december 2010

2 | FACULTY ARE PROGRESSIVE!

5 | THE CASE FOR RECIPROCITY

7 | MAKING THE CASE FOR eTRANSCRIPT CALIFORNIA

8 | SO YOU WANT TO FORM A CAUCUS?

11 | JUST THE MINIMUM FACTS

13 | FACULTY AS THE GPS FOR STUDENTS

15 | PART-TIME ISSUES HIGHLIGHTED AT FALL 2010 PLENARY

17 | CONSIDERATIONS FOR MOVING NONCREDIT MQS FROM TITLE 5 TO THE DISCIPLINES LIST

19 | C-ID, SB 1440, AND TMC: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

21 | FEDERALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE EXPANDING DATA BUBBLE

26 | BUDGET CUT BLUES, WHAT HAPPENED?

28 | DISTANCE EDUCATION: THE WAVE OF THE FUTURE?

30 | WHAT WE "KNOW" (ABOUT) WHAT WE "NEED"

32 | THE CTE WAY: DECISIONS THAT AFFECT STUDENT SUCCESS

34 | BASIC SKILLS 30-UNIT LIMIT: DO WE NEED A CHANGE?

36 | HOW GREEN IS THE SENATE?

37 | JULIE'S IN BOX

38 | THE NATURE OF GIVING: AN INTERVIEW WITH A FOUNDATION DONOR

40 | DISCOUNT PROGRAM HELPS BREAK DOWN COST BARRIERS FOR TECHNOLOGY

ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES NEWSLETTER

SENATE ROSTRUM

THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

President: Jane Patton | Executive Director: Julie Adams | Design and Layout: Rita Sabler, Creative Director

The Rostrum is a quarterly publication of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 525, Sacramento, CA 95814.

The Rostrum is distributed to all faculty through college academic senate presidents and by individual mailing. For deadline information call (916) 445-4753 or email us at julie@asccc.org

You can find this and the previous issues of this publication online at: http://www.asccc.org

Faculty ***Are*** Progressive! (Despite What You May Hear)

JANE PATTON, PRESIDENT

Sometimes it is just too easy to blame the faculty. We see it in the daily newspaper: what is wrong with the K-12 school system is the teachers, whether it is the fact that they cannot compensate for all that ails society by way of the children in their classes or whether it is their resistance to tying student progress to teacher performance evaluations. In postsecondary education, the faculty are also an easy target: some folks claim that colleges and universities are inflexible or stuck in the Middle Ages. It is too easy to forget the pioneering faculty members who embraced distance education and developed an exemplary pedagogy to serve a targeted population of college students. It is easy to forget the innovative faculty members we all know who readily adapt to shifting student needs. There are countless examples of faculty members making changes in curriculum, instruction and support services and some practices have become a model for others. At the state level, the faculty working through the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges have been leaders of innovation during recent years. Let's look at a few examples, starting with the present.

Governor Schwarznegger signed SB 1440 on September 29, 2010, and two weeks later, on October 7, the Academic Senate used its existing infrastructure to convene intersegmental discipline faculty to draft Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) in 11 of the transfer disciplines. The timeline imposed by Senator Padilla's bill demanded a lightening-speed response time, and fortunately the C-ID structure (www.c-id.net) was poised and ready to provide the foundational processes to implement new associate degrees for transfer that would guarantee students priority admission in the CSU. Knowing that the ideal strategy would be to engage the discipline faculty in consensus-building about the best content for their degrees, California community college (CCC) faculty adroitly developed and are already implementing a statewide system that will not only work well for the colleges and universities but will also help students by providing them with a thorough lower division preparation as well as a flexibility to attend multiple CSU campuses. This SB 1440 response is not an example of faculty resistance and inflexibility.

The public and media focus today on "student success" (which faculty would say has always been our focus) highlights a flaw in the regulations affecting our colleges. There is abundant evidence that students are dropping out or failing classes and as a result not completing their academic goals; in many cases it is because they are unprepared for the demands of the courses. Faculty know that students are taking transfer courses without the necessary writing, reading, or computational skills. After years of having their hands tied with unwieldy prerequisite requirements that generally resulted in a lack of the appropriate use of prerequisites, faculty wrote a resolution calling for a change in Title 5 regulations to permit them to employ rigorous content review to establish prerequisites of composition, reading, or mathematics where needed. The recommended change is now under consideration by the Board of Governors. This is an example of faculty calling for a change in order to strengthen student success.

For a number of years there has been a desire to investigate the feasibility of streamlining the way as-

sessment for placement is conducted in California's community colleges. Presently, each college may select its own instruments from those approved by the Chancellor's Office. There are some disadvantages to the present system: students may need to re-take assessments if they move to another college; most tests do not contain all the attributes desired by the discipline faculty and the costs of administering tests can be quite high. The CCC Assess Task Group which has been meeting for a year, is co-chaired by a faculty member and has convened faculty discipline groups to consider potential new or revised instruments that could assess students' skills levels more precisely and could be purchased at a significantly lower cost. This work is still underway, but so far the results seem promising and could greatly improve assessment in our colleges. The participation of the Academic Senate is the outcome of a resolution to consider changes in the current assessment practices.

In 2005 the CSU halted the intersegmental course numbering system, Course Articulation Numbers (CAN). (Yes, people do say they "canned CAN"). The plan at CSU at the time was to assign new numbers to the courses identified in their LDTP (Lower Division Transfer Pattern) initiative. However, those numbers were insufficient to meet either the aims of the previous CAN system or the additional needs of an improved numbering system. In the absence of CAN, both the CSU and the CCCs were out of compliance with the mandate for "common course numbering" called for in legislation. Enter the Academic Senate with a plan for a new and improved system. With a small amount of seed money in the form of a grant from the Chancellor's Office, the Academic Senate invited the CSU and UC faculty to design a better system: Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID). It must be noted that initially C-ID had to agree to avoid working with the courses in the LDTP initiative. It wasn't until there was a general consensus in the last year that LDTP could not be realized as originally envisioned that C-ID became free to broaden its range of courses and include the common major preparation courses. Today, the C-ID structure (http://www.c-id.net) not only responds to the requirement for "common course numbering," but it builds upon the successful faculty-to-faculty discipline dialog begun in the 1990s IMPAC initiative (Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum). (Note that IMPAC, CAN and LDTP are no longer extant). And with the recent passage of SB 1440, C-ID provides the infrastructure for the necessary intersegmental faculty consensus-building that will make the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) a success in SB 1440 implementation. C-ID has attributes that no previous system has had.

In 2005 the Academic Senate passed resolutions calling for a change in Title 5 to require all CCC

> The public and media focus today on "student success" (which faculty would say has always been our focus) highlights a flaw in the regulations affecting our colleges.

graduates to complete the college-level English composition course (typically known as "Freshman English" or "English 1A") and complete a mathematics course one level below transfer (intermediate algebra or equivalent). Because of concerns about the potential effects on students who would need additional assistance in meeting those levels, this recommendation led directly to the developing of the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) which was conceived through the collaboration of the Academic Senate and college vice presidents of instruction and student services. Faculty across the state conducted analyses to identify areas for improvement and action plans to implement changes. The innovation that was the BSI led to immediate and ongoing improvement in the delivery of instruction and services in our colleges, and the long-term effects are still being realized (see http://bsi.cccco.edu/ListRecords.aspx). The materials developed under the BSI grant include the literature review of effective practices, the Basic Skills Handbook, and an Effective Practices database.

A spin off of the BSI was the recognition that our data collection about basic skills courses did not consistently identify the various levels of basic skills courses across the state. How could we demonstrate student progress through pre-collegiate courses if the coding system identifying the various levels in English and mathematics was inconsistent? When the faculty identified the discrepancy, it led to a faculty-driven "re-coding" effort: CB 21. Colleges and the state will be able to more accurately identify and analyze student success through basic skills courses. It is likely that most of the innovations through the BSI would not have occurred had the faculty not pushed the envelope by insisting that the English and mathematics degree requirements be changed. The ripple effect of BSI has lasting outcomes.

In 2005 Senator Jack Scott saw the successful passage of SB 70, which focused on improving the linkages and pathways between high school and California community colleges career-technical education (CTE) programs. In response to SB 70, the Academic Senate was awarded a multi-year grant to develop and implement the largest of the SB 70 initiatives: Statewide Career Pathways: School to College Articulation. The infrastructure for the articulation of CTE classes from high schools and Regional Occupational Centers and Programs (ROCP) to the community colleges has made it possible for thousands of secondary students to get appropriate college credit for secondary coursework, and research from the Community College Research Center at Columbia University (CCRC) shows that when secondary students are also getting college credit, they see themselves as successful college students and their chances of going to and completing a college program increase.

In addition to fostering the development of articulation templates (114 at last count) in all of the industry sectors and over 1,425 articulation agreements, this initiative also created a handbook for school-to-college articulation, a CTE counseling resource kit, CTE lesson plans and the WhoDoUWant2B.com website.

The Academic Senate is not claiming it has acted alone in the innovations described here. The point is that these initiatives illustrate that faculty are progressive. So, the next time you hear that faculty are resistant to change, please dispel the myth. Mention the creative changes you have witnessed at your college and the far-ranging improvements developed at the state level. ▪

The Case for Reciprocity

JOHNNIE TERRY, SIERRA COLLEGE, TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION COMMITTEE

REC-I-PROC-I-TY (res-uh-**pros**-i-tee): *noun*. **The relation or policy in [general education] dealings between [California community colleges] by which corresponding advantages or privileges are granted by each [college] to the [students] of the other.** Of course, this definition is not precisely what one would find in a Merriam-Webster's dictionary; it is, however, a policy being adopted by community colleges throughout California. Each local college or district determines for itself what reciprocity means, but the term generally connotes the intent to allow general education courses from other California community colleges to fulfill general education (GE) requirements at one's own local college. Colleges that adopt a reciprocity policy honor the ways in which courses are used at other community colleges when certifying course work taken at the local institution; i.e. courses approved for a specific area at another institution will be honored for that area at the local college. During its Spring 2010 Plenary Session, the Academic Senate adopted Resolution 9.02, which encouraged colleges to honor GE courses from any California community college, including other local colleges within a district.

Title 5 §55063 outlines and defines the four general education subject areas that each college must include for the associate degree, and all California community colleges are required to use due diligence when developing and approving courses for GE. Though each college reserves the right to accept or deny courses approved for GE by other institutions, colleges may choose to adopt a reciprocity policy for various reasons. According to Kevin Bray, institutional researcher for Sierra College, "Students tend to view community colleges like library branches rather than discrete institutions." Whether such a view provides a correct image of colleges or not, research done at Sierra indicates that Bray's comment is descriptively accurate. In 2008, 1,678 students, 7.9% of all new students, told Sierra College that they had attended another community college. In 2009, 1,360 students, 6.4% of all new students, made the same statement. Additionally, 21,938 students attending Sierra College during the years 2001-07 showed an enrollment

> The adoption of a reciprocity policy eliminates this unnecessary barrier, eliminates the unnecessary repetition of classes and thereby reduces college costs, and affords students broader educational opportunities since not all colleges have the same offerings.

at another California community college as well.[1] These statistics describe the situation at Sierra College alone; statewide numbers would clearly be much higher. The traffic among our colleges is tremendous, and failing to establish a reciprocity policy creates a roadblock between students and their academic goals. The adoption of a reciprocity policy eliminates this unnecessary barrier, eliminates the unnecessary repetition of classes and thereby reduces college costs, and affords students broader educational opportunities since not all colleges have the same offerings. The Academic Senate has repeatedly expressed concern regarding the cost of higher education for students, and calls to reduce unnecessary units and classes have become more frequent in the past year. Reciprocity agreements can help to address each of these issues.

Reciprocity policies not only benefit students, but they also benefit colleges and their employees. Such policies reduce the amount of local workload created by the circulation of student petitions, while they also reduce the subjectivity by which courses taken at other institutions are granted local GE credit, subjectivity inherent in a diversity of counselor and classroom faculty judgments. Additionally, reciprocity policies inherently increase dialog across the California Community College System. According to Mary Moon, Counseling Coordinator at Sierra College, "Seeing what other colleges grant GE credit pushes us to examine, internally, what we do at Sierra College. If we have a course to which we do not give GE credit and another college does give that course GE credit, we can investigate the possibility of changing our local practice." Of course, this sharing of practices between our distinct colleges will also serve to benefit students who view us, mistakenly or not, as library branches rather than discrete institutions.

As of February of 2010, 72 of the California community colleges have officially adopted reciprocity policies. Not surprisingly, these policies differ. For example, Sierra College has adopted a reciprocity policy that honors GE credit for courses taken at any other California public institution, whether community college, UC, or CSU. Some colleges only honor GE taken at other community colleges—indeed, adopted Academic Senate resolution 9.02 mentions only reciprocity among the California community colleges. Additionally, Region 4 colleges[2] have adopted a reciprocity agreement among their regional institutions. Their agreement began with each institution examining the GE courses from the other Region 4 colleges, discussions at their local senates, and subsequent adoption of a reciprocity agreement at their local colleges. Now when one Region 4 institution places a course on its GE list, the other Region 4 colleges honor it at their local institutions for the area in which it was placed. For example, Jane Church, articulation officer at Chabot College, notes that "Region 4 students who have been accepted into Chabot's Nursing or Dental Hygiene program, who have completed their GE and proficiency requirements at another participating Region 4 college, have used the GE Reciprocity Agreement to satisfy Chabot's AA/GE and proficiency requirements." Having initially discovered minor differences between their various GE lists, Region 4 colleges now trust their colleagues to exercise the due diligence required by Title 5. Region 4's agreement benefits students by capturing the greatest amount of student traffic among their regional colleges. The Region 4 agreement, however, does not extend reciprocity to non-Region 4 colleges and will potentially miss some of the student traffic into the region.

Given that the adoption of reciprocity policies eliminates barriers for students at the same time that it cuts the costs of higher education and reduces the necessity of course repetition, many colleges have enthusiastically adopted such policies or initiated local discussions about them. Through the resolution process, the Academic Senate of California encourages colleges to honor GE courses from any of their sister colleges in the California Community College System. ▪

1 These years were chosen because National Clearinghouse data was less robust in the 90's and there has been a reporting lag in more recent years.

2 "Region 4," as designated by CIAC, The California Intersegmental Articulation Council, is one of the Northern California regions.

Making the Case for eTranscript California

MICHELLE L. PILATI, VICE PRESIDENT

Every fall our Chancellor's Office convenes a group (typically representing the groups that comprise the Consultation Council) to discuss legislative options for the upcoming year. The product of this meeting (or meetings) is a proposed legislative agenda that is then presented to our Board of Governors for their consideration. One proposal this year is related to "eTranscripts". Even though eTranscripts sound like a great idea, it was reported at the legislative agenda meeting that there is some resistance to adopting eTranscripts at the colleges and, therefore, an interest in using legislation to push the issue. No clear reason was provided for the "resistance"—leading this attendee to suspect that perhaps the issue is a lack of knowledge. If faculty are unaware of this option, how can they advocate for it? Or even consider it? With that in mind, I provide you with the case for "eTranscript California". Much of what follows has been shamelessly plagiarized with the permission of its source, Patrick Perry. The complete document from which the information below can be obtained is available at *http://etranscriptca.org/file-repository/func-startdown/159/*. For more general information on "eTranscript California", including whether or not your college is participating, see *http://etranscriptca.org/home*.

In these hard times when we are losing dollars and people, finding ways to increase efficiency is critical. Yes, there is an initial and ongoing cost to implementing e-Transcripts—but eTranscripts do increase efficiency—and more. The use of eTranscripts

- saves time
- saves money
- reduces paper consumption
- improves customer service (quicker turn-around time)
- reduces workload demands for your staff.

eTranscript California is a statewide electronic transcript exchange program and offers all 112 California Community Colleges (CCCs) an Internet-based tool for requesting, viewing, and transmitting academic transcripts. eTranscript California offers a highly flexible and secure institution-to-institution transcript request and delivery service.

Colleges using eTranscript California can save personnel time, reduce operating costs, reduce paper consumption, improve student placement processes, and expand student services by offering electronic transcripts to a student's next institution of higher education. Exchanging electronic transcripts directly between your Student Information System and your major trading partners is a secure, cost-effective method of eliminating transcript keying errors and paper transcript fraud.

Recurring quantifiable benefits of operating and maintaining eTranscript California over a paper-based system include:

- a savings of $4 to $10 per transcript by reducing costs for paper, postage, and labor
- less recycling, less filing, less shredding and improved efforts towards "Green" initiatives because of less paper usage
- a reduction of necessary staff time to process paper transcripts
- easier access to student records for faster, more efficient placement with transcripts on demand
- elimination of mistakes while rekeying transcript data into recipient's student record system and degree audit
- elimination of transcript fraud.

In the face of California state budget cuts, transcript automation can help institutions overcome possible reductions in staffing levels. Budget cuts may mean a reduction in staffing levels generally needed for processing transcript requests, printing the transcripts, and getting them in the mail in a timely manner.

There's much more to be said about eTranscript California—please see the website provided above for more information. I hope you'll consider whether or not eTranscripts are right for your college. And, if so, make it happen. ▪

So You Want to Form a Caucus?

LIONEL NASH (VICTOR VALLEY COLLEGE) AND REYES ORTEGA (SIERRA COLLEGE),
EQUITY AND DIVERSITY ACTION COMMITTEE

In Spring 2009 the Academic Senate passed a resolution calling for the formation of caucuses for the purposes of broadening opportunities for faculty to discuss issues related to diversity and for developing Academic Senate leaders from underrepresented minorities. Resolution 1.05 S09, entitled "Creation of Diversity Caucuses," placed the responsibility of identifying issues and concerns related to equity and diversity with the Academic Senate representatives from Areas A, B, C, and D. The area representatives would then report their findings to the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

Resolution 1.06 F09 expanded the use of caucuses to include other groups of faculty who may benefit from organizing around a common issue or interest. It also defined the organizational processes for caucuses and the process to be officially recognized by the Academic Senate. In Spring 2010 the delegates approved resolution 1.01, which included bylaws language for the formation of caucuses and directed the Academic Senate to develop processes and procedures to guide the creation of caucuses. Subsequently, the Standards and Practices Committee, with input from the Equity and Diversity Action Committee (EDAC), drafted the following formal processes and procedures for establishing caucuses.

Purpose

The Academic Senate's caucuses serve as forums within the Academic Senate in which faculty with similar interests may meet to address concerns they feel are vital to faculty and the success of students. The purpose of an Academic Senate caucus is to provide an opportunity for individuals to network and discuss issues of like interest as they relate to academic and professional matters. By promoting dialog on issues of interest to faculty in all California

The Academic Senate's caucuses serve as forums within the Academic Senate in which faculty with similar interests may meet to address concerns they feel are vital to faculty and the success of students.

community colleges, the caucuses strive to strengthen relations between faculty and the Academic Senate, promote solutions, enhance communication, and seek to improve the overall relationships of all faculty on our campuses by giving voice to many faculty in a variety of forums. The caucuses serve to inform their participants and the Academic Senate, but they do not represent the Academic Senate.

Process for Recognition of a Caucus

1. Individuals interested in forming a caucus will identify at least ten members from at least four different colleges and at least two districts with common goals and/or interests.

2. At any time during the year, the interested members of the proposed caucus may send a letter to the Academic Senate president to request caucus status. This letter shall include the caucus' name, statement of purpose, and list of members.

3. After the caucus proposal is reviewed by the Executive Committee, the Academic Senate president will forward to the requester official notification that the caucus is recognized as an Academic Senate caucus.

4. Once the caucus is recognized and official, it will elect a caucus chair annually at the first meeting of the caucus and submit regular meeting minutes to the Academic Senate Office.

5. Each May, the caucus chair will inform the President of the caucus' intent to remain active and provide a current list of membership.

6. If a caucus fails to alert the Academic Senate President of the desire to stay active, the caucus shall be deemed inactive and a new letter of intent will need to be submitted to reactivate the caucus. The intent is to have caucuses that are active and represent current faculty in California community colleges.

Executive Committee Process

- When a caucus request is received, the president shall include the request on the next agenda. A request to become a caucus can occur any time during the year.
- The Executive Committee will verify that the caucus goals and purpose are related to academic and professional matters (10 +1). The president will notify the requester of the outcome of the Executive Committee decision. If denied, the president will provide a reason.
- If the Executive Committee approves the caucus, the Academic Senate president will submit notification to the body through normal communication channels such as listservs, area meetings, website, session communications, breakouts, and publications (president's update and Rostrum).
- Executive Committee members cannot sit as members of a caucus.

Ways the Senate Can Support Caucus Efforts

- Support in the identification of potential caucus members and in establishing a caucus.
- Recognition by the president during plenary sessions.
- Opportunity to submit articles for the Rostrum.
- Availability of breakout rooms, which will be listed in the program, in the evenings during plenary sessions.
- Opportunity to submit an item on area meeting agendas for updates and discussions.
- Opportunity to submit agenda items for the Executive Committee agenda.
- Technology support via networking tools (such as a place on the Senate website to post mem-

bers, agendas, and minutes, as well as listservs for communication purposes).

- Information about available scholarships will be shared with caucus participants.

Note: The above-mentioned support is provided based on current Senate processes and policies.

Ways a Caucus Can Support the Senate's Efforts

- Provide a forum within the Academic Senate in which faculty with particular interest may meet to address concerns and share information vital to faculty and the success of students.
- Seek solutions to concerns and issues raised by members of the caucus through the resolution process. Invite members of the caucus to submit a "Nomination to Serve Form" each year so that the Executive Committee receives a diverse pool of faculty from which to select committee and task force members.
- Disseminate Senate resources such as papers, Rostrums, event information to members of the caucus and college faculty.
- Communicate to the Senate office any suggestions for improving the caucus and its relationship to the Senate.

An example of a qualified caucus is the newly approved Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) caucus. The LGBT caucus goals are to improve the collegiate experience of LGBT students. The LGBT caucus will "…work to inform and advise the ASCCC and other professional organizations of the unique needs and challenges faced by LGBT students and develop resources to create welcoming environments free from discrimination for all students, including those whose sexual orientation or gender expression is in the minority, so that they can reach their academic and personal goals."

To view the LGBT caucus charge and membership and other caucus information, visit the caucus page on the Academic Senate website at *http://www.asccc.org/caucuses*. The Academic Senate Executive Committee also recently approved requests for a part-time faculty caucus and a noncredit matters caucus, and other faculty have expressed an interest in organizing Latino, African American and Asian caucuses as well as caucuses for faculty interested in disability issues and sustainability. EDAC held a breakout at last month's fall plenary to heighten faculty awareness about caucuses and would like to encourage faculty to consider joining an officially recognized caucus or to request approval to initiate a caucus. You may direct inquiries about joining or forming a caucus to the Academic Senate Office at *info@asccc.org*. ▪

EDAC held a breakout at last month's fall plenary to heighten faculty awareness about caucuses and would like to encourage faculty to consider joining an officially recognized caucus or to request approval to initiate a caucus.

Just the Minimum Facts

WHEELER NORTH, CHAIR, STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMITTEE

In the aftermath of the 2010 Fall Plenary Session I was reviewing my thoughts about the Minimum Qualifications (MQ) and Equivalency Training breakout that was put on. Not only was it relatively well attended, but it was immediately clear that while there were a few present who were new to the MQ issues, most in attendance were back again for more.

Thus the PowerPoint, aimed at basic MQ training, became powerpointless. Attendees had questions, many of which were the perennials, often with a new spin, but with answers that remain the same. Thus I thought I'd share with you some of those answers.

The Primary Doctrine is: *No person may teach a California community college course unless they meet the minimum qualifications or are deemed to possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to those minimums. Title 5 §§53400-53430.*

To make this happen, two things need to occur. First, there needs to be a master list of disciplines which includes qualifications for each discipline. Second, each course must be assigned to one or more of these disciplines. Then every time someone is assigned to teach a course, the assigner can review whatever local documentation exists (often the course outline of record) to determine course discipline assignment and then check the disciplines list to find the minimum qualifications. (Note: Some districts maintain separate cross-walk discipline lists that both define local additional requirements and connect courses to disciplines) Education Code §87357.

The word *minimum* is used liberally here to impart the idea that faculty must meet at least these qualifications listed, but local districts can require higher qualifications if they choose. They can do this across the board, or on a case by case basis. For example many districts require additional capabilities to teach any course in the distance modality. Districts often handle this by making it a desired factor during the hiring process in the hopes that those so qualified will rise to the top. By doing this, they reduce risk of a legal challenge due to potentially unfair hiring practices.

These *minimum* requirements apply to all faculty and instructional administrators, part-time, full-time, career technical education, credit, noncredit, transfer, general education, counselors, librarians, etc. although the qualifications in each case are different.

There is NO such thing as an emergency or temporary hire that relieves a district of these obligations.

Districts cannot invent their own disciplines; only the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges can do this, working under the authority of the Board of Governors. As previously stated, districts may impose higher qualifications upon existing disciplines such as requiring a doctorate instead of a master's degree, but they must work from the existing 'master' disciplines list. (Chancellor's Office Legal Opinion 07-08, *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*).

> There is NO such thing as an emergency or temporary hire that relieves a district of these obligations.

Programs and departments are not disciplines. Departments are an organizational unit and can be whatever a district wants. Programs are collections of courses designed to meet specific educational goals and must be approved by both the local board and the Chancellor's Office. Disciplines are specific subject areas where one or more degrees are likely to be offered.

Education Code mandates that districts must have processes for determining minimum qualifications and equivalencies and they must use them. So in cases of audits or complaint investigations, this is what the Chancellor's Office will test for. Additionally, all of these locally developed processes must be negotiated between local academic senates and boards and must remain status quo until such time as a new agreement is reached. (Education Code §87359)

In the event of a change to minimum qualifications, districts may elect to retain faculty who would have been disqualified by the change. The Academic Senate has taken the position that districts should retain these faculty and this should be negotiated into contract language. (Title 5 §53403, Academic Senate Resolution 10.01 F09)

Equivalencies are granted by districts not colleges, and they exist for life.

Equivalencies are granted for the entire discipline. This means every course assigned to that discipline may be taught by anyone determined to meet the MQs for, or granted an equivalency to, that discipline. The only case this is not true is when there are additional requirements to offer the course such as distance education modality skills. (Chancellor's Office Legal Opinion 03-28)

When it comes to the actual hiring, additional regulations also apply such as the Equal Employment Opportunity regulations. And, once a person is hired, further regulations and contractual obligations will come into effect, particularly in the case of rehiring part-time faculty.

Education Code §87458 provides that qualified administrators must be given retreat rights to become first-year probationary faculty under specific conditions. Tenured faculty who move into administrative positions retain their tenure status for that district in the event they return to faculty status.

Teaching Credentials are a construct that came from pre-AB1725 days before we had the MQ process. Faculty were granted a teaching credential from the Chancellor's Office, for life, based on the subject areas they had expertise in. These were often in a variety of subject areas. They have not been granted since 1990, but there are still colleagues out there who possess them, and they must be honored. (Education Code §87355)

However, when they retire, a common question that pops up is how does a district hire someone with this eclectic mix so they will fit right into the retiree's prior load? The answer is that it is not likely to happen. And there may be courses they taught that originally fit their expertise area, but those courses now may need to be reassigned to a different discipline to better align with today's standards.

In summary, hopefully this set of MQ crib notes will help local senates sort through the often difficult and confusing questions that come up again and again about minimum qualifications and equivalencies. If they don't, do not hesitate to contact the Academic Senate office for additional guidance. ▪

Faculty as the GPS for Students

BETH SMITH, TREASURER

Once upon a time, attendees at a stadium or arena watching a sporting even knew when to cheer and when to be quiet to support the home team, but now the jumbo-tron cues the crowd to "make noise." There used to be a day when most of us memorized our friends' phone numbers as well as their addresses. Now each contact (not person) has an allotted number of characters of space in a cell phone. In an earlier day, everyone knew how to read a map, but now a voice from a small device gives directions, gently prodding left turns and exits on freeways. Applying knowledge learned was once an everyday occurrence, but now cell phones, GPS devices, the Internet, and other technology have changed the way we think. College students used to navigate college campuses with slightly more savvy and sophistication than today, and it's not only because of changing demographics. It's because they have learned to think differently about how to access and store information and knowledge and how to apply that information and knowledge across the curriculum.

Couple this information with the fact that the age of our students is decreasing[1], and what we know is that these younger students rely on information and guidance stored in and accessed from somewhere other than an organic source. Sometimes, the directions from a device seem unrelated to the landscape and intended goal but are followed anyway. Students happily take directions from a GPS, yet our systems, made of actual human beings, are often hesitant to tell students what direction the next "turn" should be. Does this present an opportunity for us, or will students continue to seek devices instead of teachers, counselors and librarians who can help with the future?

Community college faculty must step up to be the GPS for our students. We have the opportunity to develop the maps that help students the most in the short and long term. From placement to prerequisites to transfer model curriculum for associate degrees—faculty professional expertise must be asserted to guide the actions of students firmly and gently, recalculating when necessary. Students are adults and will make decisions for themselves, and we need to help inform those decisions with good information every minute that students are on campus. Efforts at the state and local level can combine to ensure that students understand how to chart and navigate a course for success.

The Senate has worked on several projects recently that give local senates and faculty the options they need to guide students toward more success. Assessment for placement starts students on their college career with an understanding of what they know and where they stand in terms of preparation for collegiate level work, and the CCCAssess project will provide yet another instrument to use for assessing student readiness for certain courses. The option to establish prerequisites via content review gives students and faculty a tangible reminder of the rigor of our courses and expectations that some previous knowledge or skills are essential for success in trans-

1 In Fall 1999, 47% of the students were under 24 years of age. In Fall 2009, 53% of the students were under 24 years of age. (Data from Chancellor's Office Data Mart.)

fer level courses. And the transfer model curriculum will give students an excellent means to plan which community college courses to take in order to both earn a degree and transfer. These state-level initiatives are excellent for guiding students, yet there is more that can be done locally.

Do faculty in your discipline identify students with an aptitude for your subject area and encourage the students to take one more class in the subject? Do you recommend other courses that naturally follow your course as a means of guiding students through a learning experience in the discipline that cannot be determined from the catalog or GE check list alone? Do faculty in your discipline know enough about the courses in your department or discipline to be helpful? Can they speak with a student about sequencing, majors, careers, local university programs in your discipline, GE requirements, prerequisites, and more? Do the faculty know why a given course is offered at the college?

Classroom faculty cannot simply teach a great course and expect students to understand how it fits within the grand scheme of educational experiences. We have to make an effort to connect the dots for students every day, and here is one way to help faculty become better advocates for education: Invite a counselor to a department/division meeting, where as many part-time faculty might be present as possible, to discuss GE requirements and sequencing as well as transfer options in your discipline. Learn about how the discipline and its courses fit within the student experience, whether the student is a basic skills, career technical education, transfer, or undecided about next steps. Discuss how this information might be communicated to students within your discipline. Counselors know the details about meeting requirements and goals, and students need both perspectives—from counselors and discipline faculty—to find their way through college.

Does your department website show students how the curricula fit together? Have you explained why the courses in the program belong together? Do your student learning outcomes or program review processes include student feedback about the program and its cohesiveness? What about contributions from GE courses to the GE outcomes? Will students naturally see the match, or can you provide guidance on why these courses are helping to create better citizens, parents and employees?

There are other competing issues at work here too—the excess unit debate, the efficiency of moving students through a program to allow greater access for other students waiting in the pipeline, giving students time to mature and explore their talents and interests, guiding versus steering, etc. These topics warrant separate attention, and the Senate has considered many of these ideas in other Rostrum articles and breakout sessions at plenary and other venues. But faculty are in the business of education, and we can't forget that our passions lie within our disciplines and helping students see how wonderful each course is and the power of education to make a difference for students with or without a compass.

Between the work of the Senate creating state-wide options, such as prerequisites and transfer model curriculum, and local faculty providing more connections in the curriculum, students will have a college experience that is more than a matter of checking courses off a list. Discipline faculty can review the information about their courses and programs, emphasizing the bigger picture of how courses complement other courses in the GE offerings or within a program. Younger students need more time to develop and decide which path to take, and we can provide access to options that they may not have considered, maybe something off the beaten path. No device will ever replace the human aspect of teaching and learning, and we have to be sure that students begin to see their education as a collection of experiences rather than a series of turns or exits without context. Faculty must be the GPS for students. ▪

Part-time Issues Highlighted at Fall 2010 Plenary

JON DRINNON, CHAIR, FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Although the Academic Senate has always held part-time instructors in the highest regard and sought to involve them (including having a part-time liaison who attends the Executive Committee meetings), at the recently held Fall Plenary part-time issues really came to the fore in a number of ways. The Plenary was immediately preceded by the Executive Committee approval of a part-time caucus, which unfortunately came too late for an organized meeting of the caucus during the Plenary. A group of part-time instructors had taken advantage of our new process to create a caucus based on common group interests and goals, the second group caucus to be approved after the LGBT caucus was approved at the previous Executive Committee meeting in October. The caucus idea, engendered by resolution, seems to be quite timely and should have the hoped for impact of encouraging diversity at the state senate level while at the same time allowing input from a cross section of special interest groups. The creation of the part-time caucus provided a serendipitous nexus for a part-time issues breakout, two resolutions focused on part-time issues and one instituting a part-time faculty of the year award.

The part-time issues breakout organized by the Academic Senate Faculty Development Committee was very well attended by both full- and part-time faculty and featured an appearance by Vice Chancellor of Academic Services Barry Russell, evidence of the fact that the state Chancellor's Office recognizes the important role that part-time faculty play in the California Community College System. It was gratifying to see how many full-time faculty showed up to support their part-time colleagues. Among other things, we discussed how the Academic Senate can reach out to part-time faculty to provide the kind of interaction that can enhance their teaching and provide the leadership, empowerment and voice that is the Academic Senate credo. Suggestions from the attendees ranged from making available a part-time space on the new web site to conducting a survey to ascertain the extent of part-time participation on local senates in terms of voting rights, compensation and executive committee opportunities. Some attendees later in the session got together to create resolutions to advance the issues we discussed. The sentiment was expressed that having some examples of good practices from some select senates could very well encourage other local senates to follow suit to make part-time faculty a more integral part of their process and deliberations. Some of the part-time faculty present received modest compensation for attending senate meetings and others were afforded the opportunity to be on their senate executive committees. Considering the proportion of part- to full-time faculty and the difficulty for part-time faculty to attend meetings when many teach on several campuses, these seem appropriate and necessary practices. We also discussed providing webinars, office sharing, an Academic Senate faculty award and support for applying for full-time jobs.

All three part-time resolutions were passed resoundingly with only a smattering of nay votes. Again it

was gratifying to see that the vast majority of those present, most of whom are full-time faculty, value and appreciate our part-time colleagues and recognize the essential role they play on our campuses.

Resolution 13.05 F10 "Providing Part-time Faculty with Adequate Resources and Support" passed with one resolve that states:

> *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with its educational partners to advocate for a level of resources and support for part-time faculty that can maintain an adequate teaching environment for them and learning environment for our community college students.*

Resolution 13.09 F10 "Best Practices: Integrating Part-time Faculty into Shared-Governance" was approved with two resolves:

> *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges administer a comprehensive survey soliciting quantitative and qualitative information about local senates' by-laws and best practices regarding the recruitment, encouragement, and inclusion of part-time faculty in the voice of the academic senate through such means as local senate executive committee participation, department representation, compensation, voting or non-voting status, and inclusion on senate and local committees; and*
>
> *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges compile and disseminate information regarding participation of part-time faculty via a paper, Rostrum articles, or other appropriate venues, and report on the progress of the resolution at the 2011 Fall Plenary Session.*

And the third part-time resolution, 1.05 F10 "Creation of a Part-Time Faculty Member of the Year Award" was approved with the following resolve:

> *Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create a yearly award for a part-time faculty member that recognizes excellence in teaching and outstanding contributions to the campus environment and to student success and that the award amount and presentation be consistent with other comparable faculty awards given by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.*

"Indeed, Leadership, Empowerment, Voice are three necessary ingredients for ALL faculty to work together effectively to provide students with the kind of success that will advance their worthwhile goals.

You can see from these three approved resolutions that the Academic Senate recognizes the challenges that part-time instructors face in maintaining an effective teaching environment with budgets shrinking all around us and also the need to incorporate part-time faculty voices effectively within their local senates and shared governance processes on their campuses. An award designated specifically for a part-time instructor of the year exemplifies how much the Senate (and all of us) value the contributions of our part-time colleagues. We could not do it without you! Indeed, Leadership, Empowerment, Voice are three necessary ingredients for ALL faculty to work together effectively to provide students with the kind of success that will advance their worthwhile goals. ▪

Considerations for Moving Noncredit MQs from Title 5 to the Disciplines List

MARK WADE LIEU, CHAIR, NONCREDIT COMMITTEE

In Spring 2010, the Academic Senate adopted the following resolution:

Whereas, Noncredit education is an integral component of the California community colleges and is essential to the colleges' mission and role in serving California;

Whereas, The allowed noncredit offerings in the California community colleges serve areas such as access, equity, adult educational advancement, vocational training, citizenship, and the health and well being of many communities, including the disabled, new parents and older adults, and immigrants;

Whereas, Noncredit and credit programs should ensure educational rigor, processes, and high standards of quality in a manner consistent with public higher education in California; and Whereas, Currently, noncredit disciplines, areas of instruction, and minimum qualifications for noncredit faculty are not contained in the Disciplines List because they were instead directly included into Title 5, reflecting outdated K-12 regulations, and are consequently more difficult to maintain in a manner that best meets community needs and legislated expectations, particularly with regard to SB361 (2006) regulatory changes such as Career Development College Preparation;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges establish a task force of noncredit faculty to examine the existing noncredit faculty minimum qualification regulations in consultation with the appropriate constituents for the purpose of placing the qualifications in the Disciplines List, thereby implementing the same processes that are currently used for all other disciplines, faculty, and administrators; and

Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend the noncredit minimum qualifications be removed from Title 5 §53412 and placed in a separate category in the Disciplines list.

In preparation for the work of the task force, the Academic Senate's Noncredit Committee has con-

> Given that fewer than 3% of voting delegates at an Academic Senate Plenary Session are noncredit faculty, the members of the Committee are concerned about proper inclusion of noncredit faculty in the vetting and voting on proposals.

sidered the issues related to the moving of the minimum qualifications (MQs) for noncredit instructors out of Title 5 and into the Disciplines List. In fact, the Committee has little concern with actually moving the MQs into the Disciplines List. Initially, the Committee envisions that the MQs as detailed in Title 5 will simply be deleted from Title 5 and placed into a separate section of the Disciplines List as they are.

It is the process for approval of future changes to the MQs once noncredit is incorporated into the Disciplines List that is the issue of greatest concern to the Committee. Given that fewer than 3% of voting delegates at an Academic Senate Plenary Session are noncredit faculty, the members of the Committee are concerned about proper inclusion of noncredit faculty in the vetting and voting on proposals. While members recognize that it is not necessary to be a noncredit faculty member to vote on a noncredit MQ proposal, just as it is not necessary to be a history faculty to vote on a history MQ proposal, there are some problems with the current process for soliciting input and feedback from noncredit faculty on proposals and to inform voting.

Traditionally, local senates solicit feedback from their discipline faculty on any MQ proposal that impacts their area. Since fewer than 5% of noncredit faculty are full-time, this means that local senate presidents will need to make a greater effort than usual to get feedback from noncredit discipline faculty, many of whom will only be partly engaged with the college or district. In addition, noncredit faculty, even in colleges that have full-time noncredit faculty, are not always represented in their local senates, further exacerbating the difficulty of effective communication when it comes to noncredit issues.

A second challenge for the Academic Senate is the issue of getting feedback from faculty through professional organizations regarding noncredit MQ proposals, something which is regularly done for credit MQ proposals. The Association of Community and Continuing Education (ACCE) is widely recognized as one of the primary organizations representing the interests of noncredit. However, ACCE is dominated by administrators, which is not surprising given the low numbers of full-time noncredit faculty. While California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) has a strong representation of noncredit ESL faculty in its membership, it is unclear whether there is representation for noncredit faculty in other professional organizations such as ECCTYC (English) and CMC3 (mathematics). Career technical education noncredit covers a wide range of subject areas, and career development is, at best, ill defined. Furthermore, there are noncredit areas for which there may be no professional organization, such as older adults, health and safety, home economics, and parenting.

The Committee strongly supports the resolution's call for a separate section of the Disciplines List for noncredit MQs. However, the Committee is not sure whether or not there is any benefit to also including noncredit in the lists organized by requirements. Inclusion would integrate noncredit with credit, showing that both are part of the community college system. However, there is some concern that putting the MQs for credit and noncredit side by side might invite unwanted comparisons.

Finally, while the resolution calls for moving MQs listed in section 53412 from Title 5 to the Disciplines List, in fact, noncredit MQs are also listed in sections 53413 (Apprenticeship) and 53414 (DSPS). It seems appropriate to incorporate these MQs into the Disciplines List as well even though the sections in Title 5 for these two areas may remain.

If you have any additional concerns or comments regarding noncredit MQs, please direct them to Mark Wade Lieu at *mwlieu@asccc.org*. ▪

C-ID, SB 1440, and TMC: Frequently Asked Questions

MICHELLE PILATI, VICE PRESIDENT AND C-ID PROJECT DIRECTOR

Now that draft transfer model curricula (TMC—note that TMC refers to both individual examples of transfer model curricula and to the collection of transfer model curricula as a whole) are available on the Course Identification Numbering System website (C-ID; *www.c-id.net*), the need to be explicit about the relationship between C-ID, Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla, 2010), and TMC is increasing. While there are many elements of the implementation of SB 1440 that are unknown, there are many things that we do know about the roles to be played by C-ID and TMC. The questions answered below reflect questions that have arisen in the course of TMC review and general questions received from the field.

Each TMC is an effort to respond to the creation of a community college "associate degree for transfer" in a coordinated statewide manner. Once finalized, each TMC will delineate a curriculum that, if adopted, provides a community college with a fast-tracked approval process (community college degrees must be approved locally and by the Chancellor's Office)—and also provides a structure to the degree that has been developed and vetted by intersegmental discipline faculty. SB 1440 effectively makes a community college degree one mechanism for transferring, with priority, to the CSU. This legislation establishes a community college degree as the major preparation for transfer and prohibits the CSU from requiring students to repeat "similar" courses—and caps the units required by the CSU at 60 semester units (all references to units are semester units, for simplicity and consistency). The community colleges provide 60 units of the baccalaureate degree; the CSU provides the "finishing" 60. Note that there is a stated exception for "high unit" majors—but this has not been worked out. What has been clarified, at this time, is that "high unit" will be determined by the total units required at the CSU—the CCC degrees cannot exceed 60. While our degrees must be designed to consist of no more than 60 units, the CSU will continue to use and apply units about 60, as appropriate.

> SB 1440 effectively makes a community college degree one mechanism for transferring, with priority, to the CSU.

The Academic Senate will add to the list of TMC and provide additional information as it becomes available. Please see our website at *www.asccc.org* for updates.

1) In order for a community college to adopt TMC, must their courses align with the C-ID descriptors and be submitted to C-ID?

No. At this time, C-ID only has finalized descriptors in five disciplines and it would, therefore, be impossible to ask this of colleges. As C-ID's work moves forward, C-ID designations will aid students who are moving between community colleges. If most community colleges have degrees based on TMC, students who move from one college to another will have an easier time completing a 1440-based degree, if that is their intention.

2) Why are there upper division courses listed in some of the TMC?

All TMC should reflect the courses required for major preparation at a CSU. **If there are "upper division" courses listed in any TMC, this is because those courses are lower division at one or more CSUs.** Given that community college offerings generally reflect the requirements of the schools that they feed into, a course that is upper division at one CSU may very well be articulated as major preparation at another.

3) If a community college can't offer all of the required courses in a given TMC, does this mean a 1440 degree can't be offered by that college in the TMC?

No. A college in such a circumstance could choose to develop the necessary course and delay the development of that degree until such time as the course is available. Sensitivity to local limitations has been encouraged in the development of all TMC, but there will be instances where a community college simply can't support a course for the TMC. While the mechanisms for approving non-TMC 1440 degrees have not been established, it is expected that this will be possible. Efforts will also be made to draft descriptors for courses that might fill a need in multiple disciplines—possibly creating a solution for the college that can't support a given course.

4) Most community colleges offer broad "areas of emphasis" that allow a student to take what they need for a variety of majors. If these degrees conformed to the other elements of 1440, couldn't they fill the need for an "associate degree for transfer"?

It would depend. If an area of emphasis is defined enough so as to ensure student preparation for one or more specific majors, maybe. But an area of emphasis that is so unstructured that it effectively is a unique degree for every student would not prepare a student for any given major at the CSU. The only exception would be a major that universally requires no lower division major preparation. 1440 grants a student access to a major based on the degree completed at the community college—not the behavior of an individual student. This is a departure from how the system has always operated.

5) Does a CSU have to count all of the courses in an associate degree for transfer towards the CSU degree? In other words, does a CSU have to make all the courses in the TMC for a given major "work" in their major?

No. This is not LDTP where the CSU was obligated to make certain courses "work". Units in the TMC that are not counted towards the CSU major would be lower division elective units.

6) Given that units vary for some courses across our colleges, a 60-unit major at one community college might be a 62-unit major at another. Given these variations, may a "1440 degree" exceed 60 units?

No. The language in the legislation is very clear. Degrees that are developed in response to SB 1440 must not exceed 60 units. Students may, of course, take additional units beyond the required 60—and, if those units are applicable to their course of study at the CSU, they will be used. While it is certainly preferable for students in "highly sequenced" majors (physics and chemistry, for example) to take more units at the community college, our degrees can't exceed 60 units. ▪

Federalization of Higher Education and the Expanding Data Bubble

GREG GILBERT, COPPER MOUNTAIN COLLEGE

The following is a speech presented by Greg Gilbert, Copper Mountain College to attendees at the Fall Session Plenary on November 12, 2010. Faculty requested that this article be printed in the Rostrum.

Good afternoon. I am pleased to be joined today by Lee Fritschler, President Clinton's Assistant Secretary of Education. In this problem-solution presentation, I will play the role of the problem and Lee will posit the solutions.

Frank Luntz, a statistician and communications professional, writes in his book, What Americans Really Want, that Americans see the greatest need in government is for "Accountability." This hunger for data is endemic throughout our society and as global as climate change. Unfortunately, this fondness for numbers is accompanied by a prevailing penchant for simplistic, opportunistic analyses, hasty generalizations, and a lack of patience for nuanced commentary. The result is a system that favors uniformity and for-profit opportunities. And make no mistake, the uses of data and the people who manipulate and interpret data will be part of an expanding bubble well beyond the foreseeable future. Anyone who believes that accountability is a passing fad is not paying attention. Needless to say, the federalization of education is part of that expanding bubble.

Against the backdrop of growing accountability there remain the day-to-day responsibilities associated with teaching and governance.

Here, then, is the story of teachers at a small, rural college, people typical of community college faculty who employ data in local decision making in an effort to better serve students—and this is also a story of bigger dogs.

I begin by quoting Woodrow Wilson: "I not only use all the brains that I have, but all that I can borrow."

The story you are about to hear is a direct result of what I have borrowed from a number of people, particularly a professor who teaches at my college, Doug Morrison (Ed.D. in Business, MBA, CPA). What I've learned from Doug is to focus unflinchingly on student learning and advocacy for student needs. He's taught me how to provide administrators and boards with the data they should want concerning the allocation of resources in support of student learning. He's also taught me that when all appeals to reason fail, it's time to go and get a bigger dog. I've also learned from Doug the sheer energy-infusing joy of collaborating across the curriculum in support of student learning, both in the classroom and throughout the system. Here's what happened. In 1999 my college separated from its parent college and became an independent district. We achieved full accreditation under the old ten standards, a process that said, in effect, if you can

demonstrate that you have the tools and resources to do a good job, we'll assume that that is exactly what you'll do, a good job. There was no thought of micro-managing professionals, particularly within a system with so many checks and balances.

Really, all of the employees, faculty and staff at my college were having a love fest back then. We'd pulled together in a collective effort to accomplish separation and accreditation. But then, fortune's wheel turned a few degrees, slipped into a rut, and we found ourselves below 40% on the 50% Law and at 49/51 on the 75/25. It seems that the administration team had become focused on reorganization, added several additional layers of management, and distanced itself from the instructional side of the house. Doug's response was to suggest that our senate meet a half-hour early each time to focus on how we could better serve our students and collect data toward that end. The faculty managed to work with the college's constituencies, including the foundation and administration, and together we all fashioned a new mission statement that aligned with the 2002 accreditation standards. We also developed a matrix that associated our mission elements with every category of people who attended our college and with every service that we provided. It was a living, responsive educational master plan.

Then, 19 of the 23 faculty in our senate-of-the-whole participated in the drafting of white papers on such topics as advising, distance education, student success, governance, and minimum standards, among others. We worked across-the-curriculum and relied on one another's strengths to quantify, analyze, employ computer graphics, and write. Each paper was succinct, polite, and focused on serving the mission. We also formed a taskforce that worked with the administration to achieve an agreement wherein 65% of all new monies would go toward our becoming compliant with the 50% Law. Though labor intensive, our efforts drew the faculty closer together in support of our students.

Here I will compress a story of years into a few short lines. The administration reneged on the 50% Law agreement, ignored our papers, treated us like interlopers within our own village, and stonewalled any additional requests to address our concerns. When the next ACCJC (Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges) team arrived, Doug and a gifted statistician from our math department, Mike Chlebik, and I met with the visiting team leader and provided him with what was in effect a shadow report, detailed evidence of denied faculty efforts on behalf of students: our agendas, minutes, documents, white papers, everything.

With all of that, in June of 2007 the ACCJC granted the college five years of accreditation with a midterm report and a list of recommendations. While recommendations included issues of campus climate, referred to the need to improve governance, and alluded to the white papers, the provision of five years of accreditation and the general tone of the report left the faculty believing that their voices had been marginalized and that the administration had, in effect, had its dismissive attitude toward the faculty validated.

Then a student, Yaniv Newman, came to the senate (some of you may recall Yaniv was active in the formation of the Statewide Student Senate for California Community Colleges). He demanded that the faculty step forward on the issue of funding for instruction—and that is exactly what we did. Heartened by Yaniv's encouragement, we filed an appeal to the Chancellor's Office that challenged the college's request for exemption from compliance with the 50% Law. We went and got a bigger dog.

The result is that fortune's wheel lifted out of its rut. The Chancellor and Board of Governors denied the college's request for exemption, a denial that had repercussions around the state as small, rural colleges could no longer assume that they had the right to an exemption just because they were

small. At about this same time, as fate would have it, in April 2008, Barbara Beno made a special trip to our college. She met with our administrative team and invoked the two-year rule. We were placed on warning.

While the payout on 50% was significant, faculty said that they would prefer to earn the money, so we worked on program reviews and accreditation outside of our normal contracts at the part-time rate, and about 15 faculty donated a thousand dollars or more to student scholarships. The big dogs had provided the resources necessary for my college to begin setting things right.

Then the faculty stepped forward to design our program review process:

- Established a Blackboard template for minutes and documents
- Worked with all constituencies to adopt institutional student learning outcomes
- Designed program review templates
- Arranged for data collections
- Moved ALL calendars, processes, and templates through participatory governance
- Adopted an annual program review cycle
- Arranged for accreditation training by the Academic Senate
- Conducted in-house training of all administrators.

Results as of June 2010:

- Warning was lifted; accreditation was reinstated
- A new administration team was in place
- Annual compliance with 50% Law was achieved
- An improved climate was being built
- A new enterprise system was purchased and installed
- A full complement of tenure track faculty was hired
- Forty two program reviews are conducted annually and linked directly to the college budgeting process.

Today, we are a better school because with Doug's wisdom at the forefront, the faculty remained focused on student success, even to the extent of getting bigger dogs. The collection and application of data specific to our situation was a vital part of our local effort.

So, here's the dilemma. The same ACCJC that is non-responsive to the Senate concerns, the same ACCJC that pulled Compton's accreditation and between 2003 and 2008 placed 37% of California's community colleges on sanction, this same agency

> I am reminded of this quotation from F. Scott Fitzgerald: "The test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function."

> Our nearly 60,000 faculty prepare the most diverse student body anywhere for the greatest number of career and academic choices anywhere.

that cannot itself be accountable for its decisions, came to my college, respected faculty findings, and used its authority to set things right.

In 2004, I authored a Rostrum article, "Thinking Outside the Horse," which compared external accountability to a Trojan Horse that contained within its dimly lit interior legions of functionaries intent on a singular mantra: "What cannot be measured cannot be assessed and what cannot be assessed cannot be controlled and what cannot be controlled cannot be permitted." Now I wonder if it isn't more appropriate to point an accusatory finger toward the federal government.

I am reminded of this quotation from F. Scott Fitzgerald: "The test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function." While I take great issue, and have for many years, with the noblesse oblige of the ACCJC, I believe now that we must do all that we can to keep collegial peer review in an intermediary role between the classroom and the federal government. We will have to think in many directions at once to accomplish this, but I believe that without collegial peer review, the role of local decision making will experience disheartening and debilitative erosion.

Consider the following: Not counting the 20 faculty serving as commissioners on California's two regional accrediting organizations (WASC, ACCJC), of the 133 regional accreditation commissioners serving nation-wide, outside of California, only ten are designated as faculty. Ten out of 133 commissioners. Presently, tenure levels throughout the US are estimated to have fallen to about 30%. Set against the growing influence of external auditors and big money, it takes little imagination to understand that the influence of educators within their own profession is in serious decline.

During George W. Bush's Presidency, Texas businessman Charles Miller, designer of No Child Left Behind, worked with Education Secretary Margaret Spellings on her Future of Education Commission and produced copious documents alleging that because of academic freedom and adherence to local missions, universities had fostered a decline in institutional accountability and public oversight. Furthermore, the Spellings Commission asserted, tenure had become a costly, inflexible system dedicated to the protection of job security.

Had the Bush/Miller/Spellings vision of market-driven accountability and a federalized system of higher education prevailed, colleges and universities would have been reduced to legions of untenured faculty, and a proliferation of bright line indicators leading directly to Washington, D.C.

And lest you think that we dodged that bullet and can breathe easier with President Obama, Arne Duncan and Under Secretary Martha J. Kanter are on the same path as Bush/Spellings, only they are better financed. Even though Martha Kanter was a vice chancellor for policy and research for our Chancellor's Office and President of De Anza College and eventually its chancellor, we have no assurances that the present Department of Education respects educators and local institutions any

more than did the previous administration. By way of example, an ominous cloud on the horizon is the recently approved federal credit hour.

The federal definition of the newly designed credit hour describes it as "an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement," establishing a "quantifiable minimum basis" as a means to "quantify academic activity for purposes of determining federal funding." The credit hour will become enforceable in July 2012. The pleas of educators, administrators, CHEA (Council for Higher Education Accreditation), and others was that the Department of Education not impose uniformity on a dynamic system, but they were summarily ignored.

And mark my words, you can be certain that just like when No Child Left Behind was implemented, the next wave to break over our nation's colleges will be a tsunami of consultants prepared to make our lives easier and to help us with the new accountability. There's a lot of money to be made from the new accountability.

And while I wouldn't say it's entirely about the money, consider that the National Education Budget for 2007 was $972 billion (public and private all levels), and this is when Arne Duncan was the Deputy Secretary of Education.

In Washington's halls of power, lobbyists spent $3.49 billion in 2009, the equivalent of a senior professor's annual salary every two-to-three minutes that Congress was in session, and this was prior to the recent Supreme Court decision allowing lobbyists to spend without limits.

There are those who see our students as potential customers. After all, total US enrollment in all education, K-Ph.D. is 76.6 million students. Postsecondary education alone is 17.6 million students. If we consider only California, there are 3,600,000 students in higher education, more than 20% of all the higher education students in all of the United States.

What I'm alluding to here is clout. California has the largest system of higher education in the world, and California's Community College System alone is responsible for 17% of all higher education in the United States. Our nearly 60,000 faculty prepare the most diverse student body anywhere for the greatest number of career and academic choices anywhere. We respect local control while overseeing the most massive transfer and articulation system anywhere. We prepare more students to take their place as responsible participants in a democratic society than any system anywhere. Our students are the primary source of enrollments for the UC and CSU systems, and the primary source of training for our state's teachers, police officers, nurses, and fire fighters. We manage our complex mission because we respect local decision making and work system-wide in support of student success.

Surely, everyone here understands the direct link between American freedom and academic freedom and that tenure may well be the parakeet in the mine shaft. As the federal government tightens its control over America's schools and colleges, the nation is looking to California. That's no exaggeration. We are the only state where academic authority is enshrined in law. Governance is bargained in other states, and as tenure slips away so does the ability to bargain. We know that power in the new data driven world will belong to those who define the data and determine how it will be interpreted and used. We know that collegial peer review can only succeed if it is collegial, rigorous, and respectful of local decision making. We know also that Washington will never be our colleague. While juggling a range of contrary thoughts, we must act wisely, and as Doug Morrison would tell us, keep the needs of our students at the forefront of everything that we do. As individuals, as members of our professional organizations, and as patriots, we must link arms to defend our nation's glorious mind: a free academy. ▪

OUR STUDENTS TODAY

The following three articles respond in very different ways to resolution 13.07 S10, "Changes in Traditional Student Makeup." The whereas clauses in that resolution took note of cuts to both community college and CSU/UC budgets and worried that an "influx of new non-traditional students have displaced many of the historically underserved community college students who often register late for classes, thus changing the makeup of our student populations."

Widespread displacement of native students anticipated in the resolution does not appear to have taken effect, at least not yet. But the resolution led members of the Educational Policies Committee to consider a number of ways our students are changing, and some of those reflections follow. The article by Richard Mahon summarizes research completed by system Vice Chancellor Patrick Perry on changes to the 2009-10 student cohort. The article by Executive Committee member and online instructor Dolores Davison discusses the recent report by the Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) that looks to distance education technology to help California meet its Master Plan goals. Finally, the article by Karolyn van Putten discusses the educational needs our students have in light of the rapidly changing social and technological milieu they find themselves surrounded by. Only by keeping track of the needs of our students today can we meet their real educational needs.

Budget Cut Blues, What Happened?

RICHARD MAHON, CHAIR, EDUCATIONAL POLCIES COMMITTEE

As it happens, faculty have not been the only ones concerned about the effect budget cuts have had on student access, and system Vice Chancellor Patrick Perry prepared a presentation for the Board of Governors for the September 2010 meeting that analyzed demographic changes in the 2009-10 academic year: End Of Year (2009-2010) Analysis Of Changes In CCC System: Students, Courses, And FTES.[1]

So, what happened?

- The CCC system lost students, from a high in 2008-09 of 2,898,126, to 2,758,081 in 2009-10, a 4.8% decline, though 2009-10 is still the second highest enrolled academic year in the system's history.
- 2009-10 was the first academic year in which students recorded their ethnicity according to new federal categories, so comparability to previous years is uncertain; nevertheless, two categories of students showed an increase by ethnicity: "decline to state" (which increased from 12.8% to 16%) and Hispanics, which increased modestly from 29.6% to 29.7%. By contrast, the percentage of Asian, African American, and white students all declined slightly (by .5%, .5%, and .7% respectively). Hispanic students, as Patrick Perry notes, "are near convergence in the CCC system."

1 www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/.../student_enrollment_Sept_2010_BOG.pdf.

- While males are still a minority in California community colleges, their presence in the 2009-10 cohort (45.1%) is consistent with gradual growth over the previous few years toward parity.
- Students younger than 17 and older that 35 declined in the system by 1.4% in both categories; the decline in students under 17 could reflect fewer spaces for high school students who are allowed to enroll only on a space-available basis, suggested also by a decline in K-12 special admit students from 6% to 5.1%.
- Students describing themselves as degree seeking increased from 45.5% to 48.4%, a fairly significant increase.
- Especially relevant in light of the resolution, first-time students declined from 32.5% to 30.6% and continuing students increased from 38.8% to 42.9%, another relatively substantial increase.
- The number of course sections offered declined by 38,261 (9%) but the average section size increased to 31.14 students, the first time the system has seen an average class size over 30 students and an increase of 15.6% since 2006-07.
- Remarkably, in light of the number of sections cut and the decline in headcount, the number of credit FTES increased.
- Patrick Perry's data also examine the kinds of courses (time of day, students served) that were more or less likely to be cut and the disciplines that increased or declined. The report is short and well worth reading beyond the details gleaned here.

What can we infer from this quick overview? On the whole, colleges seem to have seen the opposite of "an influx of new students." New students didn't appear and continuing students increased significantly as a percentage of students on community college campuses. In terms of the ethnic diversity of our students, while Asian, African American, and white students declined modestly, Hispanic students increased at an even greater percentage. The increasing growth of both male and Hispanic students toward equitable representation on community college campuses is a promising sign.

Patrick Perry's summary is silent on the fact that the reduction of 38,261 sections probably represents an enormous blow to the ability of our part-time colleagues to make ends meet, and anecdotal data suggest that many part-time faculty are giving up on community college teaching careers and looking elsewhere. The impact on colleges of the loss of long-serving part-time faculty is deserving of a study on its own merits.

The fact that FTES have increased even when so many sections have been cut indicates that the faculty who remain are making significant sacrifices to accommodate students in already bulging classrooms. The number of unfunded FTES in the California Community College System is simultaneous evidence of the willingness of faculty and colleges to serve students and an indication to the Legislature that we can do more with less, which is not a sign that bodes well for restored funding.

What does it mean?

The most plausible explanation for the persistence of our students and their not being displaced by the anticipated wave of CSU and UC eligible students flowing into our colleges is the widespread, if not universal, use of priority registration systems that provide earlier access to class enrollment for continuing students. As a short-term explanation, this is both convincing and reassuring. As Patrick Perry notes, however, at some point our continuing students will complete their certificates or degrees or will transfer; while our colleges may have lost those students who were perhaps even "admitted" to our colleges but ultimately unable to enroll in any classes. We know who we retained; we do not know who we lost through lack of space. And we cannot guess the cost to California's moral and economic climate to those students who sought to continue their educations but were not able to find a seat at a UC, CSU or California community college campus.▪

Distance Education: The Wave of the Future?

DOLORES DAVISON, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER

In the focus of the November 2 elections, the publication of the Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) paper "The Master Plan at 50: Using Distance Education to Increase College Access and Efficiency" did not receive the notice that it might have otherwise engendered. The recommendations of the LAO potentially have significant impacts on all community colleges, regardless of their current use of distance education.

The paper is divided into four major categories of discussion: an overview of distance education, an assessment of the effectiveness of distance education, the funding and costs of distance education, and a discussion of "Where Do We Go from Here?", which includes recommendations for the future of distance education in California. The overview provides a context in which the rest of the discussion in the paper takes place. The LAO points out that definitions of "distance education" vary and that there is no consensus among educators, providers, and researchers as to where to set a threshold for what constitutes a distance learning course. The LAO report cites the Sloan Consortium report that nationally, distance education enrollments have been consistently growing since 2002, seeing double digit growth through those years. Sloan estimates that 4.6 million students are enrolled in distance education courses, representing approximately "one-quarter of total enrollments in postsecondary institutions for that time period."

Distance education courses are offered at virtually all of the California community colleges (CCC) and all 23 campuses in the California State University (CSU) system. While at least two colleges (Coastline and Foothill) in the CCC system offer fully online degrees and certificates, the CSUs do not, although they do allow for bachelor completion programs and master's degrees and teaching credentials online. The University of California (UC) system does not currently offer more than a few dozen classes online, although it does offer a significant number of online classes through its extension program. The LAO report suggests ways that the UC system could move into more online education, including providing the opportunity for fully online degrees, as well as other collaborative efforts with the CCC and CSU systems.

The LAO report addresses concerns regarding the quality of distance education courses, stating that courses are generally held to the same standards as their face-to-face counterparts. The report also addresses national research which indicates that similar learning outcomes occur for online and in-person courses, although it is clear that retention continues to be a concern. There are also concerns that colleges do not possess uniform standards in dealing with issues of academic integrity and that in many colleges there is no proof that the student enrolled in the class is actually the student submitting the work for the course. Finally, the LAO reports that many faculty, especially at the UC level, are concerned about the efficacy of distance education classes, pointing out that many respondents to a survey by the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities indicated that they

believed that the learning outcomes for the courses offered through distance education were inferior or somewhat inferior (these numbers were considerably higher among faculty who did not teach online in comparison to those who did).

The cost and funding of distance education courses is also discussed in the report. The fiscal impact on students enrolled in distance education courses might be less, for instance, as those students can complete courses while caring for children and thereby saving the cost of child care. The fiscal impacts on campuses, in terms of technology and instructional costs, seem to be comparable; however, the impact on facilities can be mitigated by distance education courses, and therefore might be a cost-saver for colleges. In addition, savings through collaborations with other universities and colleges might also allow colleges to save monies.

The fiscal impact on students enrolled in distance education courses might be less, for instance, as those students can complete courses while caring for children and thereby saving the cost of child care.

The recommendations of the LAO in terms of where distance education should go from here provide a myriad of options and can certainly be used to spark local discussions. First, the LAO suggests that the Legislature should adopt a standardized definition of distance education, as the CCC and CSU systems use different definitions. Second, the LAO recommends that the Legislature require periodic reports on data related to distance education, including enrollment trends and performance data. Third is a recommendation to build on the already existing distance education foundation to expand on collaboration between the three internal systems as well as external groups. This collaboration would allow for a clearer path for students moving between the systems, and could facilitate sharing of curriculum across campuses and systems, as well as potentially creating collaborative academic programs. Fourth, the LAO suggests consideration of an online degree completion program that is targeted towards re-entry students, particularly those who began a degree but never completed it; the model that has been created in Texas (the "Bachelor's Accelerated Completion" program) is mentioned as a possible model to study and determine feasibility for a similar type of program in California. Finally, the LAO recommends the formation of a legislative-executive task force to examine the possibility of creating a model along the lines of the recently developed Indiana-Western Governors University (WGU) partnership, involving the WGU board of trustees along with input from Indiana officials and state leaders. This new plan allows advanced students to complete their programs in a more accelerated manner, and the LAO sees potential for a similar program in California.

In conclusion, this is a paper that all faculty involved with distance education, curriculum, articulation, and enrollment planning should read, especially in terms of the recommendations that the LAO proposes, which could potentially lead to the creation of policies with limited or no faculty input. While the LAO points out that distance education will not replace face-to-face education, the potential for growth is almost unlimited and as such merits closer scrutiny. ▪

What We "Know" (About) What We "Need"

KAROLYN VAN PUTTEN, EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE MEMBER

Just recently, I heard a senior administrator refer to community colleges as "employment engines," alluding to the pivotal but somewhat undervalued (or under-acknowledged) preparatory role we play in getting students ready for (or retraining them in) the world of work. This preparation refers to more than career and technical education (CTE) programs and certificates; it engages all of our most noble learning outcomes. We aspire to produce students who contribute to society in meaningful ways, who are ethical world citizens, who think critically. Even our statewide mission emphasizes "a skilled workforce and an educated citizenry."[1]

Actualization of this mission is increasingly focused on and driven by a tripartite mantle: basic skills, transfer, and CTE. Though CTE is more directly and clearly learning that is work related, and while we certainly want to increase our local success rates, still, the students who transfer and later graduate, are ultimately expected to enter the world of work. As a system we're becoming more accommodating of basic skills needs which, once met, then prepare these students for success in classes that are directed at transferring or degree and certificate completion, all of which lead to, well, work.

We know that higher wages are a predictable outcome of college degrees and certificates; that this is so could always be a prominent message from our colleges. The business world has been clear in stating its needs and expectations of incoming workers and President Obama's community college initiative further spotlights the integral relationship between student success and economic recovery. The Association of American Colleges and Universities identifies the Top Ten Things Employers Look for in College Graduates[2]:

- The ability to work well in teams—especially with people different from yourself
- An understanding of science and technology and how these subjects are used in real world settings
- The ability to write and speak well
- The ability to think clearly about complex problems
- The ability to analyze a problem to develop workable solutions
- An understanding of global context in which work is now done
- The ability to be creative and innovative in solving problems
- The ability to apply knowledge and skills in new settings
- The ability to understand numbers and statistics
- A strong sense of ethics and integrity.

You will readily observe that nothing in this list is specific to a particular discipline or career path.

1 http://www.cccco.edu/SystemOffice/MissionandVision/tabid/194/Default.aspx.

2 http://www.aacu.org/leap/students/employerstopten.cfm.

One could further synthesize some of these qualities as the abilities to focus, communicate and collaborate. If we accept this as part of our charge, to develop students who know how to focus, communicate and collaborate, then it behooves us to pay closer attention to how this learning occurs, and to what conditions and circumstances facilitate—or interfere with—developing these abilities.

An increasing body of research suggests that the quantity, quality and expanded access to global media in the form of entertainment, news, information, social connectivity has potentially detrimental effects on acquisition and use of the cognitive skills associated with an ability to focus.[3] Similarly, there is growing concern about the social and affective impact of media exposure and communications technology.[4] Exposure to violent media is associated with a reduction in empathy and compassion; repeated exposure to rapid-fire media snippets may confuse one's moral compass; game playing and other forms of online interactivity often interfere with completing homework assignments. Growing dependency on an abundance of digital distractions threatens physical fitness, is associated with sleep deficits, trivializes interpersonal communication and impairs concentration. All of these effects conflict with developing the abilities employers seek in college students.

At the same time, engaging educational uses of technology are lacking, and the existence of the Internet has changed everything about how we learn anything. For the first time in the history of consciousness, with access to technology, it is now possible to learn anything one wants to know about without leaving home. In principle, this flattened world of knowledge makes access to educational opportunity easier and more affordable than ever, provided the student learner is savvy enough to know how to use it. Some would propose that a large part of our job as educators is to help students develop that savvy.

We must ask and answer for ourselves the question, "If the answer can be found on the Internet in a matter of seconds, why should a student spend time memorizing it?" More importantly, when several different answers are available in a matter of minutes, how will the student know which ones are accurate and reliable? Recall that two things employers seek in potential employees are a) the ability to think clearly about complex problems and b) the ability to analyze a problem. If we are to succeed in improving student success significantly, in better, more efficient and reliable preparation for good, sustainable, life supportive jobs, we must change how we teach to accommodate increasing differences in how students learn[5], integrated with the ubiquity of the Internet and social media, and connected to what students are expected to be able to do when they enter the world of work.

The learning outcomes and assessment features inherent to our accreditation standards provide a natural incubator for making these changes and for knowing when we have been successful. Numerous resources are available to support us in making the shift from an instruction-centered to a learning-centered paradigm, including one I recently discovered, developed by the Association for American Colleges and Universities (AACU). The AACU framework is one we could benefit from examining and adopting systemically.[6] When we use what we know effectively, we will have what we need to fulfill our mission, that of cultivating "a skilled workforce and an educated citizenry." ▪

3 See, e.g., sources quoted in The New York Times, *http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/21/technology/21brain.html.*

4 *http://www.brainmysteries.com/research/Launching_an_attention_movement_in_a_distracted_society.asp*, *http://www.brainmysteries.com/research/Tweet_this_Rapid-fire_media_may_confuse_your_moral_compass.asp*, and *http://www.brainmysteries.com/research/Violent_media_numb_viewers_to_the_pain_of_others.asp.*

5 See, e.g., *http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2001/07/retention.aspx*, and *http://www.apa.org/gradpsych/2006/03/cover-teamwork.aspx.*

6 *http://www.aacu.org/resources/assessment/index.cfm.*

The CTE Way: Decisions that Affect Student Success

WHEELER NORTH, CHAIR, OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Senate Bill 1143 calls for the Board of Governors to develop a plan for improving student success. What is interesting is that SB 1143 (Liu 2010) presumes that student success is in such a dismal state that legislation is needed to direct the Board of Governors to fix it.

Fortunately for our students, this idea could not be farther from the truth. In the relatively specialized world of career technical education (CTE), for a variety of reasons, students commonly achieve their end goals. This does not mean that retention (finishing the course) and persistence (returning each semester) cannot be improved upon. However colleges also need to be careful to not do the opposite by implementing practices that impair students' ability to progress to their end goals.

Academic Senate Resolution 21.01 F05 calls for the Senate to research best practices *"regarding the impact of matriculation, placement efforts and course registration practices on occupational education students."* At the heart of this resolution was the practice of changing enrollment rules in the last week of registration, which had a major impact on the ability of returning students to enroll in CTE courses at one particular college. This almost killed several programs at that college; one wonders if that was the intent.

But in the broad scheme of things, colleges often make decisions that impact CTE programs' capacity to serve students very negatively. For example, many colleges rely very heavily on part-time student services faculty to serve their students. From the part-time faculty's perspective, they are likely freeway flyers who do not have the time to gain an adept base of knowledge about any one college's specialized CTE programs. They focus on being qualified to counsel in the broad transfer and GE patterns that are the most likely to move students from many colleges to many universities. While this will help them serve the majority of students they serve, those few CTE students that seek guidance may not equally benefit from the college's decision to rely so heavily on part-time faculty.

Another choice colleges will make is to impose minimum class sizes. This does not work for CTE programs, particularly in their advanced courses. The ideal productivity for any class (which is calculated from a variety of factors) is unrealistic for some programs where at maximum capacity they might only be able to achieve a productivity of two-thirds the desired goal, or less. This means much smaller classes, even when full. Also, these programs rarely offer many sections of a course at one time, so to cancel that course stops any students needing it from reaching their goals.

So from the counseling perspective, I always advise my students to take their CTE courses ASAP. That way if a later course is canceled, they can always still pick up a GE course to fill in until that critical course is finally offered. Of course this breaks down if the student is only interested in a certificate.

Another problem that goes with many CTE programs is they do not offer every course every semes-

ter. They do provide very sequential tracks that a student can easily follow, which is almost impossible for the GE side of our academies. However, once one of these classes is canceled, that entire track becomes disrupted. So instead of a class of 15 students getting dealt a bad deal, all 150 students in the program get mashed around for the next three to five semesters.

A related practice is to cancel the course before the semester starts. This is a huge mistake for CTE courses because CTE students tend to register late for a variety of reasons. In another instance a college decided to impose (the week before the semester started) a requirement for placement testing to be completed prior to any registration. This stopped a number of returning CTE students from being able to register because it is not uncommon for CTE students who know where they want to go to have skipped any placement opportunities.

Changing automatic drop for non-payment deadlines can greatly affect CTE students, particularly if the word does not get out. Making different rules for late adds can deal students out. In one district, due to the recent boom in enrollment, they implemented two conflicting practices: no late adds beyond two weeks would be accepted for any reason, and 16-unit maximums were imposed that could not be violated. Many CTE students will take one or more semesters above 16 units. However, resolving these appeals took more than the two-week allotment for late adds so many students were denied access, even though there were empty seats available.

The list of broad sweeping policy changes is infinite, and how that can negatively impact your students is completely unforeseeable. However, there are some things that you can do to be prepared that will improve your effectiveness in remediating these disasters.

The first is to have a strong, functional rapport with the following individuals: your academic senate president, your dean, and your Chief Instructional Officer. This means you have to go to the various

The list of broad sweeping policy changes is infinite, and how that can negatively impact your students is completely unforeseeable.

governance meetings and participate. You need to pony up to the plate and be involved in campus and district activities.

It is also important to know who the players are and how decisions are processed through the chain of command. In the latter case of hard lines about late adds and unit limitations the fact was that this did not start out as a "No Exceptions" set of rules when it was first discussed at the higher levels. But it translated to that by the time it flowed downhill. Thus the savvy faculty department chair was able to make a few calls to inform the top brass of this disconnect, and some of these students were able to get into the classes they critically needed to graduate.

One of the ironies of being large institutions is the need to be fair and treat all students equitably. What is good for the goose should be good for the gander, and all the other ducklings we serve. However we are way too complex for this to be a functional model without some means for reasonable appeal, without some means to assure the unique exceptions, which are often the majority, do not get cut out by these equitable decisions.

Hopefully, we place the following concept at the top of the list in our planning for improving student success: Every student we serve is unique, and each one has a unique set of instructional and support needs, of which many are critical to the fruition of their ultimate success. ▪

Basic Skills 30-Unit Limit: Do We Need a Change?

DIANNA CHIABOTTI, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

In Fall 2007, the Academic Senate passed a resolution asking that we "research the possible need for increasing the 30 units maximum allowed for credit remedial coursework in order to provide for more opportunities for basic skills students to be successful."

This resolution was brought to the body as a result of concerns with the Title 5 Regulations §55035 Remedial Coursework Limit which states that "no student shall receive more than 30 semester units (or 45 quarter units) of credit for remedial coursework. Students having exhausted the unit limitation shall be referred for further remedial work to appropriate adult noncredit education services provided by a college, adult school, community-based organization, or other appropriate local provider."

> Changing the limit may in fact be unnecessary. A thorough review of the entire regulation actually gives local college districts flexibility to address the specific needs within the district.

If the student then reaches college level through the noncredit or adult education program, he or she can request reinstatement into the credit program.

Many feel that this limit is too restrictive to meet the needs of many community college students, particularly in light of the recent increase in the English and mathematics graduation requirements. Many additional arguments exist that would support an increase in the unit limit, including an increase in four- and five-unit basic skills English and math courses; the needs of students with complex lives; and most importantly the need by some students for basic skills courses beyond the 30 unit limit to be prepared for college-level work, complete a program, and get out of poverty, ultimately benefitting the larger community and the state's economy.

As a result of this resolution and other concerns within the state, the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum (SACC), explored this issue. After thoughtful discussion and review by SACC and a detailed look at section 55035, some facets of this regulation became clearer. It also became evident that these particular facets have not been publicized broadly.

First, it is important to note that the 30-unit limit does not apply to students enrolled in an English as a Second Language (ESL) course or students identified by the district as having a learning disability, as defined in section 56036.

Second, the 30-unit limit is interpreted by SACC to be a limit per college, not per district.

Further, the district governing board may develop and provide a waiver process. The waiver process in this instance would allow students to exceed the 30-unit limit if the student shows "significant, measureable progress toward the development of skills appropriate to his or her enrollment in degree applicable courses" based on "locally developed standards" that are approved by the governing board. This section stipulates that the waiver, if granted, can only be given for specified periods of time or for specified numbers of units.

So what does this all mean? Changing the limit may in fact be unnecessary. A thorough review of the entire regulation actually gives local college districts flexibility to address the specific needs within the district. Districts for which this is a concern can develop a waiver process. The statute does not explicitly define "significant, measurable progress" but clearly refers to "locally developed standards"; thus, the local district can determine criteria relative to the student population served.

To address this issue at your college or in your district, the first step is to determine if such a waiver process already exists. If it does, it is a good idea to review the process and determine if it is current and applicable or if a revision is necessary. If no such policy exists, use your current processes for development of new policies to determine if such a policy would be beneficial.

If you decide to revise or develop a waiver process for the 30-unit limit, it is important to remember the following points: 1) The policy must be a district policy; 2) "Significant measurable progress" must be defined for your district; and 3) The policy should indicate how the specified period of time or the specified number of units would be determined.

As your district looks at this issue, it is important that faculty are leaders in revising or developing the waiver process. This issue is clearly an academic and professional matter, and faculty, particularly faculty that teach basic skills courses, are uniquely qualified to look at all factors that might necessitate a student applying for a waiver. ▪

RESOURCES FOR SUSTAINABILITY

The October/November 2010 issue of the Community College Journal focuses on sustainability and "going green." Articles include:

- "Achieving Your Vision: how to make sustainable living a reality on campus" (Butte College)
- "Design for Success; massive building project makes LACCD a leader in green facilities"
- "Planet Activism: students further their environmental passions through campus clubs and groups"
- "Positive Energy: green-jobs training prepares students for career success"

The American Association of Community Colleges (*www.aacc.org*), through the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (*www.aashe.org*), has created an online resource for community colleges. The SEED Center: Sustainability Education and Economic Development—*www.theseedcenter.org*—"will serve as a place where administrators and faculty members from community colleges can trade tips, materials and curricula in green-jobs programs through databases, a wiki, and discussion boards" (news blog from the Chronicle of Higher Education, October 11, 2010).

Look for an article on curriculum and sustainability in the next *Rostrum*.

How Green is the Senate?

JULIE ADAMS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

I have friends who used to laugh at my lifelong habit of reusing ribbon and wrapping paper, but today, with increasing awareness of the need to conserve resources, I am no longer saddled with the label of "cheap" but honored with the title of "green." "Green" is becoming a part of daily operations in the Academic Senate as well, and in the past several years, the Academic Senate has implemented a number of ways to conserve resources. As early as 2006, the Senate moved to printing on 100% recycled paper for our directory, publications, and Rostrums. We also began posting papers and Rostrums quickly on our website, making them available sooner and reducing the number of copies that we needed to send out, and asked you to recycle your copy when you finished reading it. Even the company that hosts our website uses a green server that offsets all of its energy use.

Over the past few years, we have also worked with hotels to conserve resources we use while onsite. For example, when we send out requests for proposals, we look for hotels with strong "green" policies concerning what do they do with leftover food and whether there are recycle bins in the guestrooms. We also consider whether they are close to public transportation and transportation hubs. You might have even noticed that there are recycling bins and we use glass versus plastic cups during plenary sessions and institutes.

In addition, we have moved to more recycled/sustainable meeting materials such as reusable bags and flash drives instead of plastic folders. For those of you who attended the recent Fall Plenary Session, you might have also noted that we have started to go "paper lite". Fewer materials were copied and most material was provided on our website in advance of the Plenary Session. Many participants commented that they appreciated being able to access the materials in advance of the conference, (as well as throughout) particularly the program. However, there are some tricks to "paper lite" conferences. For this effort to work, you have to download presentations to your laptop, IPad, IPhone or other electronic device and not just print them. That way you can also contribute to our sustainability efforts. In addition, our new Academic Senate Foundation had its first fundraiser; selling reusable name badge holders.

While my friends now laugh with me and not at me, the Senate's "green" strategies are no laughing matter. We know that you are also struggling with sustainability issues on your own campus. Thus, we have offered you a few resources—see the side bar (page 35) on sustainability articles relevant to community colleges. We hope you will join us in our efforts to conserve our resources. ▪

Julie's In Box

The Academic Senate receives many requests from the field, and most of them come through the Senate Office into the inbox of our own Executive Director Julie Adams (hence the name of this column). As you might imagine these requests vary by topic, and the responses represent yet another resource to local senates. This column will share the questions and solutions offered by the President and the Executive Committee. Please send your thoughts or questions to Julie@asccc.org.

Dear Julie,

Recently, some California university faculty asked to see syllabi for a course that is already articulated through the course outline of record. Should we submit syllabi to the university faculty? Shouldn't the course of outline be enough?

Already Articulated

Dear A.A.,

Your question is one that comes up occasionally for community college faculty who rely on the articulation process to pave transfer pathways for students. University faculty work from syllabi for courses, and community college faculty work from an official course outline of record, and articulation is from one institution to another institution, not from one faculty member to another. As department chairs change within the respective universities and colleges, sometimes faculty forget about basic differences between our systems and the underlying premise of the articulation process.

We recommend not submitting syllabi to university faculty for articulation purposes. Instead, try to work with the university faculty and your articulation officer to communicate the features of the course as specified in the official course outline of record. Your articulation officer might have some additional ideas on how to work with university faculty when questions come up. Determining a reason for the request for syllabi might be beneficial, and maintaining good working relationships across faculty ultimately supports students. It should be emphasized that a given syllabus is merely a sample of how the COR is implemented by a single instructor. If a request for syllabi persists, then we suggest sending syllabi that best reflect the course as it is taught at your college. Note that mode of delivery (i.e. distance education or online instruction) has never been a component of the articulation process.

However, reviewing syllabi for all sections of a single course is beneficial for community college discipline faculty to check for consistencies in pacing, course content, and SLOs. Some faculty evaluation processes include a review of an instructor's syllabus for the course. You might try an exercise with your discipline faculty: collect all syllabi for a course, remove any information that identifies the instructor, and then exchange syllabi and look for strengths and weaknesses in the syllabi to see how students are served by these documents and how the course content is addressed. Keep in mind that faculty have academic freedom in how the course content in delivered and that freedom must be balanced with meeting the obligations of the course outline of record.

If you have further concerns about university faculty requesting syllabi from faculty, please send the specifics to the Senate office.

Good luck!

From the Executive Committee ▪

The Nature of Giving: An Interview with a Foundation Donor

BETH SMITH, PRESIDENT OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOUNDATION, INTERVIEWS KATE CLARK, FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

I understand you have chosen to give to the Academic Senate Foundation for California Community Colleges.

Yes. Although all of us are besieged by our alma mater and worthy causes, I am pleased to support the Foundation. As a recent retiree, I have to be all the more careful about organizations I choose to support.

So why did you decide to give to the Foundation?

It was really rather simple: I owed the Academic Senate and needed to return to others what the Academic Senate had provided me over the years.

> The Foundation seeks to "enhance the excellence of the California community colleges by sustained support for professional development of the faculty in the furtherance of effective teaching and learning practices."

When I was a fledgling local senate president, ASCCC Executive Committee members came to my college's rescue, providing legal and moral support in the face of egregious Title 5 violations. And I attended ASCCC Plenary Sessions and Institutes—Leadership, Vocational Education, and Curriculum. Even the many publications, and the website and the office staff who answered questions and referred me to those who mentored me—for all of that, I owed the Academic Senate something in return. I needed to repay my debt to ensure that all those who follow may likewise benefit in the years to come.

But wasn't it enough that you served as a local senate president and then on the ASCCC Executive Committee? Wasn't that a kind of repayment?

No. As rewarding as those experiences were for me, it is the on-going work that the Academic Senate does that warrants my on-going support. After all, it costs to print the Rostrum, to maintain and improve the website, to sponsor plenary sessions, to send Technical Assistance teams to local colleges. The Academic Senate is a frugal organization that seeks inclusion of all colleges and their faculty. Unlike the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) or the Community College League of California (CCLC), the Academic Senate has kept its dues at a nominal rate. But its Chancellor's Office funding has been slashed over the years by over 30%. That's a lot to absorb and still maintain the quality of services that the Academic Senate has provided to faculty over its 41 years! Readers of this interview are probably serving

now; but they incur their own debt to the Academic Senate.

What do you anticipate that the Foundation will do with donations?

The Foundation's mission spells it out rather clearly: The Foundation seeks to "enhance the excellence of the California community colleges by sustained support for professional development of the faculty in the furtherance of effective teaching and learning practices." Briefly, the Foundation wants to provide stability and continuity to the projects of ASCCC. And it is able to apply for external grant and longer-term funding opportunities that are not available to the Academic Senate because of its separate but different non-profit status. In general, grants would be targeted toward very specific projects to improve teaching and learning, or to further the work of teachers in basic skills and CTE—or other projects consonant with the Senate's mission. Our donations to the Foundation could also be used for a wider variety of related purposes—such as sponsoring plenary speakers, and offering scholarships for faculty to attend ASCCC events, such as the Foundation is doing in 2011 so that part-time faculty can attend the Basic Skills Institute.

How did you choose to give to the Foundation?

I'm giving in two ways: one, I'm volunteering my time to serve on the Foundation Board of Directors. Second, I sent a check as the first of what I intend will be an annual financial gift to this new Foundation. But that's not the only way to contribute. Others may prefer a monthly donation—or a planned giving option. The Foundation would also benefit from those who can help us identify other potential donors or grantors in the national community. The website *http://www.asfccc.com* has more information about easy ways faculty can recompense the senate. I hope they will do so.

The Academic Senate Foundation is a 501 (C) (3) non-profit organization. Your donations are tax-deductible. ▪

Upcoming Events

2011 Vocational Education Leadership Institute
January 27-29, 2011
Hyatt Regency Newport Beach, Newport Beach, CA

2011 Teaching Institute (Basic Skills Across the Curriculum)
February 25-26, 2011
San Jose Doubletree, San Jose, CA

2011 Accreditation Institute
March 18-19, 2011
Napa Valley Marriott, Napa, CA

2011 Spring Plenary Session
April 14-16, 2011
SFO Westin, Millbrae, CA

2011 Faculty Leadership Institute
June 16-18, 2011
Claremont Hotel, Berkeley, CA

2011 Student Learning Outcomes Institute
July 13, 2011
Marriott Mission Valley, San Diego, CA

2011 Curriculum Institute
July 14-16, 2011
Marriott Mission Valley, San Diego, CA

Discount Program Helps Break Down Cost Barriers for Technology

SHENG LOR, FOUNDATION FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Community colleges fill a unique role in society, making quality higher education available to any who seek it. Keeping fees among the lowest in the nation is one way California's community colleges accomplish this mission, but once students enroll, the cost of staying in school continues to increase. Expensive software, textbooks, and supplies create an additional barrier for many. The CollegeBuys program helps break down this hurdle by offering Microsoft® and Adobe® software to California community college faculty, staff, and students at prices even below the regular educational discount. With access to more affordable educational resources, educators and schools can continue to support the endeavors of an increasing student population.

The Foundation for California Community Colleges launched CollegeBuys in 1999, when it partnered with Microsoft to establish a cost-saving program for college software and to offer the benefit of work-at-home licensing to faculty and staff. The program is one of the Foundation's oldest and has grown significantly in scope and in savings. Currently, CollegeBuys partners with 22 different retailers, offering discounts on a wide range of educational products on the CollegeBuys.org website, including software, hardware, classroom furniture, and more, saving California community colleges and their students, faculty, and staff tens of millions of dollars each year. In the first ten months of 2010, faculty, staff, and students saved nearly $8.5 million on popular Microsoft® and Adobe® programs.

Affordability increases accessibility, making CollegeBuys a resource for faculty, both as individuals and as instructors. Faculty and students can be on the same page with current technology, creating a more seamless learning environment. Technological literacy is now more critical than ever to finding and pursuing greater opportunities, and CollegeBuys can help close the gap between those who have access and those who don't.

Community college faculty and staff have already benefited greatly with CollegeBuys. "This program provides a real service to faculty across the state," says Jane Patton, president of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and faculty member at Mission College.

The California Community College System plays a large and crucial role in the preparation of students for career placement and higher education beyond the two-year college. California community college educators and staff have the opportunity to impact lives daily. CollegeBuys is a resource that faculty and staff can use and pass on to help students forge new skills and be more competitive in today's employment environment.

A decade has passed since the launching of CollegeBuys, and while the service continues to save millions of dollars for community colleges, many Californians continue to feel the pinch of the current economic crisis. A cost-savings program such as CollegeBuys is becoming more important than ever before. Increasing affordability and equitable access to resources is one way that community colleges can truly continue to extend educational opportunities to an increasing number of people. To find out more about CollegeBuys and its discount programs, please visit CollegeBuys.org. ▪