

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**September 7, 2017 to Saturday, September 9, 2017**  
*Residence Inn Downtown Marriott, Sacramento*

On Thursday, September 7, 2017, the Executive Committee participated in presentations on their role as directors on a nonprofit board and succession planning for the executive director position.

**I. ORDER OF BUSINESS for Executive Committee meeting Friday, 8 September 2017**

**Roll Call**

President Bruno called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. and welcomed members and guests.

J. Adams, C. Aschenbach, R. Beach, D. Davison, R. Eikey, S. Foster, J. Freitas, G. May, L. Parker (Saturday only, via Zoom), C. McKay, C. Roberson, C. Rutan, L. Slattery-Farrell, and J. Stanskas.

Guests: Gregory Anderson, CIO Liaison; Dave Dillon, Grossmont College, OER Task Force Chair; Laura Hope, Executive Vice Chancellor, CCCCCO; and Troy Myers, FACCC Liaison.

**A. Approval of the Agenda**

**MSC (Freitas/Slattery-Farrell) to approve the agenda as presented.**

**B. Public Comment**

*This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Executive Committee on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes.*

No public comment.

**C. Calendar**

Members were updated on deadlines. Adams provided the due dates for the *Rostrum* for the entire year which are September 22, December 31, and March 5.

**D. Action Tracking**

Members were asked to review the Action Tracking and update as necessary. Adams noted that the Action Tracking as well as the Committee Priorities spreadsheets are now in the LiveBinder for members to update.

**E. Local Senate Visits**

Members were asked to update the local senate visits table.

**F. One Minute Accomplishment**

Members shared a one-minute accomplishment.

**G. Dinner Arrangements**

Members discussed dinner arrangements.

**II. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**A. August 11-12, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

**B. EDAC Regionals**

**C. Policy for Executive Committee Members Attending Events**

**D. Foundation Bylaws**

**Items A, C, and D were pulled from the consent calendar.**

**MSC (May/Freitas) to approve the consent calendar as amended.**

**A. August 11 – 12, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

The minutes were pulled because the presentation on Crucial Conversations with Veronica Neal was missing from the minutes. This will be added to the minutes and returned to the next meeting for approval.

**C. Policy for Executive Committee Members Attending Events**

Members asked for clarification on whether or not the Executive Director role should be clearly defined or is it covered sufficiently by the reference to all Executive Committee members. The Operations Committee to clarify.

**MSC (Davison/Beach) to return the policy to the Operations Committee to clarify whether or not the appointments should be approved by the Board versus the President, the role of the Executive Director at events, and whether or not the President should collaborate with the Executive Director on presenters at events.**

**D. Foundation Bylaws**

Members discussed the Foundation Bylaws. It was noted that Item 5.3 is no longer needed given that the Foundation now holds elections. Members also discussed how members should respond if a possible conflict of interest is identified by being elected to the ASCCC Board and appointed to the ASFCCC Board. By consensus, Adams will discuss with the ASCCC attorney about how directors should address such conflicts if discovered.

**MSC (Slattery-Farrell/Aschenbach) to strike Item 5.3 of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Foundation bylaws.**

**Action:**

A. The August minutes will be revised to reflect that the Executive Committee participated in a presentation on crucial conversations and return to the next meeting for approval.

B. The EDAC Regional meeting schedule will be posted on the website.

C. The policy for Executive Committee members attending events will return to the Operations Committee for clarification and return to a future meeting for approval.

D. The Foundation Bylaws as amended will be updated on the Foundation website. Adams will contact the ASCCC attorney to explore actions to address possible conflict of interest of directors who serve on both the ASCCC and the ASFCCC.

### **III. REPORTS**

#### **A. President's/Executive Director's Report**

Bruno informed members that the Chief Executive Officers Workgroups on accreditation will report to the Board of Governors. She reminded members that there are two workgroups. Workgroup I was tasked with evaluating ACCJC's structure, functioning, and relations, and suggesting improvements. Workgroup II was to facilitate communication between accreditors and institutional members and develop a regional accreditation model that aligns all higher education segments. There have been reports that there is a softening of support among CEOs to move to one regional accreditor for all higher education segments. More information will be available after the Board meeting.

Bruno reported that the Chancellor's Office work on apprenticeship regulations continues; however, it is unclear where the Chancellor's Office is in making any recommendations to the Board of Governors.

At its upcoming meeting, the Board of Governors will discuss the Budget and Legislative Requests. The request reflects the funding and policy priorities necessary to advance the goals outlined in the strategic vision. The following are the priorities:

- Base increase of \$200 million;
- Place holder for Flex Learning Options for Workers to expand online learning for students;
- Resources for full-time hiring (\$75M) and part-time support (\$25m);
- Resources for Professional Development (\$25m)
- Resources for Basic Skills Transformation grants (\$25m);
- Resources for College Promise programs to assist students transitioning from high school to community college (\$25m);
- Financial aid that reflects the total cost of attendance to help students' success; and
- Support for a culture of data-informed decision-making for adult education.

Bruno encouraged members to review the Board of Governors agenda item found on the Chancellor's Office website.

The Chancellor's Office continues the process of evaluating the work of Common Assessment Initiative. The evaluation report is due today and will be presented to Deputy Chancellor Skinner on Wednesday. Rutan reported on the current

challenges and possible timeline of when the test will be released. More information will be forthcoming.

Bruno informed members that the IEPI Change Leadership Summit is scheduled for October 5 – 6, 2017 in Southern California. The summit is intended to bring forward thoughts, skills, and knowledge to the field on leadership in a time of significant change to the CCC system and our colleges.

The ASCCC has put structures in place make progress on the Strong Workforce Recommendations that fall within our purview. Three taskforces have been formed under the Standards and Practices Committee. The taskforces will work on the following: 1) develop an Equivalency Toolkit including developing a white paper on the equivalency process; 2) develop guidelines and training modules for CTE industry professionals who serve as on-site supervisors for work experience and internships; and 3) explore the development of subdisciplines to address the minimum qualifications in disciplines that are having difficulty in finding qualified faculty to teach all the sections of discipline but might find faculty with particular skills to teach one section. For example in agriculture, a faculty might not be able to teach all courses in ag but could teach in husbandry.

Governor Brown sent the Chancellor a letter recommending that the CCC create a fully online college. The Chancellor formed a taskforce -- Flex Learning Options for Workers (FLOW) – to address how best to accomplish this request. Aschenbach, Pilati, and a distance coordinator from Lake Tahoe have been appointed to this group.

The Workgroup on Regulations (often referred to as the “Sacred Cow” workgroup) was formed under Chancellor Brice Harris to address the FON, 75/25 ratio, and the 50% law. The Workgroup will begin to meet again this fall in an effort to accomplish its goal by the end of the academic year. The group established baseline agreements before the work stopped. For example, the group agreed that counselors and librarians should be part of the instructional side of the 50% law and might be included with an increase in the percentage. Bruno noted that the proposal that the workgroup developed last year was included in the March 2016 Consultation Council agenda and encouraged those interested to review the attachment to the item.

Adams reported that she and Bruno met with Executive Vice Chancellor Hope to discuss C-ID, UC Transfer Pathways MOU, and military prior learning. The ASCCC has agreed to research national and statewide efforts to recognize military prior learning on California community colleges.

Adams acknowledged that there is an item on guided pathways later on the agenda but commented that the work on Guided Pathways has been all consuming with weekly calls, regular meetings, numerous emails, and other work related to recruiting faculty.

Adams reported on C-ID and a change in how C-ID will address CTE. She has had several conversations with regional consortium representatives and sector navigators regarding refocusing the C-ID CTE work from the development of descriptors and model curriculum to working with industry to develop the competencies and skills needed for students who receive a certificate. The Model Curriculum Workgroup discussed the concept and was in agreement with the modification in how C-ID addressed CTE. Adams attended the Sector Navigators meeting to present the new direction, which was well received by the group. A pilot has been scheduled in October for medical assisting.

Adams and Aschenbach had a conversation with the Chair Academy regarding the potential to offer leadership training to CCC. Adams was approached by a dean at Golden West College regarding the potential to offer training to CCC department chairs, who he felt most of the time did not receive coordinated professional development prior to assuming the role. During the conversation, the dean introduced Adams and Aschenbach to a representative of the Chair Academy (<http://www.chairacademy.com/>), which is an organization that offers leadership training to community colleges. Both Adams and Aschenbach felt that their proposal was worthy of consideration and will discuss the idea with the Faculty Development Committee prior to bringing it to the Executive Committee for consideration.

Adams informed members that she has discussed with 3CSN an augmentation of the LACCD grant. In negotiating with 3CSN, they have agreed to hold the Part-time Leadership Institute for 2018 and to provide \$75,000 to the noncredit event. She will revise the contract and update the budget to recognize this change.

Adams noted that she attended a variety of other meetings such as the Chancellor's Office Legislative and Budget meeting, Technology Mapping meeting which discussed mapping technology against guided pathways, UC Transfer Pathways, Events, and Foundation meetings.

Adams updated members on operational issues. She, the Office Manager, and the Communications and Development Director attended the American Society of Association Executive conference for professional development. A report of the training will be forthcoming.

The ASCCC audit will begin the week of September 18, 2017. All the planning has been completed and staff is prepared for the audit.

Adams has been training staff to assume operational tasks, particularly the associate director to assume many of the high level operational tasks. Staff is also being trained on the ASCCC appointment process.

Adams is working on finalizing two Professional Development College courses. They are the courses on new faculty orientation and teaching incarcerated students. These courses should be posted next week.

## **B. Foundation President's Report**

Rutan noted that the Foundation Board of Directors is updating the Foundation's strategic plan, which will come to the Executive Committee for approval. He reminded members that the Foundation has three current research projects. One project, for which the Foundation is seeking \$175,000, is to fund research and the development of data-informed resources for effective practices in recruiting, hiring, and retaining faculty of color. A letter of interest has been sent to potential funders. The other two research projects approved by the Foundation Board of Directors and the Executive Committee are STEM interventions for CCC and K-12 teachers and Multiple Measures effective practices. The letters of intent should be developed this month.

The Foundation will hold elections for two positions on the Foundation Board. The terms were staggered so that there would only be one position each fall; however, one of the directors resigned because she became a dean so this year there will be two positions open. Rutan requested that the Area Representatives add to their Area meeting agenda an announcement about the open position. Staff will also be developing an announcement to go out via the listserv.

The Foundation approved an Area Competition for the Ostrich plaque, which will be opened on the first day of plenary session rather than prior to the Area meetings. By opening the campaign the first day of plenary, the Foundation Board hopes that other areas will be provided an opportunity to compete. Last year when the competition opened prior to the Area Meetings, Area D donated immediately and other areas could not catch up, which may have affected the competition. For this campaign, the Foundation Board has budgeted to exceed the \$4,000 amount received last year by \$2,000. There is also a campaign to increase the number of individuals who donate to the Foundation's 10 + 1 fund raising goal. Currently, the contributors are current or prior Executive Committee and a few faculty members. The Foundation Board would like to grow the number of people who donate on an ongoing basis.

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

Liaisons from the following organizations are invited to provide the Executive Committee with updates related to their organization: AAUP, CCA, CCCI, CFT, CIO, FACCC, and the Student Senate.

FACCC Liaison Troy Myers informed members that FACCC has a new president--Adam Wetsman. Wetsman has decided that the FACCC liaisons will change based on location within the state to save travel funds. FACCC Board members in the north will go to Executive Committee meetings in the north and those in the south will attend meetings in the south.

Myers updated members on the FACCC activities and issues currently under discussion including their letter in support of Deferred Action for Children of Arrivals (DACA) students, the FACCC Board meeting is September 14<sup>th</sup> at Sacramento City, and other topics they are monitoring.

Gregory Anderson updated members on CIO activities. The CIOs are deeply concerned about the actions on DACA. The CIO Board is actively working on planning their conference.

#### **IV. ACTION ITEMS**

##### **A. Legislative Update**

The Executive Committee was updated on recent legislative activities. Members discussed AB 705 (Irwin, July 19, 2017) in detail. In addition to submitting a letter of opposition to the Senate Education Committee in June, the president and vice president have been working with the author's office to address concerns of the faculty based on Resolution 6.04 S17. The author included language that addresses a student who might not need transfer level English and math but may instead be pursuing an educational goal which requires college level English or math. However, another issue with the language was discovered. The bill language may affect Title 5 §55003 regarding policies for prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories. This language could be interpreted to supersede current regulation regarding curricular processes for not only sequential courses in English or mathematics, but also courses in other disciplines that may have a remedial mathematics or English prerequisite. The author's office informed the president that their stakeholders were not supportive of any change to the legislative language and informed Bruno that the stakeholders supporting the language is the California Acceleration Project (CAP). Stanskas contacted the representatives of CAP and both parties came to an agreement about possible language that would address the ASCCC concerns and meet the needs of CAP. This language was provided to the author's staff for consideration.

The president requested, through the author's office, a legal opinion from Legislative Counsel regarding subsection 78213 (d)(2) to clarify how this section might interact with current Title 5 regulation. The author's office declined to seek an opinion from Legislative Counsel. The president also spoke with the Chancellor's Office Legal Counsel to seek similar interpretation. In conversations with legal counsel it was noted that if the legislation is signed by the governor, the ASCCC still has the opportunity to influence any Title 5 regulations that are needed to implement Education Code through 5C and the Board of Governors.

Recently, the president reached out to the author's office again as well as the consultant to the Higher Education Committee. Bruno requested that the author's office include a note to the journal stating the intent of the legislation to clarify points of concern. There was no response from the author's office but the president has heard from the consultant. The Executive Committee must decide if the ASCCC will send a letter to the governor opposing the bill.

There is a concern, expressed by CAP, that colleges are using assessment for placement results as a skill validation tool compared to the curriculum created by the college, instead of using assessment for placement results as a measure of where the student can be successful in the curriculum.

**MSC (Beach/May) to continue to oppose AB 705 (Irwin, July 19, 2017) by writing a letter to the governor in order to uphold our existing positions in resolution 9.05 F09 as well as our positions established through *Implementing Content Review for Communication and Computation Prerequisites and Student Success: The Case for Establishing Prerequisites through Content Review* paper.**

**Action:**

A letter of opposition will be sent to the governor addressing our concerns.

**B. Fall Plenary Planning**

The Executive Committee discussed possible keynote presentations and the preliminary program for the 2017 Fall Plenary Session.

**MSC (Freitas/Slattery-Farrell) to approve the 2017 Fall Plenary Session.**

**Action:**

The preliminary program will be posted on the website and circulated to the field.

**C. Collaborative Institute**

The Executive Committee discussed whether to offer a single, integrated institute in 2017-2018 in lieu of separate events for CTE Leadership and Noncredit. Historically, the ASCCC has held a CTE Leadership Institute for many years and recently held the first joint Noncredit Summit with the Chancellor's Office, Association of Community and Continuing Education (ACCE), and 3CSN. The Executive Committee also discussed at the May and June Executive Committee meetings adding an Adult Education Block Grant (AEBG) and CTE strand to a future Noncredit Summit. The chairs and seconds of the CTE Leadership and Noncredit Committees met to explore the option of combining both events and proposed a structure that would focus on integration of noncredit, CTE, and adult education into one event. Members discussed the pro and cons of holding an integrated event.

Concern was raised about whether or not the scale of the audience proposed of 500 is realistic given that this is a new event for the ASCCC. While we have held a CTE event, this would be the first combined event so we should be conservative regarding attendance expectation and budget. A question was raised about whether or not this event would compete with other events, particularly ACCE. The committees have reached out to colleges to determine interest in this new institute and the response has been positive and supportive.

Adams presented information regarding the budget. The current proposal is based on receiving \$150,000 from the Chancellor's Office--\$75,000 from Economic Workforce Division and \$75,000 from Basic Skills. Adams was able to negotiate the \$75,000 from Basic Skills. She shared with members what the costs to the attendees would be if we received \$75,000 or \$150,000. If only the \$75,000 is received then there would be a minimal cost to the attendees -- \$225 for early registration. If the additional \$75,000 is received then the costs for attendance



would be free or minimal.

By consensus, a fee will be charged to attendees to cover the costs of holding the event since the ASCCC has received a \$75,000 subsidy for the noncredit summit through the Chancellor's Office. A request will be made to the Executive Vice Chancellor of Economic Development and Technology to subsidize a portion of the event. If the Chancellor's Office provides funding, then the registration fee could be reduced to a minimal fee.

**MSC (Rutan/Davison) to approve the Collaborative Institute with 400 attendees on May 4 – 5, 2017.**

**Action**

- Staff will begin seeking locations for the event with Riverside Convention Center as the first option.
- A subgroup of the CTE Leadership and the Noncredit Committees will be formed with the addition of representatives from 3CSN, the Chancellor's Office, and ACCE to plan the event.
- Event marketing will begin once the event location is identified and registration is open.

**D. OER Task Force – Report and Discipline Survey**

The OER Task Force Chair, Dave Dillon, updated members on the work of the OER Task Force. The task force has accomplished a number of tasks since formed in spring last year including the creation of an OER listserv, which has served as a great resource for gathering more information about OER, and conducted a need assessment. The needs assessment received 31 responses. As assumed, some colleges are doing well on developing OER materials while others are not. The most common responses to the needs assessment are as follows:

- colleges need help finding OER resources. Librarians are generally the ones who are charged to assist in this area and are doing a good job collecting the information;
- faculty want to use OER but their specific textbooks are not available or there is not enough time or funds to create the space for faculty to develop OER materials; and
- ancillaries' resources are a common need noted in the needs survey.

Dillon informed members that he is collaborating with the Chancellor's Office technical assistance providers for Zero Textbook Cost Degree (ZTC-Degree) to ensure that similar messages are provided and that overlapping events are coordinated. The technical assistance providers are also holding regional workshops and it will be important that the ASCCC coordinates its OER work with that of the ZTC-Degree. He then updated members on the planning for the ASCCC regional meetings, on the work of the task force members in archiving OER materials, and on the conversations surrounding the development of activities associated with professional development related to OER.

Members discussed the charge of the taskforce. The task force main goal is to

develop a plan for how to address the needs of California community colleges related to OER. The plan should consider if we build a repository ourselves or use an existing repository such as Merlot and request modification to meet our needs. The taskforce should recommend to the Executive Committee a plan of action with supporting pro and con comments about what would be effective or not.

Dillon then shared with the Executive Committee a survey developed by the task force to gather information to assist with assessing the current use of OER and the associated challenges with that use. The results of the survey will inform the plan. Members provided feedback on the survey.

**MSC (Freitas/Roberson) to approve the survey as amended.**

**E. 2017-2018 Academic Academy**

The Executive Committee was updated on a conversation with the TASSC and EDAC representatives on offering an Academic Academy in 2017-2018. The last two Academic Academies were combined with EDAC and TASSC developing the program. TASSC members discussed the Academic Academy and commented that there is no event for counselors; however, they did not identify areas that would require an institute. The Executive Committee previously discussed the idea of holding regional meetings on the role of student services faculty in guided pathways. The Executive Committee has also supported the concept that counselor topics should be imbedded in all events.

One possible use of the Academic Academy might be in the area of math, quantitative reasoning, general education, and discipline specific conversations. The Executive Committee previously discussed the possibility of holding series of regional meetings in the spring focused on the recent changes in computational requirement of CSU. The president has sent a request to CMC<sup>3</sup> to develop a joint taskforce to address issues related to the changes in intermediate algebra by CSU. Pending their response, the ASCCC might consider using C-ID funds to facilitate such a discussion. This idea will be revisited after CMC<sup>3</sup> Board decision, GEAC meeting, and ICAS meeting.

It was suggested that TASSC consider getting involved with the California Collaborative Advising and Counseling Conference. An announcement was sent out requesting proposals for this event. Adams also noted that the 4CG has shared an interest in working with the ASCCC to hold a counseling event. Beach will explore possible involvement with the California Collaborate Advising and Counseling Conference and Adams will follow up with 4CG.

No action was taken on this item.

**F. ADT Course Substitution Paper**

The Executive Committee discussed the Course Substitution for Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) paper written by the C-ID Articulation Officers subgroup and suggested modifications. Last year TASSC did not meet and there was some urgency to response to Resolution 9.11 S16, which required the ASCCC to

“develop by Spring 2017 resources that provide guidance to local senates on effective practices for the appropriate use of course substitutions by students who have transferred between colleges and who intend to earn an Associate Degree for Transfer while ensuring that the integrity of the degree is not compromised.” Bruno asked the C-ID AO subgroup to begin drafting the paper with the understanding that once the paper was drafted it would be given to TASSC to be finalized.

The Executive Committee discussed whether or not the paper should be a white paper approved by the Executive Committee or an adopted position paper by the delegates. It was noted that the first paper on reciprocity was approved by the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup and was sufficient for the intended purposes. However, there are good reasons why this one should be approved by the delegates including asserting that this is policy for the California community colleges rather than an intersegmental policy.

The consensus was that the paper is not quite ready for adoption by the body. The Executive Committee considered whether to make it a white paper now and bring back in fall as a position paper. However, it was determined that if it is a white paper, then the examples should be integrated into the body of the paper rather than as an appendix. Another option is to publish the appendix on the C-ID Resource page and then work on a position paper. It was suggested that if the appendix is to be posted on the C-ID website, it should be reordered by themes to make it easier to read.

**MSC (Rutan/Freitas) to publish the scenarios (appendix) on the C-ID website under the Articulation Officers Resources page and link the scenarios thematically to the seven guidelines bulleted list from the 2013 course reciprocity document. Each scenario would be linked to one of those seven bulleted principles and organized by theme. TASSC will use the draft to develop a position paper by Spring 2018.**

#### **G. ASCCC Communication Plan**

The Executive Committee discussed a draft communication plan for the ASCCC. The plan is intended to support the objectives and goals of the ASCCC and the Academic Senate Foundation through the promotion of the ASCCC programs and advocacy work. Members provided feedback including splitting the plan into two documents. One document would be public and the other one would be operational. The operational document would be expanded to include how to communicate with Areas, committees, and presenters at events. This item will return to another meeting for approval. The agenda item will also include a discussion on whether the Executive Committee would like to brand emails, Power Point presentations, and committee agendas and minutes.

No action was taken on this item. The communication plan will return to another meeting for consideration for approval.

## **H. Succession Planning and Next Steps**

Members discussed the next steps in succession planning. Adams will bring back a timeline in a decision tree format of the hiring process for the executive director including options for a possible search company and taking into consideration the emergency transition plan. The Executive Director evaluation instrument and goals will come to the September 29 – 30 meeting. Bruno and Adams will discuss the evaluation tool.

**MSC (Slattery-Farrell/McKay) to create a decision tree, provide list of resources (search firms, etc.), and a timeline for pre-recruitment, hiring, onboarding, and Executive Director evaluation process.**

Bruno informed members of the current agreement with Adams on the evaluation process for the Executive Director evaluation. Currently, the contract language states that the officers and one elected Executive Committee member would evaluate the Executive Director, which is not what has been done in the past. Bruno and Adams will discuss the evaluation process including the evaluation tool.

**MSC (Slattery-Farrell/Davison) to bring the evaluation tool, the contract and the addendum, and process for evaluating the executive director.**

Members discussed the evaluation of the Executive Committee. The last evaluation of the Executive Committee was conducted for the purposes of the Periodic Review. By consensus, a process will be developed to evaluate the Executive Committee on a regular basis.

**MSC (May/Rutan) to bring periodic review instrument options and policy for Board evaluations, process, and tools to a future meeting.**

### **Action:**

- Adams will develop a timeline in a decision tree format of the hiring process for the Executive Director. Timeline will include pre-recruiting, hiring, onboarding, and evaluation process as well as a list of resources.
- Bruno and Adams will work on the evaluation process and a negotiate a possible revision to the addendum if needed.
- Bruno to bring a process and policy for evaluation of the Executive Committee at a future meeting.

## **I. Vision for Success**

The Executive Committee discussed the System's Vision for Success goals and commitments. While the Board of Governors has not yet approved the goals, Bruno felt that there would not be significant concerns from them on adopting the vision and goals. Members were updated on the discussions the Board of Governors had at several workgroup meetings across the state. Members raised concerns that the recommendations and goals may be unattainable or may harm students, particularly since there is limited or no data or research associated with

many of the vision goals. Members were cautioned that there are political concerns associated with the Vision for Success and that the ASCCC should approach the goals with care.

## **V. DISCUSSION**

### **A. Chancellor's Office Liaison Report**

Vice Chancellor Laura Hope provided Executive Committee members with an update of system-wide issues and projects. She noted how proud she was that the Chancellor responded so quickly to the actions by the White House on DACA student. The Chancellor immediately communicated concern for our students, legal counsel quickly provided advice, and the public information officers were provided with talking points. The Chancellor's response was quick and vigorous. The Chancellor is also asking the Board of Trustees to adopt similar positions locally and will be going to Washington to lobby on behalf of our DACA students.

Hope noted that the Guided Pathways Award program will be moving from IEPI to the Educational Services and Support Division. This seems to make sense since guided pathways is more of educational policy rather than institutional effectiveness. In the reorganization of the Guided Pathways Award Program, a comprehensive advisory group will be formed with several smaller workgroups to inform the advisory group. IEPI, however, will continue to hold workshops on guided pathways.

Hope is working with the Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness Theresa Tena to create "on demand" training for guided pathways. She would like the ASCCC to assist with developing modules or some type of training to guide the field in engaging in conversations about guided pathways. There are a number of efforts to select individuals to assist colleges in the guided pathways work. Hope will work with the ASCCC to identify faculty to serve on both the guided pathway advisory and workgroups.

Bruno added to Hope's report that many of our Executive Committee members are involved in developing the Applied Solution Kits as well as serving on taskforces and workgroups. In addition, the ASCCC has recruited faculty to act as peer coaches, facilitators, and experts to assist in this work. She reported that the ASCCC will need many more representatives as we have received many questions and requests for presentations from the field. The Academic Senate's work will align nicely with the work of the Chancellor's Office.

Hope noted that in the past, colleges were asked to submit reports to the Chancellor's Office but the college would not necessarily receive feedback or suggestion about how to improve their activities. The Chancellor's Office plans to have the guided pathways workplan be a conversational process where a team will review the plans and provide feedback to the colleges including accolades where they are doing well and where they might improve.

Hope informed members about discussions surrounding the Chancellor's Office guidance on the CSU Executive Order 1100 and 1110 regarding the elimination of intermediate algebra for all disciplines other than science, technology, engineering, and math. The advice provided was for colleges to discuss the Executive Orders and possible implications but not to necessarily make any changes until further information has been provided by CSU. Bruno added that the ASCCC is going to work with CMC<sup>3</sup> to develop a task force to consider the challenges and opportunities with this change.

Hope updated members on current discussion on C-ID CTE and Credit for Military Prior Learning. Some colleges have a robust method of recognizing prior learning for the military while others do not. The ASCCC is going to do some research in this area under the guise of C-ID. The governor's budget had \$10 million for Veteran's Centers which could help with this work. There's also a strong advocate on the Board of Governors who is interested in the prior learning policies so it is better for CO and ASCCC to get ahead of this work.

Hope reported that there have been some challenges with the implementation of Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory (COCI). The system experienced a crash with a loss of functionality, which took time to get it up and running effectively and efficiently. The Chancellor's Office staff and Technology Center are discussing the issues and possible fixes. There will be a notification sent to colleges regarding the fixes. The Chancellor's Office has created a new protocol to test and communicate with the field. Hope is confident that the new protocol will prevent miscommunication. It is expected that the new system will not be complete until the end of fall semester.

**B. Board of Governors/Consultation Council**

The Board of Governors and Consultation Council has not met since the last Executive Committee meeting. No report.

**C. Guided Pathways**

The work of Guided Pathways has been challenging because the Chancellor's Office is undergoing a reorganization. While there is some agreement that the Career Ladders Project, RP Group, and ASCCC will manage the support to colleges in implementing Guided Pathways, the Chancellor's Office is still determining the role each division will play in Guided Pathways. For example, Guided Pathways was initially assigned to IEPI but had been reassigned to the Educational Services and Support Division. In addition, the Chancellor's Office is taking a greater role in oversight of the program, which has caused some confusion with determining who is responsible for what decision.

Bruno noted that the Guided Pathway Assessment tool is now available online and is due from colleges in November. The Assessment tool was developed by ASCCC, CLP, and the RP Group with input from the Chancellor's Office, Student Success Center and other stakeholders. The planning tool is in the development process and will be due from colleges in February. There are conversations about how much the three American Association of Community

colleges and 20 California Guided Pathways Project colleges will need to participate in completing the assessment and planning tools since they have different structures and requirements. The goal is to have these colleges participate in the assessment and plan at a minimal level to reduce duplication while still collecting the data to inform statewide goals.

CIO Anderson noted that there have been many conversations with constituent groups that the Guided Pathway funding is permissive, which is similar to the Strong Workforce funds but unlike the SSSP and Equity funding.

**D. UC Transfer Pathways**

Members were informed that the CCC and UC systems are engaged in a pilot project to provide CCC students with a guaranteed pathway to UC in chemistry and physics. A degree template has been developed by the Chancellor's Office and there is an MOU in process. However, the MOU is stalled because the CCC and UC system offices have been working on a broader MOU, which requires more negotiation. The chemistry and physics faculty in the two systems are in agreement on the pilot. Currently, we are waiting for UC to determine the GPA they would require students to have to be guaranteed a spot in the UC System. Bruno and Adams have also created possible phases for future CCC/UC pathways alignment.

**E. Meeting Debrief**

The Executive Committee debriefed the meeting discussing what worked well and where improvements may be made in the future.

**VI. REPORTS** *(If time permits, additional Executive Committee announcements and reports may be provided)*

**A. Standing Committee Minutes**

- i. Accreditation Committee Meeting, May
- ii. Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Committee Meeting, Beach
- iii. Noncredit Committee, Freitas

**B. Liaison Reports**

- i. IEPI ASK, May

**C. Senate and Grant Reports**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by  
Ashley Fisher, Executive Assistant  
Julie Adams, Executive Director  
Dolores Davison, Secretary