate, but connected, governance structure for guided pathways. Some of these decisions will be determined by the size of the college: small colleges struggle to populate many additional committees, while larger colleges may find the discrete structure to be less

disruptive to existing functions. The following are some points to consider about participatory governance and faculty primacy as each college moves forward.

Guided Pathways Collaborative Teams. A key component of guided pathways is the use of groups that are sometimes referred to as “cross-functional teams” to design, implement, and monitor the framework elements. These teams are designed to include many voices and knit together the overall effort so the results benefit students and maximize the strengths of the college as a whole. The ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force published a *Glossary of Terms* for guided pathways in which these teams are defined: “A Guided Pathways Collaborative Team, occasionally referred to as a Cross-Functional Team, is a group working together to undertake tasks with representatives who provide important skills and perspectives to support the goals of the group. Examples of collaborative teams include workgroups to design and implement specific aspects of Guided Pathways, such as defining meta-majors or redesigning orientation.” In addition, permanent shared governance committees, such as the curriculum committee, may also function as collaborative teams.

Local academic senates should appoint qualified, sufficient, and diverse faculty members to these teams so the completed work benefits students and honors the primacy of senate purview in academic and professional matters. Senates should also monitor activities across the campus to be sure that faculty purview is maintained and that tasks are assigned to appropriate teams.

Faculty leadership roles. Academic senates should establish clear faculty leadership roles within the governance structure for guided pathways. This task can be achieved through the use of existing senate committees and through the creation of guided pathways-specific committees that are chaired or co-chaired by faculty and that include appropriate faculty representation. Elements of the framework plan should be referred to the local senate for review and approval, and the academic senate president has the responsibility of gaining approval from the senate for annual reports before submission to the chancellor’s office.

Liaisons. Most colleges have already appointed a guided pathways faculty liaison whose responsibility includes acting as a conduit between ASCCC and the local senate. Senate meetings and communications might include regular reports from the liaison. Senates may also choose to use their faculty liaison to work with the Chancellor’s Office regional guided pathways coordinators to enhance communication. Academic Senate Presidents can designate their college’s liaison by contacting directoryupdate@asccc.org.

Data Analysis. Guided pathways change the milestones that guide our work and help us move students through pathways, and therefore effective design of pathways requires collaborative interpretation and analysis of data. Faculty, being the key providers of contextual data, need to work hand in hand with those involved in developing data to inform design and re-design. Although a college’s research department may have excellent skills in analyzing the numbers, the data is unusable without knowledgeable context and then knowledgeable implementation. The involvement of faculty in the guided pathways metrics, milestones, and data analysis is essential. From the start, as colleges make a case for guided pathways, prioritize issues and barriers for students, or begin student focus groups, faculty must be front and center in this work.

Communication. Since implementing guided pathways frameworks may involve radical change to many functions and departments, communication is key, especially early and complete communication. Informing faculty of what has been decided after the fact is a recipe for disaster; including faculty in the development of proposals and soliciting their input allows them to be a part of the process. The senate can help establish a communication plan that is proactive, includes all stakeholders, leverages governance structures, and places senate leadership and its work for students in the forefront.

Regional Guided Pathways Support. The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office established seven regions for the Strong Workforce program, and the regions are now being used for guided pathways with regional coordinators tasked with being “connectors, leaders, trainers, and supporters” for individual colleges. Local senates

should be represented in any efforts with the regional coordinator, and senates should maintain vigilance regarding consolidation of efforts with the region.

Leadership partners: Nearly every department and function of a college will be touched by changes required by the guided pathways framework, and many leaders will be involved: faculty, administration, staff, the college's students, and also students of feeder high schools and pathway universities. The work of guided pathways is the work of faculty, though it is often framed as the work of administrators. Creating a partnership mentality among leaders places an additional responsibility on the communication plan as well as on the overall vision so that stakeholders have a clear view of where this work is taking the college.

Student inclusion. Associated Student Government (ASG) representatives should be members of relevant committees, and the academic senate leadership can advocate for and approve committee lists that include appropriate representation. But the senate can also take an additional step for student success. For the most part, ASG representatives are the students who are successful, engaged, and well informed; committees working on guided pathways also need to hear from unsuccessful, disengaged, and uninformed students because those are the targets for many of the guided pathways initiatives. The academic senate can help identify students whose voices need to be heard and work for their inclusion in the process.

The strategic plan. For most colleges, a multi-year strategic plan is the launching pad for nearly everything that gets done. Such a plan is not only the product of a great deal of work by the entire campus, but it is approved by the governing board, setting an agenda for subsequent years. Placing the tasks for guided pathways in that strategic plan and identifying the champions or responsible people or committees is a key strategy to maintain momentum and to clearly define roles. The constant churn of college leadership can disrupt a plan that exists only in people's heads or on ad hoc committees. The senate can take a leadership role in urging

administration to organize the revision of the existing strategic plan to include guided pathways and support the approval of the governing board.

The ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force recently surveyed local senate presidents and found that faculty support for college guided pathway redesign is generally high, but there were concerns about getting the work done, including questions of where faculty will find the time and how pathways will affect curriculum and educational programs. These are questions that should be addressed by faculty in the planning process.

Guided pathways can be designed in 114 ways or more, and that variety is one of the real strengths of the community college system: no templates and no one-size-fits-all approach will work because every college is unique and finds its own path toward excellence. But fundamentals that support student success are the same fundamentals that built this fine system of higher education: faculty, administration, and staff working together. And a key to success is faculty-driven leadership focused on student success. 🐦

[1] <https://asccc.org/content/honoring-student-voice-ensuring-students%E2%80%99-effective-participation-governance>

[2] <https://foothill.edu/classified/media/Title5.pdf>

[3] Bailey, Thomas R., Shanna Smith Jaggars, and David Jenkins. *Redesigning America's Community Colleges: A Clearer Path to Student Success*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 2015.] A useful, brief summary of Redesigning is available here: <https://www.irsc.edu/uploadedFiles/FacultyStaff/Redesigning-Community-Colleges-For-Student-Success.pdf>

[4] <https://asccc.org/resolutions/local-academic-senate-role-developing-and-implementing-guided-pathways-frameworks>

Strategic Governance in Guided Pathways Implementation

by Hayley Ashby, Accreditation Steering Committee Chair, Riverside City College

(Note: The following article is not an official statement of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The article is intended to engender discussion and consideration by local colleges, and each college is encouraged to conduct its own structures for guided pathways according to local needs and culture.)

Research on decision-making systems during guided pathways implementation is limited, especially regarding how early community college adopters of guided pathways in California are institutionalizing the framework using their strategic planning and governance systems. In an effort to address this dearth of research, a case study was conducted regarding guided pathways work at three California community colleges. The case study used qualitative data collected from interviews and institutional documents to draw conclusions and provide recommendations for practitioners implementing guided pathways.^[1]

Conclusions of the case study were as follows:

- Inclusive and credible strategic planning and governance systems create a stable foundation for institutional redesign.
- A networked system that connects informal groups on campus with formal committees promotes and accelerates efficiency during guided pathways implementation.
- A proactive, reflective, student-centered approach to managing internal and external demands helps colleges maintain focus during pathways implementation.
- Interdependent leadership mechanisms that are culturally compatible and responsive to institutional needs facilitate efficiency and involvement in guided pathways.

A HOLISTIC APPROACH TO STUDENT SUCCESS

Community colleges are esteemed as bastions of opportunity, especially for disadvantaged students; yet, low completion rates have resulted in public scrutiny and calls for external accountability. This movement toward accountability in California community colleges has culminated in policy that connects funding to the achievement of concrete system-wide goals aimed at increasing educational attainment.

With higher expectations for institutional performance, colleges are increasing their alignment with the external environment and using new approaches to address the stagnation in student completion. Following an initial wave of student success initiatives that focused on small, segment-specific innovations that had limited impact, community colleges have entered a second phase of reform that emphasizes long-range, collective action aimed at large-scale, systemic change.^[2] Colleges are implementing guided pathways as a model for decision making that focuses on student success. However, guided pathways are only a framework for institutional redesign that provides limited guidance on how to address political and social dynamics during the change process.

STRATEGIC GOVERNANCE

The theory of strategic governance proposed by Schuster, Smith, Corak, and Yamada was used to frame the case study.^[3] Strategic governance is a construct that combines the domains of strategic planning and governance. Hierarchical and future oriented, the strategic planning domain falls primarily within the realm of administration and is externally influenced and responsive. The governance domain is faculty

driven and concerned with addressing internal operational issues through participatory processes. Institutions must harmonize these two contradictory domains to ensure effective decision making.

Four main forces or strategic imperatives exert pressure on the strategic planning and governance domains: involvement, efficiency, environment, and leadership. Colleges balance these forces across the domains of strategic planning and governance when implementing guided pathways [DM1].

ENCOURAGING INVOLVEMENT

Inclusive and credible strategic planning and governance systems create a stable foundation for institutional redesign. Strategic decision-making processes serve as the backbone for guided pathways implementation. Therefore, implementation depends on the integrity and efficacy of those processes. Integrity helps build trust and establish legitimacy during change efforts. Strategic planning and governance systems that are intentionally structured to ensure communication, promote collegiality, and sustain trust facilitate the broad engagement and commitment necessary to move pathways work forward.

The case study led to the development of the following practical recommendations for action regarding involvement:

- Coordinate and lead appreciative inquiry (AI) activities to strengthen engagement and the perceived integrity of strategic planning and governance systems. A variety of resources and tools are available to support the application of AI. College leaders unfamiliar with AI may benefit from professional development and training prior to conducting activities.
- Request the support of an IEPI Partnership Resource Team (PRT) for more in-depth assistance with improving decision-making systems.^[4] Using a peer coaching model, the IEPI PRTs help colleges to address self-identified issues and provide grants to support the implementation of improvement plans.

BUILDING EFFICIENCY

A networked system that connects informal groups on campus with formal committees promotes and accelerates efficiency during guided pathways implementation. College structures and practices should be intentionally aligned. This alignment ensures that informal mechanisms that foster agility, innovation, and motivation are connected to formal structures with decision making authority. This arrangement allows for a blended structure comprised of a traditional hierarchy for managing operations and cross-functional teams for addressing complex strategic issues.

The case study led to the development of the following practical recommendations for action regarding efficiency:

- Develop, explicitly support, and define the parameters of informal groups and establish logical connections to formal structures.
- Use charts, maps, and diagrams to identify informal groups, such as cross-functional teams created specifically for pathways implementation or departmental teams working on pathways-related activities, and show their relationship to formal structures.
- Incorporate visual representations of this networked structure into strategic planning documents.

MONITORING THE ENVIRONMENT

A proactive, reflective, student-centered approach to managing internal and external demands helps colleges maintain focus during pathways implementation. Colleges that cultivate self-awareness and motivate external engagement through a shared commitment to student success are able to minimize disruptions. These colleges continuously monitor internal and external environments by conducting self-assessments, participating in professional development opportunities, joining outside organizations, and forming partnerships. A proactive, assessment-minded approach that views pressures as opportunities for institutional advancement supports guided pathways efforts.

The case study led to the development of the following practical recommendations for action regarding the college environment:

- Administer climate surveys and environmental scans at regular intervals to monitor the internal and external environment for changes and trends that may impact pathways plans. Formal discussions of environmental data should guide adjustments to pathways activities.
- Determine how pathways progress will be measured and communicated to the appropriate groups in order to inform activities and plans. Once collected, data should be viewed holistically and disaggregated by pillar or pathway to inform implementation.
- Centrally store and manage action plans and progress updates aligned to pillars and pathways in order to promote communication, collaboration, and accountability. Consider using technology solutions that integrate with existing institutional systems.

STRUCTURING LEADERSHIP

Interdependent leadership mechanisms that are culturally compatible and responsive to institutional needs facilitate efficiency and involvement in guided pathways. Leadership at multiple levels inspires engagement and legitimizes the implementation process. Using a combination of positional authority and influence, formal and informal leaders may exchange roles as needed to accomplish pathways goals. A distributed leadership model cultivates leaders and shares power. The decentralization of leadership requires structure and clearly defined roles, responsibilities, and charges to ensure communication and accountability.

The case study led to the development of the following practical recommendations for action regarding leadership:

- Encourage coordination between the various forms of leadership and promote interdependence by delineating roles and responsibilities based on strengths and expertise.

- Support professional development opportunities for individuals and teams to develop transformational leadership skills.
- Organize intensive and immersive retreats that promote collaborative leadership and planning in support of pathways implementation.

REFLECTIONS

Guided pathways provide colleges with a holistic model for developing overall institutional effectiveness in support of student success. A systemic application of the framework promotes a staged evolution wherein colleges tune internal structures, policies, and practices with external demands for increased educational attainment.

Early adopters of guided pathways perceive the guided pathways framework as a philosophy and view implementation as a perpetual journey toward institutional improvement. Guided pathways implementation requires community colleges to embrace self-discovery in order to mature.

Leadership plays an essential role in pathways implementation and should be concerned not only with what decisions are made but also how they are made. Integrating processes to increase and sustain internal engagement while employing strategies to strengthen decision-making systems will help colleges align their actions with intention and facilitate collective movement in support of student success. 🐦

[1] Ashby, H. (2018). *A case study of strategic governance in the implementation of guided pathways at scale at California community colleges* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.brandman.edu/edd_dissertations/214

[2] Russell, A. (2011). *A guide to major U.S. college completion initiatives*. AASCU Policy Matters. Retrieved from <http://www.aascu.org/policy/publications/policymatters/2011/college-completion.pdf>

[3] Schuster, J. H., Smith, D. G., Corak, K. A., & Yamada, M. M. (1994). *Strategic governance: How to make big decisions better*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

[4] IEPI PRT information can be found at <http://iepi.cccco.edu/prt>

Lowering CCC Costs: No-Cost Designation Mandates and Low-Cost Designation Options

by **Dolores Davison**, ASCCC Vice President
and **Michelle Pilati**, ASCCC Past President

One of the longest standing positions of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is to lower costs for community college students, particularly around textbooks. As a result, the ASCCC was delighted when, in 2016, the governor signed Senate Bill 1359 (SB 1359; Block, 2016), which requires all segments of public higher education in California to “clearly highlight, by means that may include a symbol or logo in a conspicuous place on the online campus course schedule, the courses that exclusively use digital course materials that are free of charge to students and may have a low-cost option for print versions.” That bill, chaptered as CEC 66406.9, meant that as of January 2018, all community colleges were required to designate courses with no cost in their online schedules, either with their own notation or with the notation developed by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office.

Locally, colleges or districts should have a process for determining what courses qualify for the SB 1359 designation. For example, courses that have never required the purchase of a text should not be flagged with this designation. Likewise, courses that require students to purchase an access code for some required course component would be excluded. The requirement is that the college uses “a symbol or logo in a conspicuous place on the online campus course schedule.” The law indicates that “the courses that exclusively use digital course materials

that are free of charge to students” should be evident upon an examination of the course schedule, not after taking additional steps to view the details of the course, such as by accessing information specifically regarding the text.

While SB 1359 is a step in the right direction, it only mandates the identification of courses with no textbook costs. While encouraging the use of no-cost materials is laudable, this effort fails to recognize faculty efforts to dramatically decrease costs to students without achieving the ideal of zero cost. With the passage of AB 798 (Bonilla, 2015), colleges were offered grants in 2015[KGM1] and again in 2016 in exchange for demonstrating that their faculty had reduced course costs by a minimum of 30% in up to 50 course sections across all disciplines by adopting Open Education Resources (OER). More than 30 community colleges statewide submitted applications demonstrating the willingness of faculty to adopt OER materials in their courses, and while many of these courses reduced their course costs to \$0 by adopting OER, others were not able to do so due to a variety of reasons. In many cases, for example, while OER materials were available for the text of the course, workbooks or other ancillary materials that are needed for students to be successful were not available through OER. While courses might have been able to demonstrate a reduction in costs by 80% or 90%, those sections would not qualify to be marked as “Zero Textbook Cost.” In fact, in a review of the sections that qualified for a grant under AB

798, more than 25% would not qualify as zero cost, even if they provided a significant course savings to students.

The California community college system is not the only group looking at reducing textbook costs. The California State University system is also aware of the issues around textbook costs, and to that end not only did they participate in the AB 798 grant process, but they also undertook their Affordable Learning Solutions (AL\$) program, which designates courses which have reduced costs for texts and other materials. The CSU AL\$ defines “low cost” as courses in which the text and materials would cost the students less than \$50 out of pocket, and those courses are designated as such in the university schedule. In addition, while the University of California system was not part of the AB 798 grant program, many UC faculty have engaged in these conversations; UC faculty participated in the California Open Education Resources Council with their CCC and CSU colleagues and continue to be open to suggestions from the field. IN addition, as discussed in the February 2018 *Rostrum*, courses that use OER are transferable and articulate to both systems.

Course sections that are advertised as lower cost, even if they are not cost free, may be more attractive to students, especially given that many students do not buy their texts or other materials because they cannot afford to do so.

Community colleges should follow the example of the CSU AL\$ program. Course sections that are advertised as lower cost, even if they are not cost free, may be more attractive to students, especially given that many students do not buy their texts or other materials because they cannot afford to do so. Having sections that are identified as low-cost might not only increase enrollment but might also help to promote greater equity, not just for traditionally underserved students but also for students who have limited resources to spend on books, such as those on the GI Bill or with Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) vouchers. Students on financial aid might also be drawn to sections with lower costs, especially in fields where the texts are traditionally prohibitively expensive.

Local discussions regarding the use of a low-cost identifier must be thoughtful and inclusive. Establishing a threshold for “low-cost” is likely to be a robust conversation. While less than \$50 might be deemed appropriate by the CSU, that specific cost may or may not be appropriate for a community college’s local population. Colleges should ask whether students are being well-served if course sections identified as low-cost can have costs that range from \$5 to just shy of \$50, as well as what potential negative consequences might be associated with creating pressure on faculty to decrease costs. While the intended effect of employing such an identifier is commendable, the impact should be considered thoughtfully.

Upon ensuring that their colleges are fully compliant with SB 1359, local senates may wish to engage in a dialogue regarding the employment of a low-cost identifier. While colleges can choose to clarify for students that the costs for some course sections are lower than others, ultimately the instructor of record for each course section must determine whether OER or lower cost materials are the correct pedagogical choice for the course. If a faculty member chooses to reduce the cost of the course for students, colleges should promote those actions and be transparent to students about the costs associated with the materials. If the goal as a system is to educate students and to do so at a reasonable cost, letting them know about reduced costs in course sections is the equitable and logical thing to do. 🐦

Defining the Gaps: The Power of Language and the Allocation of Responsibility

by Leigh Anne Shaw, Skyline College
and Jeramy Wallace, College of San Mateo

Note: The following article is not an official statement of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The article is intended to engender discussion and consideration by local colleges, and each college is encouraged to determine its own language for discussing equity.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has been on the forefront of student equity for over twenty years. Shortly after the Board of Governors started requiring Student Equity Plans in 1992, the ASCCC formed an ad hoc Student Equity Committee to develop guidelines for local implementation. This ad hoc committee would morph into the Equity and Diversity Action Committee, which has created a vision of equity for the ASCCC on issues ranging from affirmative action to disability rights.

Even with this very proactive approach to equity, the language concerning student learning and success still does not always properly reflect a progressive vision for student equity. Decades of deficit terminology embedded into the state's language of education, including the use of "achievement gaps" and other regressive terms, have permeated professional discussions at the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, debates in the legislature, state policy documents, education research, and the media; consequently, this language is visible in ASCCC literature, from *Rostrum* articles to resolutions, and it has significant consequences for how the public views the California Community Colleges' mission and students.

Ladson-Billings (2007) addressed the many ways in which "achievement gap" terminology is problematic and how it perpetuates a "deficit paradigm." Specifically, this paradigm absolves educators of their responsibility to provide equitable opportunities for underrepresented students. According to Ladson-Billings, one of the problems with the term "achievement gap" is that it "makes us think that the problem is merely one of student achievement. It comes to us as if the students are not doing their part. We hear nothing of the other 'gaps' that plague the lives of poor children of color" (p.317). Among these other gaps are unequal school funding and inequities in health and wealth.

Ladson-Billings concluded that "we need to change the discourse from achievement gap to what I have termed an 'education debt' . . . When we speak of an education debt we move to a discourse that holds us all accountable. It reminds us that we have accumulated this problem as a result of centuries of neglect and denial of education to entire groups of students" (p.321). Unsurprisingly, the ASCCC has taken a similar stance in recent resolutions, mentioning "marginalized" students as well as others that call for removal of deficit-minded terms such as "remedial" and "remediation," which typically accompany discussions of underrepresented students.

Similar to Ladson-Billings' "education debt," the verbiage that has gained the most traction in educational discourse is "opportunity gaps," which extends the argument that we need to hold ourselves accountable for the success gaps between African

American, Latinx, and Pacific Islander students and their white and Asian peers as well as the gaps that exist between other marginalized groups and their hegemonic counterparts. Welner and Carter (2013) noted, “relatively little attention has been paid to disparities in opportunity. Current discussions of the ‘achievement gap’ highlight and emphasize significant differences in school results” (p.2). They continued, “The ‘opportunity gap’ frame, in contrast, shifts our attention from outcomes to inputs – to the deficiencies in the foundational components of societies, schools, and communities that produce significant differences in educational . . . outcomes. Thinking in terms of ‘achievement gaps’ emphasizes the symptoms; thinking about unequal opportunity highlights the causes” (p.3). This very small shift in language, however, has huge implications for how we, as faculty leaders, advocate for our students. If we are able to see the student success gaps in terms of institutional opportunity, we can take the onus of inequitable outcomes off the students who have been disproportionately impacted by the health and wealth gaps and inequitable educational funding.

Though Welner and Carter focus primarily on the K-12 education system, some important lessons can also be learned by higher education. First, the opportunity gaps in primary and secondary schooling are creating substantial inequities in students’ academic skills and habits of mind, and since the community colleges are attended by and large by students with lower GPAs and test scores, they are primarily responsible for addressing these gaps. Second, community colleges need to recognize that they sometimes perpetuate these opportunity gaps. When marginalized students, particularly students of color, enter the college landscape, they are not only plagued by the same health and wealth gaps described by Ladson-Billings, but they also face daily microaggressions and discrimination. If equity-minded professional development has not been instituted at the college, the sensitive and proactive teaching needed to transform these inequities will be absent.

As a result, the term “obligation gap” is gaining traction among college leaders, including administrators, academic senates, and other governance constituencies, because it highlights the responsibilities that faculty and administrators have for serving underrepresented and marginalized

students (Sims et. al., forthcoming). Taylor-Mendoza (personal communication, August 8, 2018) originally coined the term with respect to the dwindling access formerly incarcerated youth were experiencing in higher education. She argues that faculty, staff, and administrators must “take on ownership and responsibility for creating systems that lend themselves to opportunity [through] design thinking and equity.” She contends that the opportunity gap paradigm does not go far enough in creating educational equity because it still places the responsibility on students to take advantage of these opportunities. However, many students, particularly first generation college goers, have trouble navigating the landscape of higher education. Simply creating an opportunity or program without intentionality does little to provide access or to increase student success and retention. Furthermore, an obligation-centered framework requires practitioners and educators to continually reflect on their interactions with students and their pedagogies, and it creates praxis as they frequently ask themselves “should we do this?” and “Is it in the best interests of the students?”

Fortunately, the ASCCC can shift the conversation from one of deficit and lack of achievement to one of opportunity and obligation in one very simple way: the organization must change the language it uses in its resolutions.

The language used in resolutions is important because the ASCCC resolutions represent the collective voice of the state academic senate, and, as a result, the state’s community college faculty at large. Though resolutions are authored by a single delegate or a small group of delegates, they are passed and revised by the entire body. This process is markedly different from *Rostrum* articles, which are written by faculty from across the state and represent only the views of these authors. Similarly, since ASCCC papers, which are authored by ASCCC committees, are adopted by the ASCCC delegates via resolutions, these documents must also reject deficit language and embrace language that places the responsibility, the obligation, for closing equity gaps on community college institutions.

Resolutions and adopted papers become the official positions of the ASCCC. They communicate the organization’s values, priorities, and commitment

to educational equity to lawmakers, the Chancellor's Office, the public, and California's community college faculty, staff, and students. These documents are a public representation of who the ASCCC believes it is and where it wants to go. The use of deficit language in resolutions and papers only damages the progressive vision that the ASCCC has spent decades cultivating. And as the largest system of higher education in the world, the California Community Colleges have the opportunity to shift the discourse around student success and how colleges and universities serve traditionally marginalized and underrepresented students.

When looking closely at ASCCC resolutions, one may perceive that the ASCCC plenary delegates have had a bit of a discourse crisis in the last few years regarding how to describe student success and educational equity:

- Fortunately, in the last six plenary sessions, the word equity—excluding “equity plans”—appears 34 times in resolutions;
- In fall 2014, the ASCCC passed Resolution 7.08 “Remove the Term Remedial from the Student Success Scorecard,” which advised the Chancellor's Office to replace “remedial” with “basic skills” and “ESL” on the Student Success Scorecard. However, the resolution does not cite the term's roots in deficit language as the reason for its removal.
- The term “achievement gap” appears ten times, while the more progressive term “opportunity gap” does not show up at all;
- The term “marginalized” appears seven times but only in three resolutions, and the term “underrepresented” only shows up once.

These examples demonstrate that the ASCCC has embraced a vision of educational equity. However, they also demonstrate the difficulty in describing what educational equity looks like at local colleges and at the state level. Curiously, one resolution passed at the spring 2015 plenary aligned equity and achievement gaps four times, referencing the senate's concern for equity and achievement gaps. However, when these terms are defined in the ways described above, they are contradictory. The comparatively low success and retention rates of underrepresented students cannot

be a result of institutional barriers—equity—and student achievement, or achievement gaps. Instead, we must shift our language to show concern for equity and opportunity gaps.

As an important governance body that represents the collective voice of the California Community College professoriate, the ASCCC must be mindful of the language it uses in official documents, including resolutions. The upcoming fall plenary session provides the opportunity to clarify the organization's commitment to educational equity. As professors often tell their students, language is power. As a result, the ASCCC should encourage delegates to use terms and descriptors that more accurately describe the struggles underrepresented and marginalized students experience in their institutions. The ASCCC must finally finish what it started with Resolution 7.08 in fall 2014 and reject deficit language once and for all. The organization must take responsibility for the equity gaps in the California community colleges and must publicly do so in resolutions by replacing regressive terms like “achievement gap” with the more progressive “opportunity gap” and including language, such as “obligation gap,” that make clear that the ASCCC works in kinship with students and is committed to not only providing them with equitable opportunities to higher education but to intentionally and relentlessly helping them take advantage of the programs and resources colleges have to offer.

REFERENCES

- Ladson-Billings, G. (2007). Pushing Past the Achievement Gap: An Essay on the Language of Deficit. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 76(3), 316-323.
- Sims, J.J.; Taylor-Mendoza, J.; Hotep, L.; Wallace, J. *Minding the Obligation Gap in Community Colleges: Theory and Practice in Achieving Educational Equity*. New York, NY: Peter Lang (forthcoming).
- Welner, K.G. & Carter, P.L. (2013). Achievement Gaps Arise from Opportunity Gaps. In P.L. Carter & K.G. Welner (Eds.), *Closing the Opportunity Gap: What America Must Do to Give Every Child an Even Chance* (pp. 1-10). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. 🐦

The Transformation of Counseling Along Guided Pathways Sidelines

by **My-Linh Nguyen**, Cuyamaca College

Note: The following article is not an official statement of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The article is intended to engender discussion and consideration by local colleges, and each college is encouraged to determine its own language for discussing equity.

California community colleges are committing to a guided pathways framework, and transformation is taking place college-wide at each campus. Across each of the major principles or pillars of guided pathways, counselors could likely attest that the strategies indicated are what they have been doing for decades in terms of helping students choose, enter, and stay on educational paths to achieve their intended outcomes. Those functions of a counseling department now must play an even clearer and expanded role in the larger guided pathways framework, a framework that better integrates instruction and student services. As California community colleges will be transforming under guided pathways, the counseling discipline itself will as well need to transform.

As one out of the 20 colleges selected under the California Guided Pathways Project, the counseling department at Cuyamaca College felt that it quickly needed more insight from counseling colleagues in the state before Cuyamaca's counselors could have a clear grasp as to what their own model of "counseling in guided pathways" could look like. Concepts and best practices were available, but the 114 California community colleges offer great variety in terms of college size, full-time counseling faculty, and staffing, let alone at what stage each college may be in the process of this implementation.

An informal survey was sent out May 2018, initially to counselors at the 20 California Guided Pathways Project participating colleges and then further shared on the Guided Pathways Listserv, to seek responses from counselors at large. The survey obtained 35 responses that provided initial insights into a number of aspects that counseling departments have had to consider for this transformation:

- Where are counselors being located on campus?
- How are counselor assignments and duties being assigned?
- How do adjunct counselors fit in?

Across each of the major principles or pillars of guided pathways, counselors could likely attest that the strategies indicated are what they have been doing for decades in terms of helping students choose, enter, and stay on educational paths to achieve their intended outcomes.

- How is counseling coverage managed in a caseload or pathway structure?
- How does GP affect other areas of student services, such as categorical programs?
- How are counseling “peak-times” managed?
- Are paraprofessionals being used, and if so, how?

The survey further sought to identify what counselors felt were the challenges faced in implementing guided pathways from a student services standpoint, and, for those counselors at colleges that were further along in the process, what things, in retrospect, they would have done differently during this process.

One of the major transformations that may be taking place in counseling departments now is that as these clear pathways are being formed for the students, counselors across the state may find themselves having to function within those pathways in more specialized areas, or meta-majors, versus performing in a generalist capacity.

As community college counseling departments continue to partake in this transformation, common challenges are being addressed:

- Staffing and space
 - Specialized vs. General Counseling
 - Physical space and location
- Understanding guided pathways and what it means to the counseling discipline
 - What does it look like for counselors?
 - Transformation is change and change takes time
 - Essential career guidance
 - What have counselors already been doing?
 - Faculty buy-in
- Time and Planning
 - Bridging a gap between instruction and student services
 - Equitable quality of service for all
 - Having a voice for feedback and brainstorming
 - Planning for more specialized counseling

As varied as community colleges are in size and demographics, they are just as varied in their approach and progress towards the guided pathways framework.

From those counselors at colleges that were further along in the process, the following were areas recommended for institutions in earlier stages to focus on:

- Counselor involvement
 - Needed at all points in the process
- Time and planning
 - Realistic timelines
- Organized Guided Pathways Design Teams
 - Structured approach
 - Student input
- Research, consultations, and discussions
 - What are other community colleges doing?

As varied as community colleges are in size and demographics, they are just as varied in their approach and progress towards the guided pathways framework. Counseling and student services is simply one piece of a larger puzzle, and the need to consult and collaborate among counseling departments statewide is vital to preserving the discipline during this transformation. Continued surveying of counseling departments through the process will yield much needed insight for all. Further detailed data reporting would provide a better comparison of what departments and colleges are doing based on their student populations, sizes, and staffing availability. Over the next five years, the future will reveal what the majority of counseling departments look like, how far into specialized, meta-major counseling departments will go, and whether guided pathways was really the answer we were all looking for. 🐦

Recognizing Faculty with Statewide Awards

by **Rebecca Eikey**, ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee Chair

The California Community College System offers three respected statewide awards that recognize the excellence of our faculty colleagues and their support of our students. These awards arise from nominations from local senates in recognition of their faculty and programs that exemplify the ideals of community college service to students. Local academic senate presidents receive announcement letters, application forms, award criteria, and scoring rubrics in advance of the application deadlines. While announcement letters are sent approximately one month before the deadlines, local senates should start early in identifying potential nominees for these awards. Information about all awards, including award criteria and scoring rubrics, is available at <http://asccc.org/awards>, including applications for 2018-19 awards.

EXEMPLARY PROGRAM AWARD

Application Deadline: November 5, 2018

Theme: Environmental Responsibility

This Board of Governors award is sponsored by the Foundation for California Community Colleges. The Exemplary Program Award recognizes outstanding community college programs. Each year the ASCCC Executive Committee sets a theme related to the award's traditions and statewide trends. The theme for 2018-2019 is Environmental Responsibility. Environmental responsibility may be demonstrated in a variety of ways. Colleges are encouraged to consider faculty roles in curricular and co-curricular programs, efforts like certificate or degree programs with an emphasis on environmental responsibility and sustainability, and campus programs, efforts, campaigns, and planning efforts that promote environmental responsibility and sustainability. These areas may include but, are not limited to, biodiversity, habitat conservation, college landscaping, and creating environmentally forward learning labs.

Up to two college programs may receive the Exemplary Program Award resulting in \$4,000 cash prizes and a plaque, and up to four colleges may receive an honorable mention and a plaque. The call for nominations and application materials is sent to local senate presidents in October. Members of the ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee, along with representatives of CEOs, CIOs, CSSOs, and the Student Senate, review and score the applications. Awardees are recognized by the Board of Governors each January, with the program director of each program invited to attend the Board meeting to receive the award. More information is available at <http://asccc.org/events/exemplary-program-award-0>.

HAYWARD AWARD

Application Deadline: December 17, 2018

This is a Board of Governors award sponsored by the Foundation for California Community Colleges. Named for former California Community College Chancellor Gerald C. Hayward, the award honors up to four outstanding community college faculty, two full-time and two part-time, who have a track record of excellence both in teaching and in professional activities and have demonstrated the highest level of commitment to their students, profession, and college. Recipients of the Hayward Award receive a plaque and a \$1,250 cash award. The call for nominations and application materials is sent to local senate presidents in November.

An important change implemented in 2017 is that the Hayward Awards are no longer based on geographic area; applications will now be considered on a statewide basis. This change replaces the previous requirement that the full-time and part-time awards be rotated by area. Thus, each local academic senate can nominate two faculty, one full-time and one part-time. However, only one faculty member per college can receive the award. Applications are scored by members of the Standards and Practices

Committee and additional faculty readers identified from each of the four areas. Recipients are recognized by the Board of Governors each March. The award winners are invited to attend breakfast with the ASCCC President on Monday morning before the award ceremony and to attend the Board of Governor's meeting to receive the award. More information is available at <http://asccc.org/events/hayward-award-0>.

STANBACK-STROUD DIVERSITY AWARD

Application Deadline: February 11, 2019

Proudly sponsored by the ASCCC, the Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award, named for former ASCCC President and current Skyline College President Regina Stanback-Stroud, honors faculty who have made special contributions addressing issues involving diversity. In the more than 15 years that this prestigious award has been given, faculty from around the state have been honored for their work teaching to diverse learning styles, working with students of color and from non-traditional backgrounds, designing inclusive curriculum academic support programs, and many more projects and programs. Winners of the Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award are tireless advocates for those who may feel marginalized or overlooked in an academic setting, and the winners have demonstrated commitment to the advancement of intercultural harmony, equity, and campus diversity at their colleges. Local senates may nominate a single faculty member or a group of faculty members who exemplify the ideals of the Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award. A cash award of \$5,000 is given to the recipient. All faculty are eligible. The call for nominations and application materials are sent to local senate presidents in December. Members of the Standards and Practices Committee and the Equity and Diversity Action Committee review and score applications. The winners of the Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award are honored at lunch at the Spring Plenary Session. More information is available at <http://asccc.org/events/stanback-stroud-diversity-award-0>.

SUGGESTIONS FOR COMPLETING AWARD APPLICATIONS

With all the work local senates have before them each year, they may have difficulty finding the time to nominate programs and faculty for these statewide awards. However, recognizing the valuable contributions of our faculty and their programs in their tireless service to our students is an important responsibility of faculty leaders. The following are some practices local senates may want to consider:

- Establish an awards committee or appoint individuals to ensure that faculty from your college have the opportunity to be recognized for their work.
- Establish local senate faculty awards that align with the statewide award criteria. This practice can provide the means for local senates to identify their nominees for the statewide awards.
- Use the criteria in the award rubrics as a guide in completing the application for the award. Each award has specific rubric criteria that the readers use to evaluate the applicants.
- Provide direct and demonstrated evidence—both observable and measurable—in the form of qualitative and quantitative data and provide detailed examples. This practice will help the readers to distinguish the applicants.
- Ensure opportunities for recognition of excellent part-time faculty. Part-time faculty colleagues have a profound impact on the success of our students and are a core part of the fabric of our colleges, and their efforts should be recognized.

Recognition of faculty excellence, whether through local or statewide awards, is an important means for providing motivation for professional growth while boosting faculty morale. Local senates not only can identify nominees for statewide awards but also can provide the leadership needed to recognize faculty excellence at the local level. To that end, the ASCCC strongly encourages local senates to identify and nominate faculty for statewide awards and to identify local opportunities for recognition at their colleges. 🐦

THE ROSTRUM IS DISTRIBUTED TO ALL FACULTY THROUGH COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENTS AND BY INDIVIDUAL MAILING. FOR DEADLINE INFORMATION CALL (916) 445-4753 OR EMAIL INFO@ASCCC.ORG

NOTE: THE ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN THE ROSTRUM DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT THE ADOPTED POSITIONS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE. FOR ADOPTED POSITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, PLEASE VISIT OUR WEBSITE.

YOU CAN FIND THIS AND THE PREVIOUS ISSUES OF THIS PUBLICATION ONLINE AT: WWW.ASCCC.ORG

PRESIDENT: JOHN STANSKAS · CREATIVE DIRECTOR: RITA SABLER