SENATE Rostrum

VOTES OF NO-CONFIDENCE:
AN ACADEMIC SENATE PERSPECTIVE

Votes of
No-Confidence
page 1

Convergence
of Diversity
and Equity
page 3

Votes of No-Confidence:
An Academic Senate Perspective

by John Stanskas, ASCCC President

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has received many questions regarding exactly what a vote of no-confidence means when directed at an individual administrator, a board or office, or an idea or plan. At a college or district, a vote of no confidence by the academic senate can have a variety of meanings. The reasons for such a vote should be clearly spelled out in the resolved statements of a resolution that explicitly indicates what the action is intended to convey—alarm, a concern, a broken trust, or a call for removal of an individual. Resources exist for academic senates considering local action and are listed at the end of this article. In all cases, an academic senate should think carefully, evaluate the principles involved and the political landscape of the environment, and generally take the step of a vote of no confidence only when all other mechanisms of communication have failed.

The ASCCC and local academic senates have at their core an obligation to utilize the educational expertise of faculty to evaluate and make recommendations about how institutions should best serve students. Local academic senates are empowered by their boards of trustees with the authority to make recommendations in academic and professional matters as explicitly spelled out in Title 5 §53200. However, although the role of the ASCCC with the Board of Governors is similar, matters work somewhat differently at the state level. The ASCCC is ordered by law to work with the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office. For example, California Education Code 66025.71, which deals with granting credit for military experience, states, "The Office of the Chancellor for the California Community Colleges, in collaboration with the Academic Senate

for the California Community Colleges, shall do both of the following…" Numerous similar examples exist in which the law orders the ASCCC to work with the administration. For the ASCCC, therefore, working collaboratively with the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors is not just a right and a responsibility, as it is for local senates, but also a legal obligation.

At the state level, the ASCCC has only utilized a vote of no-confidence once, in Spring 1994, Resolution 07.01 regarding Chancellor Mertes.[1] In the June 1994 issue of the Rostrum, ASCCC President Regina Stanback-Stroud cited "the years of frustration by the faculty combined with the Chancellor's disengagement with the faculty" as the reasons for the vote of no confidence in Chancellor Mertes. Previous consideration of a vote of no confidence was placed on hold in Fall 1993, and Chancellor Mertes

---

1 The text of Resolution 7.01 S94 can be found at *https://asccc.org/resolutions/no-confidence-chancellor-mertes*.

> In all cases, an academic senate should think carefully, evaluate the principles involved and the political landscape of the environment, and generally take the step of a vote of no-confidence only when all other mechanisms of communication have failed.

was advised that a vote of no confidence was being discussed but "did nothing to address his alienated relationship with the faculty" (Stanback-Stroud, 1994). Thus, the only vote of no confidence taken by the ASCCC came after an extended period of consideration and repeated attempts to address the situation in other ways. At all other times in which dissatisfaction regarding individuals, organizations, or initiatives has existed, the ASCCC delegates have chosen to use language that indicates protest, concern, or even condemnation but not to take the step of a no confidence vote.

Given the context of the one instance in which the ASCCC issued a vote of no-confidence, the defined role of the ASCCC, and specific laws that direct the organization at the state-level, a vote of no-confidence by the ASCCC would mean that we collectively believe that complying with our legal obligation to consult with the Chancellor's Office is more harmful to our students than not. Such an action would mean that local academic senates would cease to work on directives or initiatives from the Chancellor's Office and abdicate their right to influence local policy to their boards of trustees. In 1994, this situation is what transpired. Nevertheless, the Board of Governors at the time reviewed the concerns expressed and did not remove Chancellor Mertes, who eventually resigned of his own accord. Such an outcome is typical with votes of no confidence: they may create pressure and draw attention to issues, but no board or individual has a legal or technical obligation to respond to or act upon such a vote.

Other organizations may undertake an action with similar or the same language as a vote of no-confidence. For example, a collective bargaining unit representing the faculty may in some cases do so. Since collective bargaining units exist to protect faculty in areas of working conditions and fair compensation, these votes may not be rooted in the same rationales as those taken by academic senates and may have different implications. In fielding questions about the meaning of other state-wide organizations, we have referred those inquiries to the organization in question.

While other faculty groups can and should act in accordance to what their organization and their constituents believe is the right thing to do, the ASCCC must take care to only issue a vote of no-confidence after

> # A vote of no-confidence by the ASCCC would mean that we collectively believe that complying with our legal obligation to consult with the Chancellor's Office is more harmful to our students than not.

---

it has exhausted all other options, as the organization has a legal obligation to work with the Chancellor's Office. A vote of-no confidence must be thoughtfully and thoroughly examined and must be rooted on the grounds that continuing with the status quo produces more harm to the institution and ultimately, to students. The ASCCC, as the organization that represents all of the community college faculty, has a duty to ensure that the system can continue its work to serve all our students, and as such, must exercise great care when deciding to conduct a vote of no confidence.

REFERENCES AND RESOURCES

Bruno, J. (2017, April). "Power in the Collective: Faculty, Collegial Consultation, and Collaboration." *Rostrum.* Retrieved from *https://asccc.org/content/power-collective-faculty-collegial-consultation-and-collaboration*

Patton, J. (2003, October). "So, You're Thinking About a Vote of No Confidence: 10+1 Questions to Ask." *Rostrum.* Retrived from *https://asccc.org/content/so-youre-thinking-about-vote-no-confidence-10-questions-ask*

Simpson, H. (2003, April). "Power and Paranoia: Effective Senates are Victors, not Victims." *Rostrum.* Retrieved from *https://asccc.org/content/power-and-paranoia-effective-senates-are-victors-not-victims*

Stanback-Stroud, R. (1994, June). "An In-Depth Look at the Mertes 'No Confidence' Vote." *Rostrum.* Copy preserved in ASCCC archives.

Convergence of Diversity and Equity: Guiding Framework for the Hiring Processes

by Luke Lara, ASCCC Faculty Leadership Development Committee Member, MiraCosta College

Faculty diversification efforts in the California Community Colleges and funding to address those efforts have been prioritized by multiple stakeholders, including the legislature, the Board of Governors, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC). This issue is not new for the community colleges, but, with a recent additional allocation of funding, it is becoming a more realistic goal. In fact, in 2016 the legislature enacted Senate Bill 826, known as the Budget Act of 2016, which stated,

> The Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall report by December 1, 2016, and annually thereafter for five years, on the racial/ethnic and gender composition of faculty, and efforts to assist campuses in providing equal employment opportunity in faculty recruitment and hiring practices as well as system-wide training, monitoring, and compliance activities.

The Budget Act of 2016 provided nearly $3 million to distribute among Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) programs across the system. Currently, the Chancellor's Office EEO and Diversity Advisory Committee is revising the EEO Plan templates and preparing enhanced guidance for clarity and increased accountability at all levels.

The academic year 2019-20 is the second in a row in which the ASCCC has made faculty diversification a major goal, with the understanding that it will remain a top goal for several years. In its commitment to removing bias and barriers in the hiring process, the ASCCC adopted the paper *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures* in spring 2018. This paper reiterated the critical role of academic senates and faculty in the faculty hiring process and also provided effective practices for increasing diversity in faculty hiring outcomes.

The ASCCC has been clear that diversity is all encompassing and that the first two years of this effort have been specifically focused on increasing the racial and ethnic diversity of faculty. While the messaging has emphasized increasing the diversity of faculty, colleges need to be cognizant of current EEO laws that prohibit the usage of a candidate's protected class, such as race, ethnicity, gender, disability, or veteran status, as a means to privilege candidates in the hiring process. This situation poses a dilemma, forcing institutions to ask how they can be accountable to the hiring outcome if the process cannot consider the candidate's background and what principles should be used in the hiring process to help them achieve a more diverse professoriate.

Two concepts are at play that need to be better understood: diversity and equity. Despite the increasingly diverse student population in the CCCs over the last three decades, the system has seen very little change in the demographic profile of the faculty body, which is predominantly racially white (Lara, 2019).

> The ASCCC has been clear that diversity is all encompassing and that the first two years of this effort have been specifically focused on increasing the racial and ethnic diversity of faculty.

Published research supports the notion that improved student outcomes, especially for students of color, can be attributed to a more diverse faculty body (Lara, 2019). The majority of faculty at California community colleges are white, which is not reflective of the current student racial and ethnic demographic. This fact does not mean that institutions should not hire more white people, but rather it means that the institutions should be gathering and evaluating data and being responsive to the rich diversity of their communities and ensuring an equal employment opportunity to anyone regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or other factors.

Equity work is about removing barriers, possessing equity-minded competencies such as being culturally competent, implementing race conscious principles, analyzing disaggregated data, approaching equity systemically, and taking responsibility as an institutional agent to remove barriers (Center for Urban Education). In this respect, equity-mindedness is a characteristic that can be learned and a skill that can be assessed. Equity work leads to results that transform students, institutional agents, and institutional structures. If colleges are looking to change inequities, they need to apply an equity framework to address historic and contemporary issues for their diverse student populations. This work is both individual, involving practices, and institutional, involving policies and procedures. It can be practiced by anyone, regardless of racial or ethnic background. However, such practice does not mean that institutions do not need to worry about diversity, and although the concepts of diversity and equity are seemingly different and contradictory, they in fact interact. For example, while the race of an applicant should not be the determining factor of whether he or she should be hired, a search committee that seeks equity-mindedness will more likely hire a candidate that is not in the dominant majority—i.e., white—based on equity-minded competencies.

Colleges need to acknowledge that in order to achieve the outcome of increased faculty diversity, they must approach the task with equity-mindedness. That principle is first and foremost. An equity-mindedness framework requires colleges to engage in the following competencies (Center for Urban Education):

1. **Evidence Based**: Institutions need to collect and regularly review disaggregated data to uncover

> Published research supports the notion that improved student outcomes, especially for students of color, can be attributed to a more diverse faculty body. The majority of faculty at California community colleges are white, which is not reflective of the current student racial and ethnic demographic.

potential patterns of inequities in hiring practices and determine where biased practices may be occurring. Demographic data on applicant pools at each of the hiring stages needs to be reviewed in accordance with applicable EEO laws.

2. **Race-Conscious Practices (Lara, 2019)**: While race cannot be considered a factor, discussions about race and racism and how racial bias impacts hiring practices—e.g., color-evasive ideology—are important. For instance, terms such as merit and fit are often used as coded language for race. These terms can be redefined through an equity framework to be more inclusive of diverse experiences and strictly focused on the knowledge, skills, and abilities related to the job description. Committee members should have a common understanding of what merit and fit mean in the context of the particular job search. This conversation needs to happen before candidate applications are reviewed and before evaluation criteria is developed. Conversations about race and racism and trainings on implicit bias need to happen throughout the year, outside of the hiring process, and in various settings such as department meetings, divisional meetings, and onboarding processes. In addition, job announcements should be posted to relevant outlets that cater to diverse populations in order to expand the diversity of recruitment pools.

3. **Institutionally Focused**: The lack of diversity in faculty is a problem for practitioners, not an issue with the potential candidates. Colleges need to focus on understanding the problem while focusing on the individual and collective practices that contribute to the lack of diversity in faculty hiring outcomes. They need to question assumptions, recognize stereotypes that harm candidates, and continually reexamine practices.

4. **Systemically Aware**: The hiring process is guided by various institutional structures, including culture, policies, and practices. These structures can create dysfunction and perpetuate inequities. Within the 10+1 academic and professional matters of academic senate purview under Title 5, faculty have influence and agency over all of these institutional structures.

5. E**quity Advancing**: Most importantly, change will require equity-minded practitioners who are willing to assess and acknowledge that their practices may not be working. Only equity-minded practitioners will be compelled to apply this framework to become accountable for the success of faculty candidates and see racial gaps as their personal and institutional responsibility.

The guiding principle of equity-mindedness, enacted through the above five competencies, should increase the diversity of faculty in hiring outcomes and ultimately benefit all students in the California Community College System.

The guiding principle of equity-mindedness should increase the diversity of faculty in hiring outcomes and ultimately benefit all students in the California Community College System.

REFERENCES

Center for Urban Education. (n.d.). What Is Equity-Mindedness? University of Southern California Rossier School of Education. Retrieved from *https://cue.usc.edu/about/equity/equity-mindedness/*.

Lara, L. J. (2019). Faculty of Color Unmask Color-blind Ideology in the Community College Faculty Search Process. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 43 (10-11), pp. 702-717. Retrieved from *https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2019.1600608.*

An Oasis of Support:
DACA, AB 540, and Undocumented Students

by Leigh Anne Shaw, Equity and Diversity Action Committee, Skyline College

Recent changes to federal policies regarding undocumented individuals in the U.S. have created challenges for community college leaders who wish to support the vulnerable population of DACA, AB 540, and other undocumented students in their colleges. These students may be undocumented due to outstaying a visa, having incomplete applications or delayed renewal processes, having come to the U.S. at a young age without official residency status, or other complications of the immigration process. Regardless of how they arrived at the status they now hold, the job of a community college is to serve its community, and that task necessitates some solid practices. Because many colleges are leading the way in offering support to this population, many models are available for interested colleges to follow.

UNDERSTANDING THE COMPLEXITIES OF STATUS

Many who work or study at community colleges are unfamiliar with the nuances of undocumented status and may misconstrue the terms AB 540, DACA, Dream Act or Dreamer, TPS, and undocumented. DACA, or Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, is a federal status providing work authorization and temporary relief from deportation for undocumented children. The current administration has said that DACA will be phased out, so its future status is unknown. Temporary Protected Status (TPS) is also a federal status; it allows temporary residence and work in the United States to eligible nationals of designated countries due to situations such as armed conflict or natural disaster. Both AB 540 and the California Dream Act are California state initiatives. AB 540 refers to California legislation, passed in 2001 and updated in 2014, allowing qualified students who are considered non-residents for tuition purposes to pay resident fees for higher education. These students must meet certain requirements such as attending a California institution of public learning for three years; SB 68 (2017) expanded eligible institutions to include California adult schools. The California Dream Act is an application process that allows AB 540 students, TPS students, and some visa holders to apply for state financial aid. Undocumented refers to any individual residing in the United States without legal documentation to do so; this category can include the aforementioned as well as additional types of status and circumstances. Commonly, a single family may have members with different statuses; such families or households are called mixed status. All of these different status holders require unique and often personalized levels of support and attention.

PROVISION OF UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION

First and foremost, a college that wishes to support undocumented students needs to provide up-to-date

Recent changes to federal policies regarding undocumented individuals in the U.S. have created challenges for community college leaders who wish to support the vulnerable population of DACA, AB 540, and other undocumented students in their colleges.

information at all times. This support often comes in the form of an online presence where students may find information related to their status, ways to obtain support or assistance, links to detailed legal information, and latest news. A good website will provide clear, updated information about deadlines, AB 540 affidavit completion processes, DACA renewal assistance and related forms, information sessions, and personal referrals to outside services such as legal representation and mental health. Such information can be bolstered by a regular newsletter to the community via email and the internet filled with information on deadlines, scholarships, events, and services relevant to a variety of different status holders. Dedicating internet resources is an easy thing for colleges to do; what makes the resource vital is the dedication of personnel who can update the information as it changes. Because each subpopulation has such unique needs, internet resources need to clearly delineate specific information for DACA, AB 540, and other undocumented students to help them find what they need quickly and efficiently.

When policies change, prompt action is needed. Some colleges have created Rapid Response Teams tasked with providing direct services via information and supportive policies and practices. The campus community also needs to be alerted as to when changes occur that affect students. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) published a *Rostrum* article in April 2018, "Updates on Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Efforts," that details changes up to that date[1]; sharing this information in the form of newsletters, forums, panels, and academic senate reports can help to keep the campus from circulating outdated information.

DREAM CENTERS/DACA CENTERS

A physical space staffed with knowledgeable individuals is paramount to the adequate support of DACA, AB 540, and other undocumented students. Staffing should include dedicated personnel; volunteers or even faculty with partial reassigned time are far less effective and supportive than an institutional commitment to a full-time expert who can address the needs of these very marginalized students. Such staff must be fully empowered to hold trainings and provide direct services such as admissions assistance including how to apply without a social security number, personal counseling and services, assistance with paperwork, and know-your-rights trainings. Additionally, a truly supportive center can provide referrals to immigration attorneys, the ACLU, or even psychological services for a population that frequently lives under fear of deportation or family separation. In particular, mixed-status families—one or more members having different status from others—find themselves in an excruciating circumstance that requires attentive and broad-reaching guidance. For example, California's SB 68 (2017) law provided an expansion to AB 540 status-holders, but many students are unaware of its breadth and how to access it. Assistance with AB 540 affidavits is critical; a misfiled form can jeopardize status and have devastating effects.

Community college campuses need not be alone in their efforts to support undocumented students. Successful partnerships between a community college and a local CSU or UC exist whereby the institutions work together to support not only services on each campus but also transitions of students between campuses. Colleges are encouraged to connect with institutions in their various pipelines to expand support all along a student's educational pathway.

> Community college campuses need not be alone in their efforts to support undocumented students. Successful partnerships between a community college and a local CSU or UC exist whereby the institutions work together to support not only services on each campus but also transitions of students between campuses.

---

1   The article is available at *https://www.asccc.org/content/updates-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca-efforts*.

CAMPUS MESSAGING

A supportive campus can make its support known through intentional public statements to the undocumented community. Colleges can investigate "Become an UnDocuAlly" trainings where faculty, staff, and students can become knowledgeable about the issues that undocumented students face.[2] Forming a campus student club can develop a group identity and support, and hosting UnDocuWeek activities can provide campuses with an entire week long dialogue about undocumented issues and can educate members of the community whose understanding may be informed by competing and inaccurate narratives. The Community College League of California has taken great steps by creating a toolkit[3] that colleges can use to increase their campus support. Critical skills to address in supporting undocumented students include the following:

- Listening: Each individual is a human being with a story. Allowing students to tell their stories gives them agency.
- Administrative statements: Messages of "you are supported" and "diversity is strength" throughout campus publications can buoy students who are feeling voiceless.
- Statements from campus police: The job of campus police is to protect students, and a statement from a proactive public safety department can go a long way in alleviating anxiety and fear.
- Resolutions: Senates hold a position of great power in campus messaging, as do Boards of Trustees.

CAMPUS EDUCATION

Myths about immigration, undocumented status, asylum, and other issues will abound without efforts to educate the campus community. A truly proactive, community-focused campus can take aggressive steps to educate faculty, staff, and students on the issues undocumented students face. Such measures can include the creation of FAQ and "myth-busting" pages detailing questions about everything from definitions of terms to sanctuary campuses to trainings on what to do if ICE comes to campus. Provocatively-titled discussions can raise fears and concerns among campus members who

> Myths about immigration, undocumented status, asylum, and other issues will abound without efforts to educate the campus community. A truly proactive, community-focused campus can take aggressive steps to educate faculty, staff, and students on the issues undocumented students face.

worry about their legality, and the college should clarify that it is not interested in actively violating federal law but may certainly resist inappropriate federal over-reach, as supported by California's sanctuary laws passed in 2018. Colleges thus have an opportunity to shine as educators and enable the community to move beyond any political associations and into intentional and authentic student advocacy.

IN THE END, COMMUNITY COLLEGES ARE ABOUT COMMUNITY

Regardless of political contexts and overtones, campuses have an obligation to serve all students. On the first day of class, faculty do not know what has brought their students into the classroom; they only know that it is their honor and privilege to provide the education that will help the students realize their futures. The framework of guided pathways encourages campuses to do more to make students feel welcome and supported in their educational journeys, and this obligation extends to the most vulnerable students colleges serve. Every student is a human with a story, a dream, and an unlimited capacity to turn the investment of education into direct benefits to their communities.

---

2   See *https://www.thedream.us/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Pre-Work-Packet.pdf* for more information on this program.

3   The toolkit is available at *https://www.ccleague.org/advocacy/federal-advocacy/supporting-undocumented-students*.

Subtle Support for Undocumented Students in the Classroom

by Juan Buriel, Equity and Diversity Action Committee Member, College of the Canyons

The courage mustered by so many students, let alone undocumented students, to attend classes is not an experience that attendance policies are designed to recognize. Colleges do not have a metric for courage[1], which is likely why the courage on full display by the most vulnerable students just to make it to class is lost on colleges and even on their professors. Attendance is an expectation and the most basic requirement for success in a class. But once students have made it to the classroom, if they make it at all, worries that often concern family, finances, and the law can follow, distract, and fester. After all, students are human. The unique and public, yet still institutionally unrecognized, demonstration of courage by undocumented students who attend classes defies the natural impulse to preserve one's social anonymity when detainment and deportation are possibilities.[2] An affirmative or well-intentioned acknowledgment of an undocumented student's status, even in private, can perpetuate rather than relieve the impulse to have one's status remain as unknown to others as possible. In the public and varied setting of a classroom, professors should do all they can, pedagogically and ever so subtly, to reach undocumented students in an effort to make them at once feel included as part of the class, convey a respect for their instinctive need for self-preservation, and provide them with the learning they seek.

1   Resilience or persistence metrics measure the successful overcoming of obstacles rather than the courage to decide to confront obstacles in the first place.

2   For a review of the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Legal Counsel's interpretation of Assembly Bill 21 and its requirement that districts hold undocumented students harmless, see Dolores Davison's article "Updates on Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Efforts" in the April 2018 Rostrum, available at *https://www.asccc.org/content/updates-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca-efforts*.

Whereas outside of the classroom a college campus may provide any number of resources to assist undocumented students as a matter of equity, should the students seek out such services, the classroom's egalitarian setting, in principle, is supposed to offer every student equal access and opportunity. Yet, a classroom's inherited language and practices can make it an unintentionally threatening environment for undocumented students for whom attention to details, such as linguistic cues, is a necessity for self-preservation. For instance, the use of a term like "illegal," which may be hard to avoid within certain disciplines, evokes the law, which is a source of anxiety in the lives of undocumented students and their families. It is a term, a signifier, that for undocumented students publicly names the status that their efforts at anonymity attempt to withhold from public view. Therefore, students may feel that even though they themselves have not been personally outed, their status has. This situation does not mean that the subject of law should be avoided, or even can be avoided, in the classroom. In fact, quickly noting the

> Colleges do not have a metric for courage, which is likely why the courage on full display by the most vulnerable students just to make it to class is lost on colleges and even on their professors.

> Supporting undocumented students has to aspire to be more than the avoidance or the strategic disarming of language. The effort must also involve affirmation of the value of the knowledge and skills that undocumented students uniquely possess.

---

very contingency of law in the United States – the fact that the law is always subject to reform, to change – as a means of offsetting any undue alarm caused by the use of potentially sensitive language such as "detainment," "deportation," or "alien" can also convey a reminder of the equally real and hopeful possibility that one's status is not set in stone. Ultimately, the subtle support of undocumented students in the classroom, support that intends to be inclusive while preserving anonymity, should respect the power of language to both harm and to liberate.

However, supporting undocumented students has to aspire to be more than the avoidance or the strategic disarming of language. The effort must also involve affirmation of the value of the knowledge and skills that undocumented students uniquely possess. Faculty efforts must not only find relevance in this knowledge but must also capitalize on it and appreciate it as essential to the subjects that they teach. When students do not participate in classroom activities, their silence is often interpreted by professors as a sign of disinterest, as something of negative value that contradicts the positive value of voice that society and institutions favor, privilege, and reward. However, silence can be understood more positively, and proactively, as the very means by which one's precious anonymity is preserved if detection is feared. For undocumented students, silence is understood differently than how it is understood institutionally when social survival is at stake. Silence to undocumented students is an asset, and one – whether faculty realize it or not – that has been essential to any epistemological progress ever made in the history of any discipline.

In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Thomas Kuhn explains that during the silent period of normative science that has preceded every scientific revolution, anomalies have emerged – perhaps in the form of questions about unsolved problems – to irritate and challenge the norm to such an extent that eventually the norm is forced, often in spite of great resistance, to become a new model of understanding. A debt is owed, then, to the former anomaly that forced progress. If in the classroom setting the undocumented student's asset of silence is devalued and regarded almost exclusively as a problem today, this very silence is likely a harbinger of inevitable wisdom for a society in which no one is genuinely heard because everyone is trying to speak. In other words, the undocumented student's silence is an exhibition of something essential, not merely a tolerated alternative. The undocumented student's experience must be affirmed and made relevant in such indirect but life-preserving ways in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1996) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. University of Chicago Press: Chicago

---

> The undocumented student's silence is an exhibition of something essential, not merely a tolerated alternative. The undocumented student's experience must be affirmed and made relevant in such indirect but life-preserving ways in the classroom.

Guided Pathways and Student Engagement: Student Centeredness as Equity in Practice

by Jessica Ayo-Alabi, Guided Pathways Task Force Lead, Orange Coast College

and Mayra Cruz, ASCCC Area B Representative, Guided Pathways Task Force

Student-centeredness as equity in practice is an opportunity. Most of us desire equity to be more than a word that people say in passing; we want equity to be something that we practice with measurable outcomes as we close achievement gaps. The idea of student-centeredness as equity in practice means that focusing on students—all students—can infuse equitable practices into institutions if faculty are strategic and intentional. This goal is accomplished through student engagement, which is key to community colleges successfully implementing guided pathways.

According to the Research and Planning Group's Student Support (Re)defined research project (2013), student engagement is defined as "students actively participating in class and extra-curricular activities." Phil Schlecty (1994) found that students who are engaged exhibit the following characteristics: "(1) they are attracted to their work, (2) they persist in their work despite challenges and obstacles, and (3) they take visible delight in accomplishing their work." A student-centered institution places student learning, development, and transformation at its core. "The term student-centered learning refers to a wide variety of educational programs, learning experiences, instructional approaches and academic support strategies that are intended to address the distinct learning needs, interests, aspirations, or cultural backgrounds of individual students and groups of students" (Student Centered Learning, 2014). Student-centeredness and student engagement have become hot topics in higher education in general and have become central topics in California community colleges in particular. The challenge of focusing on equity and closing important educational gaps when colleges are not student-centered has found its way to the heart of many of faculty discussions. Currently, however, nearly every California community college is tapping into the reservoir of innovative ideas that comes from re-centering student perspectives, experiences, goals, and challenges and their contributions to the educational mission, objectives, and student success.

Guided pathways as a broad completion framework holds as a central tenet that student engagement is critical to the implementation of its four pillars. In order to create pathways, get and keep students on those pathways, and ensure that students are having a high-quality learning experience on the pathways, colleges are charged with centralizing student engagement to ensure that the student voice is heard. A college community can only benefit by not assuming knowledge about diverse students' goals, challenges, and needs and the complex ways that each generation experiences an institution as outsiders—incoming students—compared to insiders, or employees. Thus, the guided pathways framework actually opens up a very critical window of opportunity for colleges to integrate and align important tasks on their campuses. Using student engagement as a powerful tool could help faculty tackle two central issues their campuses are facing in today's educational climate: closing equity gaps for disproportionality impacted students and better understanding diverse student experiences as colleges make important decisions, plan, and implement campus practices. Embedded in student engagement is the broad opportunity to be inclusive and supportive of a wide variety of student experiences, which could facilitate closing equity gaps. In addition, student-centeredness is inherent in student engagement,

and if colleges are intentional about making student engagement activities meaningful, they can begin a continuous shift towards student-centeredness which not only provides a constant mental image of students' needs as faculty do their daily duties but places empowered students in the seats next to the faculty so that they are active leaders in their own education.

Equity has been the focus for colleges and the community college system for some time now, yet operationalizing equity in ways that can align changes in processes and programming with measurable outcomes takes considerable time. The goal of colleges is to provide equitable instruction and services to produce equitable outcomes. In attempting to achieve equity, activities such as diversity conferences, multiculturalism, food pantries, ally training, and implicit bias training have been useful as campuses have striven to improve their climates and support for disproportionately impacted students. However, these activities can easily become a list of "equity things to do" that has been checked off, which means that some may think they are all that is needed. A college cannot achieve equity unless the college can experience a cultural shift that includes cultivating an equity mindset. Students must feel valued by faculty

---

The goal of colleges is to provide equitable instruction and services to produce equitable outcomes. In attempting to achieve equity, activities such as diversity conferences, multiculturalism, food pantries, ally training, and implicit bias training have been useful as campuses have striven to improve their climates and support for disproportionately impacted students.

who actively inspire them to engage inside and outside of class and to develop the knowledge and skills they need to be successful as they actively participate.

Student engagement gives colleges a unique way to be more equity-minded on a deeper level by being inclusive of diverse student populations in initiatives like guided pathways, AB 705 implementation, shared governance committees, task forces, ad hoc groups, design teams and advisory groups. Examples of students from diverse backgrounds include, but are not limited to, the following: major or course of study, CTE students, Adult Education and non-credit students, international students, working students, out-of-state or out-of-area students, under 18 students, homeless students, racial and ethnic minority students, the LBGTQIA+ community, transitional-age foster youth, veterans, low-income students, disabled students, undocumented students, student with families, formerly incarcerated students, online students, older students, night students, weekend students, athletes, students with wellness, family, health, housing instability, full-time students, part-time students, and life-long learners. Most faculty can rarely say that they sit in committee meetings thinking about how their decisions will impact the educational lives of many of these student categories. Doing the important work of guided pathways has brought clarity about the responsibility to center faculty's work in the unique student populations they serve when decisions are made by committees or academic senates regarding developing programs or initiating long-term changes.

Having students engaged in the process is vital. When students from various backgrounds have a seat at the table, they are experts in their own experience and will remind others to consider how decisions, ideas, and budgets impact their education. By being at the table with the power of being part of the decision-making process, students do not only rely on reminding, asking, or pleading with colleges to do the right thing, but they are empowered to be part of doing the right thing. While some may feel that such engagement is the purpose of student government, as with everything in a society that struggles with equality and equity, associated student organizations typically attract certain types of students and do not always include a full range of diversity. Several colleges have discovered different ways to engage diverse students in their guided pathways work, which has impacted the colleges' equity work as well.

One college created a transformation team for guided pathways to engage the entire campus. While the team included student government, it separately included diverse students at large and conducted several activities with team members pretending to be students themselves in order to learn what helps and hurts students. Another college chose to create a peer-led coaching model for helping with student support where the institution hired and trained diverse students to be peer coaches. The college found that students were better at getting students to use student support services, but it also found that the training for the peer coaches themselves was life-changing, built confidence, and actually helped them focus on their careers and academics.

To implement guided pathways effectively, student equity and institutional equity are imperative because colleges are presented with important considerations such as how raising the completion rates of all students addresses disparities, how the college can address the challenges of disproportionately impacted students to succeed in courses and programs, and how high expectations can be maintained and coupled with high support both academically and socially. Having diverse students engaged and involved to help answer these questions helps close institutional equity gaps and improves student performances and success.

At the 2019 ASCCC Academic Academy, a student attendee spoke to a group of faculty about her aspirations, experiences, favorites instructors, best classes, biggest challenges, hopes and dreams. Her comments were inspiring because she represented the true reason for equity work. The exuberance of students as they discuss open educational resources and access would be a welcomed breath of fresh air on every campus. Many of faculty have experienced this connection as they have answered the call of guided pathways student engagement. Students are integral parts of design teams and have sorted programs, visited neighboring colleges with faculty, tested Star Fish and Career Coach, and co-facilitated workshops on FLEX days.

Guided pathways has opened the doors for colleges to actively listen to what students have to say and use the information to redesign processes so that students have the best onboarding, intervention, and learning experiences possible. For example, one college decided to create a student advisory squad with diverse students working with campus leadership on guided pathways. The institution hired nearly twenty students to attend guided pathways meetings to help make decisions, but the student advisory squad also held its own student meetings to discuss guided pathways. Another college embedded student engagement in classroom assignments. For a sociology of education assignment, 55 students researched guided pathways and student engagement and made recommendations to the campus Guided Pathways Task Force as their research paper for the semester. Many colleges have allowed students to determine what their pathways or metamajors would include and be called and what the symbol on the website would look like. One college was set on what it would call its pathways, but the students disagreed. That college changed course and went with the students' decision because it realized that the decision impacted the students and was for the students' education.

Student-centeredness is not difficult when one thinks of it as inclusiveness. If students are included, they will speak for themselves. However, substantial incentives will be necessary to get and keep students engaged. Almost every college that has been successful with student engagement has paid student workers or embedded activities in the classroom as part of its courses.

The ultimate goal of guided pathways is that students complete their educational goals. Student engagement presents colleges with a special opportunity to practice equity and focus on students, which subsequently empowers students to actively and intentionally participate in their own education.

REFERENCES

Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges. (2013). Student Support (Re)defined. *https://rpgroup.org/student-support*.

Schlecty, P. (1994, January). *Increasing Student Engagement*. Missouri Leadership Academy. California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Vision for Success and Career Ladders Project, 2019. Guided Pathways College Profiles.

Student Centered Learning. (2014). The Glossary of Education Reform for Journalists, Parents, and Community Members. Great Schools Partnership. Retrieved from *https://www.edglossary.org/student-centered-learning/*.

The Role of Counseling Faculty in a Guided Pathways Redesign

by Jeffrey Hernandez, ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force Lead, East Los Angeles College
and Tahirah Simpson, ASCCC Guided Pathways Task Force Lead, San Bernardino Valley College

Successful implementation of a guided pathways framework in the California community colleges will entail transformation of institutions and processes with the students' goals in mind. This undertaking will have significant implications for several academic and professional matters under academic senate purview, not least of which are "standards or policies regarding student preparation and success."[1] Regarding these issues, academic senates and district governing boards are required to consult collegially. Local academic senates will benefit from affording counseling faculty a central voice in supporting the institutional redesign undertaken by the implementation of a guided pathways framework.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has long recognized the significance of counseling faculty. In spring 1995, when it adopted the paper titled *The Role of Counseling Faculty in the California Community Colleges*, the ASCCC noted that higher expectations and lack of funding by the state were undermining the capacity for counseling faculty to fully meet their charge.[2] The ASCCC paper reviewed how minimum qualifications for counseling faculty were essential to the functions of a counseling program as defined by California Education Code, while at the same time clarifying the appropriately limited support role of paraprofessionals and the role of faculty advisors.

Two years later, the ASCCC went further when it adopted *Standards of Practice for California Community College Counseling Programs*.[3] Drawing from California Education Code and the American Counseling Association, the spring 1997 paper delineated universal standards for counseling in six broad areas: core functions, ethical standards, organization and administration, human resources, physical facilities, and new technologies.

In the years that followed, the ASCCC continued to publish papers, documents, and articles clarifying and reaffirming the essential role and practices of counseling faculty in support of student success. In spring 2003, the ASCCC adopted the *Report from the Consultation Council Task Force on Counseling* in which the ASCCC recommended additional funding to make progress toward a counselor/student ratio of 1:370.[4] In fall 2008, the ASCCC adopted *Standards of Practice for California*

1   https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I6EED7180D48411DE
    BC02831C6D6C108E?transitionType=Default&contextData=%28sc.
    Default%29

2   https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Role_Coun-
    seling_Faculty_0.pdf

3   https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Standards_0.pdf

4   https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Consultation-
    Council_0.pdf

Recent changes to federal policies regarding undocumented individuals in the U.S. have created challenges for community college leaders who wish to support the vulnerable population of DACA, AB 540, and other undocumented students in their colleges.

Community College Counseling Faculty and Programs, which, notably, presented additional principles for extending counseling practices through new technology.[5] In spring 2012, the ASCCC adopted *The Role of Counseling Faculty and Delivery of Counseling Services in the California Community Colleges*, which included modifications following the 2011 Board of Governors Student Success Task Force recommendations, delved into benefits of the student education plan, and further elaborated on technological tools and online counseling.[6]

These past ASCCC publications were developed to clarify the important work of counseling faculty during instances in which the California community college system was experiencing substantial change. Moments of system change will often necessitate that the ASCCC and local senates unequivocally sustain the faculty voice. As the article "The Transformation of Counseling Along Guided Pathways Sidelines" in the October 2018 *Rostrum* noted, guided pathways redesign is leading to transformative change that will have significant implications for counseling faculty.[7]

Guided pathways helps to reduce the sink or swim mentality perceived by students when they are navigating the community college system. Reorganizing the way colleges operate for the betterment of students is necessary to support student success; offering a seamless experience is the core virtue of guided pathways. Guided pathways outline the role of the counseling in each pillar. The role of counseling, as the first faculty contact with students, is to assist students in entering the paths to their goals through intrusive wraparound

counseling services. Students work with counseling in discovering their best academic options to meet their desired careers of choice. In guided pathways, counselors provide more targeted services, advising students on setting goals, developing comprehensive education plans, and career development while helping students connect with academic, financial, and social resources.

Consequently, local academic senates must ensure that counselors play an active role in deliberations on guided pathways inquiry, design, and implementation. The academic senate is the voice of the entire faculty in regard to academic and professional matters, both instructional and non-instructional; moreover, as the ASCCC has long recognized, counselors are uniquely qualified to help all faculty collaborate and align with student service resources, concerns, and objectives.

Guided pathways helps to reduce the sink or swim mentality perceived by students when they are navigating the community college system. Reorganizing the way colleges operate for the betterment of students is necessary to support student success; offering a seamless experience is the core virtue of guided pathways.

5   https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Standards-of-Practice_0.pdf

6   https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/CounselingS12_0.pdf

7   https://www.asccc.org/content/transformation-counseling-along-guided-pathways-sidelines

Guided Pathways and Governance: Avoiding the Fate of Sisyphus

by Virginia May, ASCCC Treasurer, Guided Pathways Task Force Chair

and Eric Thompson, Santa Rosa Junior College, Guided Pathways Task Force

At the outset of the California Guided Pathways Project, colleges struggled with where in their governance processes guided pathways efforts would reside. Many colleges set up separate guided pathways committees or task forces and assigned various existing and new staff from faculty, administration, and even classified professionals to lead the efforts. Many of these very same colleges are now restructuring their governance systems to accommodate guided pathways efforts, often feeling like Sisyphus rolling a huge boulder up a hill. Just when a college believes it has its governance system set up for guided pathways, it finds it has to start again.

In fall 2016, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office successfully worked with the legislature and the governor to enact the California Community Colleges Guided Pathways Grant Program, more commonly referred to as the Guided Pathways Award Program, into the 2017-18 Budget Act. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) President Julie Bruno wrote in the February 2017 *Rostrum*, "In considering the implementation of any pathways program, discussions are and should be collaborative, involving participation from all constituent groups on campus including students, staff, and administrators. However, certain characteristics that are inherent in all pathways establish the obligation for academic senates and faculty to be at the core of the effort... In other words, pathways land squarely within the 10 + 1 (p. 2).[1] More than a year later, Jeff Burdick, a member of the Guided Pathways Task Force and former member of the California Community Colleges Board of Governors, wrote in the April 2018 *Rostrum*, "Each of the 114 colleges has

committed to creating some version of a guided pathways framework, but no one has a template. There are no rainmakers or software programs or magic genies that will 'pathway' your college. Your mission, vision, values, and culture are where your pathway begins, and your strategic planning structure is where it will be built. Since this is a faculty-driven project, this is our chance to point our individual colleges toward excellence" (p. 18).[2] These statements are apt articulations of faculty purview in guided pathways projects.

In the meantime, the ASCCC adopted several resolutions that were responses to the lack of genuine consultation with the Academic Senate on the guided pathways project by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. Academic Senate leadership has contended that at times much of the project has not been faculty driven.[3] The state-level tension between administrative drive and academic senate purview is often mirrored locally. An inevitable friction exists in the governing of guided pathways implementation. On one hand, guided pathways

---

1   https://asccc.org/content/developing-guided-pathways-importance-faculty-voice-and-leadership

2   https://asccc.org/content/we-already-do-what%E2%80%99s-new-about-guided-pathways

3   For example, https://asccc.org/resolutions/call-faculty-leadership-implementing-vision-success; and http://www.asccc.org/resolutions/investigate-effective-practices-pathways-programs.

> Certain characteristics that are inherent in all pathways establish the obligation for academic senates and faculty to be at the core of the effort.

efforts are cross-functional, as is specifically called for in the Self-Assessment and Scale of Adoption forms. In addition, guided pathways should be collaborative: faculty, student, administrative, and classified staff perspectives and skill sets should all be involved, and indeed must be involved, to accomplish the project's goals. On the other hand, guided pathways efforts should be faculty driven; moreover, they should be faculty-owned, as is so often repeated, mantra-like, and in recognition of which the chancellor has made the academic senate president a necessary signatory. A tension is thus created regarding how cross-functional and faculty-driven goals can both be realized.

The California Community Colleges are now entering the third year of a five-year period for funding to implement a guided pathways framework under the Guided Pathways Award Program. Although most people will agree that full implementation could take up to ten years, colleges would do well to have their governance structures in place as early as possible. Various approaches are being pursued.

THE TRI-CHAIR MODEL

Tri-chair models are popular. This structure often entails a faculty tri-chair with reassigned time appointed by the academic senate, an administrative tri-chair appointed by the president, and a classified tri-chair. While the process of reassigned duties for faculty, which have a minimal cost of what it takes to back-fill their classes with adjunct instructors, is a very familiar one, compensating administrative and classified professionals is more complicated. More to the point, this structure may muddy the waters of senate purview. Since guided pathways ask institutions to rethink their operations from a student perspective, and since faculty, represented by the academic senate, define the curriculum that students need to succeed in and what student success in courses and programs looks like, the Guided Pathways Project is an opportunity to recover and revitalize the concept that administration and classified professionals exist to support the institution's educational purpose which is, at its core, a transaction between faculty and student. At its best, that is what Guided Pathways should be doing.

Tri-Chair models certainly can work, but their success depends on who the participants are and to what extent they understand and have experience in the actual in-

the-trenches process of facilitating student acquisition of knowledge and skill. Administrator and classified perspectives can augment and support faculty and student interaction toward educational achievement or they can run counter to it, depending on where those personnel sit and what experience they bring to the table. Many administrators have come from the ranks of faculty, but others have not. Their prior experience will determine how effectively they will be able to inform the guided pathways restructuring, the whole point of which is to help students succeed in their academic programs.

DIRECT ACADEMIC SENATE GOVERNANCE

At some institutions, the academic senate has assumed full leadership regarding guided pathways. At Santa Rosa Junior College (SRJC), as an example, the local academic senate has essentially prevailed in an argument with the district that guided pathways efforts fall squarely under the 10+1 academic and professional matters detailed in the California Code of Regulations Title 5 §53200. Therefore, the academic senate directly oversees the enterprise. Reaching this point was a process. For the first year of guided pathways planning and implementation, a large steering committee of representatives from each cross-functional constituency led the work of inquiry. Now that the college has moved on to the design phase, the academic senate has pressed the point that, since the guided pathways reformations the college has chosen to work on are thoroughly academic and professional matters in which deans and classified professionals play important but supporting roles and which are informed by student insights, faculty properly belong in the driver's seat.

The full SRJC academic senate debated and voted on the areas of guided pathways to design and implement and on principles of governance. The academic senate executive committee works out the details. The allocation of funds has been put entirely under the control of the academic senate. The lion's share of the funds goes to faculty work group leads in the form of reassigned time to do the research and design work. Some funds are reserved to provide incentives for student participation, which often means food; student members of guided pathways work groups are appointed by student government and paid an hourly wage from the student government budget. Participation of classified staff may also require compensation. Administrative colleagues are assigned

to the work within their job duties. Since the funds are mostly allocated for faculty reassigned time, the structure goes to the faculty union and a memorandum of understanding is created.

Deans on SRJC's four guided pathways teams advise, and their participation is valued, but the team leads are faculty. After much discussion, the academic senate decided not to have a "GP Czar" who would head the effort. Rather, the faculty leads report directly to the academic senate, and the senate executive committee meets with two administrators assigned to be guided pathways support, one from student services and one from academic affairs. Classified and student involvement is harder to acquire, but the college is still working on it. One downside of this approach is that it takes time, and some people become frustrated by the slowness of progress. Advantages are that it distributes the work, relieves the Sisyphus effect, fully honors democratic processes, and is faculty driven.

GUIDED PATHWAYS LEAD

Some institutions have a faculty member with reassigned time, which usually varies from 50% to 100%, or an administrator who is solely responsible for oversight and coordination of the college's guided pathways efforts. Having a guided pathways "czar" provides the benefit of a dedicated coordinator that can unify the efforts, and if the coordinator is a faculty member it may keep the 10 + 1 purview of the academic senate in the forefront of the initiative. The downside is that a single person may have difficulty representing the perspectives of many disciplines. This structure may be more efficient but also may make avoiding a top-down approach harder and may intensify the Sisyphus effect.

> Work with college constituencies while giving the guiding place to the faculty expertise represented by the academic senate to integrate guided pathways efforts into governance structures.

OTHERS

Of course, many other structures are possible. Whatever structure of guided pathways governance exists within a college, the local academic senate should exercise its rights and take on the responsibility to lead the efforts. ASCCC resolutions passed two years ago fully support the leadership roles of the academic senate in guided pathways efforts: Resolution 17.02 F17, which affirmed "the right of local academic senates and senate leaders to play central roles in the development of all elements of a guided pathways framework at their college that are relevant to academic and professional matters," and Resolution 17.05 F17, which asserted that "it is the role and purview of the local academic senate to appoint faculty to provide leadership or serve on college or district groups that design and implement a college's guided pathways framework or program, including those faculty that receive release or reassigned time to serve" and urged local senates "to establish processes to appoint faculty to provide leadership or serve on college or district groups that design and implement guided pathways frameworks or programs, including those faculty that receive release or reassigned time to serve."

Cross-functional participation in guided pathways is vital, as the ASCCC does and always has affirmed, but the above-cited resolutions call for academic senate purview to be "central" and to give direction to all aspects of guided pathways reforms. Now that colleges and their academic senates are enmeshed in guided pathways implementation and are possibly re-examining their governance processes, faculty should call out the areas of the 10+1 academic and professional matters that directly address guided pathways—and all areas of the 10+1 may apply under various circumstances.

Avoid the fate of Sisyphus. Work with college constituencies while giving the guiding place to the faculty expertise represented by the academic senate to integrate guided pathways efforts into governance structures. Doing so will help ensure that the college does not have to continue re-examining and establishing the roles of leadership in guided pathways efforts because ownership will be widespread, since shared governance is honored. Such a structure will ensure that the expertise of the faculty in academic and professional matters will imbue the guided pathways effort, as it should.

An Argument for Expanding Baccalaureate Degree Programs in the California Community Colleges

by Dolores Davison, ASCCC Vice President

For almost 60 years, since the creation of the California Master Plan for Higher Education in 1960, California community colleges have focused on serving students seeking lower division course work and career technical training. During that time, while focus on other areas of study has been diminished, including much of life-long learning and, more recently, much in remediation and basic skills, additional elements have rarely been added to the mission of the California community colleges. The potential for the mission to change began in 2010 when legislation was introduced to potentially add baccalaureate degrees to the options available to community college students. In Resolution 6.01 S10, the delegates at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Spring Plenary Session rejected this idea, making clear that such action would call for an expansion of the community colleges' mission.[1] The proposed bill, AB 2400 by Assemblymember Anderson, failed to garner support and eventually failed, but the call for baccalaureate degrees in the California Community College System continued.

In 2014, Senator Marty Block introduced SB 850 calling for the creation of a pilot program for baccalaureate degrees at community colleges around the state. Senator Block noted at the time that baccalaureate programs existed in community colleges in 21 states and that California would face a shortfall of educated professionals in fields including health, biotechnology, and other needed occupations. Despite the ASCCC's continued opposition to the expansion of the system's mission, the bill passed and was signed into law. Once the bill was signed, the ASCCC worked to assist colleges that were chosen to participate in the Baccalaureate Degree Pilot, providing guidance in areas such as general education, minimum qualifications, and expectations around accreditation.

In the five years since Senator Block's bill became law, 15 colleges from around the state have developed baccalaureate programs in fields including dental hygiene, mortuary science, biotechnology, health information systems, and others. These programs have now gone through at least one full cycle of students from enrollment to graduation, with many of them completing two cycles, and the results appear promising in many areas. More than two hundred students have graduated with degrees in fields in which industry standards are increasingly calling for a baccalaureate degree, enabling them to apply for jobs for which they previously might not have qualified. This success, while still preliminary, leads to three questions: should the ASCCC remove its opposition to the baccalaureate degrees, should the pilot notation for the programs be eliminated, and should the programs be expanded? At this time, the answers to all of these questions should be a resounding yes.

> In the five years since Senator Block's bill became law, 15 colleges from around the state have developed baccalaureate programs.

---

1 https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/opposition-proposed-modification-community-college-mission

The ASCCC opposition to the baccalaureate programs was initially logged almost a decade ago, long before anyone knew what would happen with many of the industries in which baccalaureate programs are being offered. As more majors are requiring baccalaureate degrees for job applicants to be successful, the ASCCC should not oppose the creation of programs designed to allow students more opportunities for employment and advancement. At the 2019 ASCCC Fall Plenary, a resolution will be presented asking the delegates to reverse the position taken in 2010 and to allow the ASCCC to continue its work around the baccalaureate degrees.

In addition, the word "pilot" needs to be removed from these programs. Colleges have invested time and energy, both in terms of faculty and administrative efforts, to make these programs successful. The word pilot implies that these programs may not remain consistent or may suddenly be eliminated, which may preclude students from wanting to enroll in them. The costs of the baccalaureate programs remain largely in human resources rather than in other areas such as equipment, as many of the courses in the upper division of the programs are centered in areas such as theory rather than in practicum and labs. These programs should now be made a permanent part of the colleges at which they are located, and removing the word pilot would indicate this intent.

Given the success of the baccalaureate programs, the time has come for them to be expanded. Senator Block's legislation allowed for the creation of 15 pilot programs, with no more than one per district. Therefore, while some colleges were allowed to create a baccalaureate program, most were not, and those that were allowed to do so were only allowed to create one. Demand in many fields, especially those in allied health, far exceeds what is available coming out of other colleges and universities in the state. Students seeking a baccalaureate are often forced to enroll in a for-profit institution or to travel out of state because no program is available at their local community colleges. This situation does a disservice to students: it forces them to go into debt, to potentially leave the state, or, in a worst-case scenario, for them to not able to continue their educational endeavors because these doors are closed to them.

The mission of the California Community College System is to provide access and success to all students who seek to learn; not allowing colleges to create baccalaureate programs to their full ability means the system is failing in that mission. Ultimately, while the ASCCC's original stance was to oppose the baccalaureate degrees due to concerns about the mission of the California community colleges, one can now argue that allowing for the expansion of these programs is in fact absolutely in keeping with the mission: to educate students and provide them with the skills and knowledge needed to be the future of California's workforce.

> While the ASCCC's original stance was to oppose the baccalaureate degrees due to concerns about the mission of the California community colleges, one can now argue that allowing for the expansion of these programs is in fact absolutely in keeping with the mission: to educate students and provide them with the skills and knowledge needed to be the future of California's workforce.

Measuring the Second Minimum Qualification: Considerations for Exceeding Mere Compliance

by Geoffrey Dyer, Area A Representative, Standards and Practices Committee Chair

and Michelle Bean, Area C Representative

Since 1990, districts have been required, per California Education Code §87360, to include in their hiring processes for faculty and administrators "criteria that include a sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socio-economic, cultural, disability, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students." This statute is included in the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in the California Community Colleges*, also known as the Disciplines List.[1] Title 5 §53022 dictates that job requirements for faculty and administrative positions include these criteria and broadens the list to also include sensitivity to and understanding of gender identity and sexual orientation. The regulation also specifies that "any 'required,' 'desired' or 'preferred' qualifications beyond" the minimum qualifications in the Disciplines List comply with equal employment opportunity requirements and nondiscrimination laws. Taken together, the statutory and regulatory requirements that applicants possess a responsiveness to and knowledge of students' diverse backgrounds and identities constitute a minimum qualification. This minimum qualification, distinct from the discipline-specific qualifications listed individually in the Disciplines List, applies not to a single discipline but to all faculty and administrative positions. For this reason, the requirement has come to be known in the community college system as "the second minimum qualification," though some districts have begun to apply it as their first.

Since districts are legally required to have such criteria in place, most districts' job announcements and applications for academic and administrative positions state that candidates are required to possess sensitivity to and understanding of students' diverse backgrounds and identities. However, statute and regulation offer no clear guidance regarding how to apply this criteria in practice. Screening committees are therefore often left to determine for themselves whether candidates possess this qualification and to understand its significance on their own.

At some districts, this important qualification may simply be screened for with a boilerplate yes or no question—essentially a check box—or a single narrative question to which candidates are compelled to respond and that screening committees can simply determine does or does not demonstrate evidence of meeting the second minimum qualification. These approaches may comply—or nearly comply—with the letter of the law, but gauging whether or not they are meaningful or effective is difficult. Surely, districts can do more.

> The statutory and regulatory requirements that applicants possess a responsiveness to and knowledge of students' diverse backgrounds and identities constitute a minimum qualification.

---

1   The disciplines list is available at *https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Minimum_Qualifications2018.pdf*.

One must remember that this requirement is a minimum qualification. When screening for applicants that meet the first, or discipline-specific, minimum qualification, districts do not simply ask candidates if they meet the stated minimum qualification and then grant an interview. Most, if not all, districts require that candidates submit their academic transcripts as evidence of required academic preparation and other documents and artifacts as evidence of professional experience or equivalency and ensure that minimum qualifications are met before offering an interview. The second minimum qualification should be no different, yet it is generally not held to the same standards of confirmation, whether because it is perceived to be less important or because is it simply more difficult to measure.

By now, most faculty in the community college system will agree that the second minimum qualification is not less important than the first, given the wealth of information about disparities in attainment of outcomes that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, the CCC Chancellor's Office, and local districts have been sharing for many years. In one study, Robert Fairlie (2014, p. 2577) and his colleagues reported the results of their longitudinal examination of one California community college, determining "underrepresented minority students" were more likely to complete courses and more likely to complete with a grade of B or higher in sections taught by an "underrepresented instructor." The California Community Colleges Student Success Scorecard reports that in 2017 the gulf in completion rates for degree, certificate, and/or transfer within six years of entering community college was 30.1 percentage points between the group with the highest completion rate and the group with the lowest rate. The placement of students of color into remedial courses and outcomes of students beginning in remedial courses as reported by the Scorecard even found a home in AB 705 (2017) as justification for the bill's action on assessment and placement. Despite all of the abovementioned efforts and findings, the proportion of underrepresented minority students in the California Community College System—over 50% in fall of 2017—is the inverse of the proportion of underrepresented minority faculty—roughly 20% in 2017 (California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, 2017). While carefully applying the second minimum qualification is not exactly the same thing as diversifying faculty, presentation and evaluation of the second mini-

Faculty and administrators are required not only to possess knowledge but also to act with sensitivity. Measuring this qualification effectively requires triangulation.

mum qualification could be leveraged to reinforce an institution's commitment to equity.

When candidates for a position do not meet the first minimum qualification, they are not granted an interview. However, discipline-specific minimum qualifications—barring sometimes complex local equivalency procedures—are relatively straightforward and easy to measure. The second minimum qualification cannot typically be demonstrated by an academic degree; it is not only cognitive but also affective and behavioral. Faculty and administrators are required not only to possess knowledge but also to act with sensitivity. Measuring this qualification effectively requires triangulation. At the very least, application processes should include more than a simple yes or no question or limited narrative response.

Some promising practices that various districts have embraced and begun to implement approach screening for the second minimum qualification by infusing equity-mindedness throughout the job announcement, application, screening, and interview process instead of just in one place. The following are some tangible examples from CCC districts that can be used in concert with each other:

- Clearly listing the requirement as a minimum qualification in the job posting. In at least one district, it is listed as the first minimum qualification.
- Stating the institution's mission—with its special attention to equity, diversity, and inclusion—on top of the job announcement and referring to it in various ways throughout the description as it pertains to duties and responsibilities and specific desirable qualifications.
- Including district demographic information in the job posting.

- Requiring as part of the application materials specific evidence of how the applicant exhibits the second minimum qualification and directing applicants on the type of evidence they should include. Evidence might include relevant professional development attended, coursework addressing cultural competence, and other documented experiences.
- Requiring the applicant to submit as part of the application a detailed diversity statement and providing clear explanations of what the applicant should address.
- Infusing equity-mindedness into as many aspects of the hiring process as possible, including multiple interview questions and any live performance of skills for candidates granted an interview.
- Development of and use by screening committees of a rubric measuring how application materials demonstrate knowledge of and sensitivity to the diverse backgrounds and identities of CCC students.

As new faculty enter a district, minimum qualifications, job announcements, and interview processes introduce them to the institutional culture. Local senate leaders must understand the role of their academic senates in shaping hiring criteria, policies, and procedures as directed by California Education Code §87360. Since local governing boards are required to reach mutual agreement with their academic senates on these issues, as established in regulation, a worthwhile examination of ways to improve how the district evaluates the second minimum qualification should be senate-led and student-focused but involve appropriate stakeholders. Faculty leaders should consider how their districts are addressing equity in their missions, student equity and

achievement plans, guided pathways work, and cultures to ensure that each district's approach to screening for the second minimum qualification best supports institutional efforts to promote equity.

REFERENCES

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2017). Equal Opportunity Employment Report. Retrieved from *https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/Reports/ 2019-cccco-eeo-report-final-web.ashx?la=en&hash=1B93D 2C44CD582585660329FF576A9CA012EB470.*

Fairlie, R., et al. (2014) A Community College Instructor Like Me: Race and Ethnicity Interactions in the Classroom. *The American Economic Review.* V. 104, n. 8, pp. 2567-2591.

As new faculty enter a district, minimum qualifications, job announcements, and interview processes introduce them to the institutional culture. Local senate leaders must understand the role of their academic senates in shaping hiring criteria, policies, and procedures.

Introducing the CTE
Minimum Qualifications Toolkit

by Carrie Roberson, ASCCC North Representative

and Cheryl Aschenbach, ASCCC Secretary

A s mentioned in previous *Rostrum* articles and the ASCCC paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications* (2016),[1] colleges should recognize that faculty applicants may prepare in various ways for employment and may meet qualifications in different ways depending on their disciplines. As a result, colleges should have means of considering qualification through equivalence.

Rostrum articles titled "Building a Deeper Career Education Candidate Pool – Using Faculty Equivalency Processes More Effectively" (October 2017)[2] and "Looking at Equivalency Differently: Rethinking Equivalency to General Education" (October 2018)[3] spoke of work being done between the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) and system stakeholders, including CEOs and HR professionals, as part of the Chancellor's Office CTE Minimum Qualifications Work Group. The prior articles described use of effective practices as well as the general education equivalency examples that were under development as part of the CTE Minimum Qualifications Toolkit. At conferences and regional events throughout 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, Chancellor's Office and ASCCC representatives encouraged use of the toolkit once it was finished. That time has now come. Academic senates, equivalency committees, human resources offices, and even potential candidates can now access the resource that is the CTE Minimum Qualifications Toolkit.

Faculty delegates to ASCCC plenary sessions have requested equivalency-related resources. On more than one occasion, delegates passed resolutions asking that ASCCC "present proposed guidelines for locally establishing standards with suitable criteria for determining equivalencies, including model practices" (10.11 Spring 2011) and "develop and disseminate resources that empower local senates to evaluate and assess, more effectively and with greater flexibility, the qualifications of applicants for faculty positions who have significant professional experience in the field but who have not completed formal academic work in the discipline and/or in general education" (10.05 Fall 2017). The CTE Minimum Qualifications Toolkit is a response to these resolutions as well as a response to recommendation 13.b. of the Strong Workforce Taskforce recommendations: "Disseminate effective practices in the recruitment and hiring of diverse faculty and the application of minimum qualifications and equivalencies."

The toolkit is intended to assist local academic senates, discipline faculty, and equivalency committees in screening for minimum qualifications for potential career technical education faculty and in the use of equivalency

---

1   The paper is available at *https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/equivalency_paper.pdf*

2   *https://www.asccc.org/content/building-deeper-career-education-candidate-pool-using-faculty-equivalency-processes-more*

3   *https://www.asccc.org/content/looking-equivalency-differently-rethinking-equivalency-general-education*

> Academic senates, equivalency committees, human resources offices, and even potential candidates can now access the CTE Minimum Qualifications Toolkit.

processes to determine suitability for employment at community colleges. The purpose of the toolkit is to maximize the flexibility currently allowed in the use of equivalency to create deep, diverse, and qualified pools of industry expert candidates for our career technical education programs.

Minimum qualifications for faculty are essential for promoting professionalism, integrity of instruction, and rigor within each discipline. Locally developed processes that provide a mechanism for an individual to meet minimum qualifications through equivalency ensure the opportunity to hire industry experts who meet the needs of the ever-changing career technical education programs and emerging disciplines. As California community colleges continue the task of meeting future workforce needs, all colleges should have a consistent application of the equivalency processes for minimum qualifications for CTE faculty.

Equivalency is the process that supports local hiring committees to consider faculty applicants whose possession of minimum qualifications for a discipline as defined by the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges 2019 Handbook*—also known as "The Disciplines List"—may be in question or is uncertain.[4] This option is especially relevant to applicants for faculty positions in career technical education, many of whom are experts in their fields but do not possess traditional academic credentials.

Education Code §§ 87359 and 87360 establish that individuals who do not possess the minimum qualifications for service may be hired as faculty members if they possess "qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications." The Disciplines List, a Board of Governors' adopted list of minimum qualifications for hiring faculty, uses the term "equivalency" to describe processes to support this regulation. When charged with determining faculty minimum qualifications, equivalency committee members and other stakeholders can refer to the Disciplines List.

---

4   The handbook may be found at *https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/ CCCCO-Website/About-Us/Reports/Files/CCCCO_Report_Min_ Qualifications-ADA-Final.ashx*

The toolkit includes information targeted at specific groups of people involved in faculty hiring —presidents and chancellors, chief instructional officers, CTE deans, and CTE department chairs, and faculty—to reinforce the importance of effective equivalency practices in faculty hiring within each specific group.

The CTE Minimum Qualifications Toolkit is a practical guide for academic senates and equivalency committees, with the support of Human Resource professionals, to use in helping include industry experts into hiring pools and ultimately into classrooms in order to provide their industry expertise to California community college students. The toolkit is intended to provide specific tools with a specific function to assist campus professionals in improving and facilitating effective equivalency practices at colleges.

The toolkit includes information targeted at specific groups of people involved in faculty hiring—presidents and chancellors, chief instructional officers, CTE deans, and CTE department chairs, and faculty—to reinforce the importance of effective equivalency practices in faculty hiring within each specific group. In addition, checklists are provided to help pre-planning equivalency within departments, equivalency from an HR perspective, and equivalency practices from the equivalency committee perspective.

The "Equivalency Tools" section includes recommended policies, committee make-up, processes, and practices for equivalency committees. While human resources offices routinely handle hiring for all employees and, specific to faculty qualifications, may determine when a faculty member clearly meets the minimum qualifications

as listed in the Disciplines List, any recommendation regarding qualification by way of equivalency should be made by faculty. Faculty and human resources personnel must work together to ensure that an efficient, transparent, and thorough process is followed when considering equivalency cases for CTE faculty minimum qualifications. While equivalency discussions and recommendations may be difficult because of the subjectivity of equivalency, having clear policies, processes, and practices is important in consistently considering minimum qualifications through equivalency as well as for justifying any equivalency recommendations.

The "General Education Equivalency Examples" section is the part of the toolkit that is newest to the conversation. The most challenging aspect of most equivalency considerations when a faculty applicant does not have an associate's degree or even coursework that could be considered equivalent is determining what is equivalent to the general education elements of an associate's degree. If an applicant is an industry expert with at least the six years of professional experience required for minimum qualifications in most CTE disciplines, he or she is usually considered to have plenty of preparation in the specific discipline. The challenge in determining equivalency is most often centered around how to determine whether or not the applicant has workplace training and experiences that are at least equivalent to the outcomes of required general education coursework and competencies.

The "General Education Equivalency Examples" section breaks apart the eighteen general education units and English, math, and reading competencies required for an associate's degree and offers suggestions for what might be required to meet each general education area requirement. The examples provide a few alternatives to coursework that may be considered equivalent for specific disciplines. These examples are intended to encourage conversation about what is possible through industry and community training or experiences. The worksheet that precedes the examples in the toolkit is a sample for how an equivalency committee can document the recommendations made; a worksheet like the one in the toolkit can then be included in personnel files as evidence in case of audit or for accreditation.

The remainder of the toolkit includes specific information about eminence, apprenticeship qualifications, credit for prior learning, and faculty internships. While these areas are not critical for equivalency discussions or deliberations, faculty leaders and administrators should understand all of the ways in which faculty may be qualified or prepared to teach in California community colleges.

The CTE Minimum Qualifications Toolkit is now a resource available to faculty, human resources professionals, equivalency committees, and applicants. Academic senates are encouraged to review the practices and examples in the toolkit and to review local policies, processes, and practices to ensure that equivalency processes are clear to all involved, that they are considered consistently across disciplines, that equivalency recommendations are properly documented and that the documentation is retained, and that discipline faculty are included in equivalency conversations, particularly when industry training and experience is considered for equivalency to general education course outcomes. These considerations are all important as senates examine local practice.

If academic senate leaders would like support in reviewing local practice, facilitating dialogue around equivalency processes, or implementing practices recommended in the CTE Minimum Qualifications Toolkit, the ASCCC is available for technical visits at no cost to the college. The first step is to determine the local college need and then to have the local academic senate president complete a request for service form online, available at *https://www.asccc.org/contact/request-services*. Individuals completing the form should be certain to indicate that the visit is requested for equivalency purposes.

The CTE Minimum Qualifications Toolkit is now a resource available to faculty, human resources professionals, equivalency committees, and applicants.

Data 101: Guiding Principles —10 Years Later

by Julie Bruno, Educational Policies Committee, Sierra College

and Stephanie Curry, ASCCC North Representative, Educational Policies Committee

In February 2010, the ASCCC Executive Committee published a white paper titled *Data 101: Guiding Principles for Faculty*.[1] Since that time, data has become an everyday part of faculty lives throughout California's community colleges and districts. Data is integral to decision making and student success on college campuses. From guided pathways implementation and the Vision for Success goals, to AB 705 implementation and closing equity gaps, faculty take on a significant role in data-informed discussions and decisions.

The amount and types of data available to faculty have increased exponentially, and data literacy on campuses has also significantly increased. Faculty must understand and utilize data responsibly in order to best assist students in achieving their educational goals. Data not only exposes equity achievement gaps but may also help faculty identify and remove systemic barriers to student success.

Although the *Data 101* paper uses a hypothetical example that may seem dated to some, the foundational guiding principles articulated in the paper still resonate and are as applicable today as they were ten years ago. As current initiatives and trends require colleges to consider and use data effectively, faculty should reflect on these principles and consider how they currently impact the work at their colleges.

DATA 101: GUIDING PRINCIPLES
Principle 1 – Use longitudinal data when possible
Principle 2 – Use data in context

Principle 3 – Look for both direct and indirect data
Principle 4 – Do not oversimplify cause and effect of data
Principle 5 – Use appropriate levels of data for appropriate levels of decisions

Principle 6 – Perception is the reality within which people operate
Principle 7 – Use of data should be transparent
Principle 8 – Consider carefully when to aggregate or disaggregate data
Principle 9 – Focus on data that is actionable

These nine guiding principles provide a starting point from which to critically evaluate data and highlight the importance of responsibly and effectively using data with integrity. All areas of the 10+1 academic and professional matters of academic senate purview require the use of data to make informed decisions. Local academic senates should take the lead in ensuring that faculty are involved in determining how and what data is used in decision-making and have the opportunity for professional development to increase their data literacy.

In the past ten years, faculty have become more involved in the creation, analysis, and use of data. Many faculty have begun to take ownership of data through programs such as data coaching. Data coaches guide teams through the process of collaborative inquiry and engage others in making sense of and responding to data in ways that improve learning for all students. Faculty are not only becoming data experts but are sharing their knowledge with their fellow faculty members.

Faculty should take a leading role in bringing the guiding principles from the *Data 101* paper into their college-wide discussions about data. They should ask about longitudinal data and disaggregation, have discussions about whether their institutional data is transparent, and provide the proper context for data discussion. Instruction can only grow stronger when well-informed faculty are active participants in data-driven discussions, recommendations, and decision-making.

---

1   This paper is available at *https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Data101Feb2010_0.pdf*

The ASCCC-FACCC Connection:
A History of Cooperation and Support

by David Morse, History of the ASCCC Project Chair

(In 2013, the Academic Senate Executive Committee approved a project to record and preserve the history of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The April 2017 Rostrum *contains an article that explains the intent and structure of this project. The following article was written as an aspect of the history project.)*

The connection between the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) and the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) reaches back to the origins of the ASCCC. FACCC was largely responsible for the founding of the State Academic Senate, and strong ties between the two organizations have remained in place for fifty years and into the present day.

The initial movement to create a state-level academic senate began in 1968 with the Local Senates Committee of the California Junior College Faculty Association, which was later renamed in 1969 as FACCC. Norbert Bischof and Ted Staniford, two members of the CJCFA Board of Governors, called a meeting of local senate leaders from around the state to discuss the creation of a new statewide organization to represent academic senates. While this meeting "was done independent of [CJCFA], because we felt we should immediately appeal to all faculty, even if they belonged to CTA or CFT, who were in some competition with [CJCFA]," Bischof "persuaded [CJCFA] to give [him] some seed money" (Bischof, 2001). The meeting led to the writing of a constitution for and the founding of the ASCCC, and thus the Academic Senate owes its creation to the efforts of, and funding from, the organization that would shortly thereafter become FACCC.[1]

From the time of the ASCCC's founding, it was intended to serve as a collaborative organization with and close ally of FACCC. Jonathan Lightman, Executive Director of FACCC from 1999 to 2018, recalls Bischof explaining on numerous occasions that "the name ASCCC was chosen as the symmetrical counterpart to FACCC, which was anticipated to be the legislative voice for the Senate. The state Academic Senate founders fondly used the acronyms to state, 'ASCCC FACCC [phonetically, "ask FACCC"] about legislation'" (Lightman, 2019). FACCC's positions on academic issues were to be informed by the ASCCC, while any ASCCC legislative activity was to be done with the assistance and guidance of FACCC.

Much of the authority of the ASCCC, as well as many of the organization's successes, have come with the strong support of FACCC. Perhaps most significantly, FACCC played an important role in the development and passage of Assembly Bill 1725 (Vasconcellos) in 1988, the Community College Reform Act that, among other matters, defined the participatory governance system of the California community colleges. AB 1725 was preceded by two special task forces, both created in large part due to the recommendations of FACCC and co-chaired by FACCC representatives. FACCC's Larry Toy led a group that developed a new financial structure, program-based funding, that included incentives for hiring full-time faculty. FACCC President Cy Gulassa led the other task force, which designed the reforms regarding shared governance, faculty empowerment, faculty development, and other areas. "Working closely with a legislative joint committee led by Assemblyman John Vasconcellos, these task forces . . . packaged dozens of complex reforms into an omnibus bill that became known as Assembly Bill 1725" (Gulassa, 2000).

In addition to the contributions of FACCC's faculty leaders, Karen Grosz, ASCCC president from 1987 to 1989,

---

1   For a more detailed account of the creation of the ASCCC, see "The History of the ASCCC Project: The Founding of the ASCCC" in the February 2019 issue of *The Rostrum,* available at *https:// www.asccc.org/content/history-asccc-project-founding-asccc.*

> Much of the authority of the ASCCC, as well as many of the organization's successes, have come with the strong support of FACCC.

recalls the important role played Patrick McCallum, FACCC Executive Director from 1981 to 1998, in AB 1725's development: "When the Academic Senate announced its interest in pursuing legislation to provide for 'shared governance' within the CA Community Colleges, Patrick McCallum stepped up and offered to help. He knew the legislature and the legislative process better than anyone except the legislators themselves, and I bet he knew the process better than many of them. . . The Academic Senate could not have accomplished [the passage of AB 1725 and the pursuant Title 5 language] without the extensive help Patrick McCallum provided" (Grosz, 2019). Thus, FACCC's leadership, both from faculty and its executive director, was instrumental in creating and implementing the legislation that granted academic senates their important role in governance in California's community colleges.

In the wake of the passage of AB 1725, FACCC and the ASCCC developed a joint agreement, adopted by both organizations in 1992, that formalized a mutually cooperative relationship. In its introduction, the agreement stated, "In responding to the needs of faculty, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges must maintain communication between the two organizations in order to address common policies surrounding legislation regarding academic and professional issues" ("Academic Senate/FACCC Relationship"). The agreement provided for FACCC and the ASCCC to appoint formal liaisons to each other's executive boards and to jointly sponsor professional workshops as well as for FACCC to maintain a variety of legislative services for the ASCCC.

Another important milestone for the ASCCC came in 1984, when Jonnah Laroche became the first faculty member appointed to serve on the California Community Colleges

Board of Governors. Laroche was nominated for this position by the ASCCC, which had been granted nominating authority for the faculty positions on the Board of Governors with the passage of SB 1204 in 1983, a FACCC-sponsored bill that passed in spite of opposition from numerous system constituencies. SB 1204 was "supported vigorously with letters and phone calls by community college faculty in a campaign spearheaded by FACCC Executive Director Patrick McCallum" (Conn, 1986).

Throughout the years, the ASCCC and FACCC have retained a close connection in numerous ways. FACCC has continued to consult regularly and directly with the ASCCC regarding its legislative activities. McCallum (2017) notes that as FACCC Executive Director, "For 16 years I addressed the senate conference [plenary sessions] twice a year." McCallum's successor, Jonathan Lightman, continued this tradition, attending ASCCC plenary sessions and presenting on a wide variety of topics. Lightman also provided trainings on advocacy techniques at ASCCC conferences and to the Academic Senate Executive Committee. ASCCC leadership has reciprocated by attending and sometimes presenting at FACCC's annual Advocacy and Policy Conference and at other events. The two organizations also continue to send liaisons to each other's executive board meetings. In 2016, FACCC was instrumental in mustering support from other California community college organizations for a $300,000 augmentation for the ASCCC in the state budget. In addition, several ASCCC presidents, including Edith Conn, Leon Baradat, Bill Scroggins, Ian Walton, Jane Patton, and Julie Bruno, have been recognized by FACCC with awards for their service to faculty in the community college system. Walton comments that "I was delighted to receive the FACCC John Vasconcellos award in 2007, which I felt nicely symbolized the effective political cooperation between the two organizations at that time."

Walton, the ASCCC President from 2005 to 2007, recalls the strong cooperation between the organizations. "In my own time as VP and president, relations between FACCC and ASCCC were very cooperative, first with FACCC President Carolyn Russell and then with Rich Hansen–and by that time of course with Jonathan Lightman," he notes. "I've always looked at FACCC as a good partner with other faculty organizations and supportive of wider faculty goals in general" (Walton, 2019).

Current FACCC President Debbie Klein, who is also a former member of the ASCCC Executive Committee, likewise recognizes the importance of the relationship between the organizations. "FACCC plays the important role of advocating 'solely on behalf of community college faculty.' Thus, the Senate and FACCC have a symbiotic relationship of mutual support. FACCC often sends leaders and/or staff to ASCCC events to discuss advocacy work and train faculty to become advocates. I think this relationship is very important. And when it works, it's powerful" (Klein, 2019).

FACCC and the ASCCC have continued a significant connection since the creation of the ASCCC fifty years ago. The two organizations are each independent, with their own goals and missions, but history has shown that both are stronger when they communicate and work together. Preservation of the FACCC and ASCCC connection can

benefit the leaders and membership of both bodies, and recalling the productive history of their association can provide a foundation for continued collaboration.

> The two organizations are each independent, with their own goals and missions, but history has shown that both are stronger when they communicate and work together.

REFERENCES

"Academic Senate/FACCC Relationship." (1992). MOU adopted at the FACCC Conference, February 29, 1992.

Bischof, N. (2001). Recorded interview with Julia Cheney. 16 January, 2001.

Conn, E. (1986). "60 Milestones in the History of Senates and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges." Retrieved from *Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. https://www.asccc.org/papers/sixty-milestones-history-senates-and-academic-senate-california-community-colleges.*

Grosz, K. (2019). Email communication to the author, June 28, 2019.

Gulassa, C. (2000). "A Brief Overview of the History of the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges." *FACCTS*, December 2000. Retrieved from *https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED454888.pdf*.

Klein, D. (2019). Email communication to the author, September 6, 2019.

Lightman, J. (2019). Telephone interview with the author, May 17, 2019.

McCallum. P. (2017). Written responses to interview questions by the author.

Walton, I. (2019). Email communication to the author, August 30, 2019.