# SenateRostrum

STRATEGIC PLANNING

LEADERSHIP

ACADEMIC SUCCESS

# What to Be, Where to Go

by David Morse

A New Assessment for All Students **p3**

The Challenges of Student Equity Plans **p5**

## also in this issue

# What to Be, Where to Go

## The ASCCC 2014-15 Strategic Planning Process

by David Morse, President

Any strong organization or institution should take careful thought for its own future direction, determining in a deliberate and explicit manner what it wants to achieve and what it wants to be. For this reason, strategic planning is a concept discussed throughout the California community college system, from the Board of Governors down to the level of local colleges and even individual departments. Likewise, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges should have a vision for the future and a plan for achieving that vision, and therefore the ASCCC Executive Committee has begun a strategic planning process that will be informed and guided by the will of local senate leaders and faculty throughout the system.

The ASCCC's strategic planning process began at a special meeting of the Executive Committee on September 6, 2014. The meeting was facilitated by Steven Weiss of the Weiss Group, a Sacramento-based strategic consulting firm. Weiss and his company have experience working with the Los Rios District and other higher education institutions, so he is not a stranger to community college processes and issues.

The meeting began with Weiss stating a very simple principle: "The best time to start a planning process is when things are going well." With the current positive energy within the ASCCC Executive Committee and an improving economic climate in the state as a whole, this statement was easy to apply to the Academic Senate in this moment. Weiss then mapped out a process for developing a strategic plan, noting clearly that his group would "provide a framework but this is your work—you wrote it, you own it" and stressing the importance of creating a plan that is "authentic to your organization." With this background, the Executive Committee spent several hours developing the initial elements of a draft plan that could, after further consideration in October, be presented for input and revision by the attendees of the Fall Plenary Session.

By the end of the special meeting, the Executive Committee had developed five draft goals addressing areas such as equity and diversity, communication, fiscal stability, and the role of the Academic Senate in statewide discussions of educational policy and faculty professional development. These broad goals were then assigned to a sub-group for wordsmithing, to be returned for further discussion at an extended Executive Committee meeting on October 10-12. At the October meeting, Executive Committee members will again consider the draft goals and will also draft objectives through which the organization's success in achieving the goals can be assessed.

The draft goals and objectives will be presented for input and discussion in a breakout at the Fall Plenary Session. Attendees will have the opportunity to critique the work done by the Executive Committee and to offer suggestions for modifications or additions. Discussion at the breakout will also serve to begin drafting strategies through which the goals and objectives can be pursued. In addition, the draft goals and objectives will be published for vetting electronically so that faculty throughout the state can examine them and offer input.

The product developed at the plenary breakout and through the electronic vetting process will be discussed and modified as necessary at a special meeting of the Executive Committee on December 6, at which time the strategies will also be further developed. In the spring, the draft plan of goals, objectives, and strategies will be further refined and will again be published for input, with the final draft being submitted for approval by the ASCCC body at the Spring 2015 Plenary Session.

The Executive Committee considers this planning process to be of great importance. The strategic plan will help the organization to more effectively identify opportunities for the Academic Senate to benefit faculty and students. It will strengthen engagement within the Executive Committee and with the faculty statewide that we serve, and it will provide greater transparency and accountability in the Senate's decision making.

The plan will also provide direction regarding what the ASCCC wants to be and how it wants to operate. It will allow the Academic Senate to develop its own consciously chosen image, both for itself and for our system partners, the legislature, and others. More importantly, because the plan will be constructed through input from the faculty statewide and approved by the delegates at the plenary session, that direction and image will be determined not by the Executive Committee itself but by the faculty that we serve.

A question was raised in the September meeting regarding what would happen if a new president is elected who has a different vision from that of the current president or the current Executive Committee. Certainly the strategic plan should be written broadly enough to allow for new leaders to pursue the Senate's goals in their own ways, and the plan should always be subject to discussion and revision if a need arises. As Weiss noted at the September meeting, strategic plans should be "dynamic, living documents, not rigid or 'set in stone.'" However, if the plan is to be approved by the delegates at plenary, then no new president or other individual should be able to truly change the goals or structure of the organization without first receiving support for the change from the body. The direction and image of the ASCCC should never be determined by the president; they should reflect the will of the faculty statewide as represented by the plenary delegates.

In this way, one of the greatest benefits of the strategic planning process is to provide stability for the organization. No matter who the elected leaders of the ASCCC may be, their primary obligation should be to serve the will of the faculty as indicated through the resolutions process at plenary sessions. The strategic plan will be a broad expression of the faculty's voice and of the direction in which faculty want the organization to move, and it will help to ensure that this obligation to uphold that direction is respected by ASCCC leaders.

The Executive Committee encourages attendees at the plenary session to join us for the strategic planning breakout, to discuss the plan with us, and to participate in the electronic vetting of the draft goals and objectives when they become available. In order to be effective and useful, the plan must reflect the will and the voice of the faculty statewide. Only with your input and assistance will the ASCCC be able to develop a plan that truly achieves this purpose. 🐦

# A New Assessment for All Community College Students

by Craig Rutan, South Representative, Common Assessment Initiative Steering Committee Vice Chair

Students come to California community colleges with various backgrounds. Some come straight from high school, while others may have a long gap in their education. Some students take many honors and advanced placement courses in high school, while for others basic English or math might be more challenging. No matter what background a student has, he or she is put through an assessment process upon enrolling at a community college campus. This local process usually involves an assessment test and other measures that the college uses to determine the most appropriate math and English courses for a particular student. If that student decides to go to a different college, he or she often has to go through the assessment and placement process again because colleges have developed unique assessment processes that do not always transfer from one campus to another.

A common question raised in the California Community College (CCC) System for the past several years is whether we could develop a way for students' assessments to move with them from one campus to another. To assist students when they move among campuses, the 2011 CCC Student Success Task Force, in Recommendation 2.1, stated, "Community colleges will develop and implement a common centralized assessment for English reading and writing, mathematics, and ESL." The Common Assessment Initiative (CAI) was established to create this common assessment system for all community colleges.

The assessment will include an adaptive test in English, ESL, and mathematics and a set of multiple measures validated by the Chancellor's Office that colleges can use to place students. The CAI is intended to create a common assessment system, not a system for common placement. The determination of cut scores and placement of students into courses is a local decision.

No matter how well any current local assessment process is working, all colleges need to be aware of developments regarding the common assessment. The common assessment will give students the opportunity to move their assessment profile from one campus to another, but that ease of movement is only possible if all of the colleges are using the new system. SB1456 requires colleges to use the common assessment or lose their Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) funding. Even if a college believes that its current assessment process is effective, it is unlikely they would choose to forfeit these funds. Since every college will be using the new assessment, this common system must give colleges all of the information they need to properly assess and place students.

The CAI is directed by a steering committee that consists of representatives from the ASCCC, the RP Group, the Chancellor's Office, Trustees, the Chief Executive Officers, the Chief Instructional Officers, the Chief Student Services Officers, the Chief Technology Officers, CalPass Plus, and the Student Senate for California Community Colleges. The steering committee oversees the

entire project, including workgroups that are considering various content areas (English, ESL, and mathematics), multiple measures, the test development process, the vendor selection, and professional development. Each of the workgroups is assigned a specific aspect of the assessment instrument or process, and the steering committee is tasked with bringing all of those pieces together.

The first meeting of the steering committee was in March, and much has happened in the six months since that meeting. Some of the accomplishments are as follows:

- **The colleges responsible** for piloting the assessment have been selected. These colleges will be responsible for testing the new assessment technology and helping in the validation of the items included in the assessment. The pilot colleges are

  Bakersfield College
  Butte College
  Chaffey College
  DeAnza College
  Delta College
  Diablo Valley College
  Fresno City College
  Rio Hondo College
  Sacramento City College
  Saddleback College
  Santa Monica College
  West Los Angeles College

- **A Request for Information (RFI)** was distributed to vendors to determine what would be possible for the assessment test. This RFI sought to discover innovations that were now possible since the last RFI for an assessment system in 2009. Some of the possible innovations include the ability to set different starting points based on student preparation, incorporating pre-tests that could direct students to tutorials, the ability for students to show their work in mathematical calculations, and tutorials inside of the test to remind students of concepts they might have forgotten. These

innovations might not all be part of the common assessment, but they offer an idea of what might be possible as the system is being developed.

- **Workgroups for English, ESL,** and mathematics met over the summer to develop the assessment competencies that will be incorporated into the Request for Proposals (RFP). These competencies are designed to look at a continuum of skills in math, English, and ESL. The competencies are based on the CB21 rubrics, the ESL test specifications, common core standards, and the smarter balanced assessments. The competencies will be vetted from October 6 through November 15.

- **A Request for Proposals (RFP)** will be distributed to vendors around December 1. A RFP and Vendor Selection workgroup has been created to develop the RFP using the competencies developed by the workgroups and to select the vendor or vendors for the assessment system. This group will include members of the CAI steering committee, the pilot colleges, and the CAI workgroups.

- **Pilot colleges will begin** testing pieces of the assessment in Fall 2015.

- **The Common Assessment** will be available to colleges beginning in Spring 2016 for placement of students for Fall 2016.

Local senate leaders should stay involved and informed about the Common Assessment Initiative. To do so, any interested individual can go to asccc.org and sign up for the ASCCC's discipline listservs. Subscribing to the listservs is the best way to make sure one is receiving important emails. Faculty who wish to be considered for involvement in future aspects of the CAI can also submit an application to serve on the ASCCC website. Additional information about common assessment can be found at *cccassess.org*. Common assessment will change many things for our students and our colleges, and faculty throughout the state need to work together to make the system as comprehensive as possible.

# The Challenges of Student Equity Plans

by James Todd, Area A Representative, Chair, Equity and Diversity Action Committee
Carolyn Holcroft, Foothill College, Equity and Diversity Action Committee
Corinna Evett, Santiago Canyon College, Equity and Diversity Action Committee

The dialog heard at the Fall ASCCC Student Equity and Success Regional Meetings proved one thing: While Student Equity Plans are in varying stages of completion throughout community colleges across California, nearly every campus now faces the daunting challenge of simultaneously tackling the achievement gap and overall student success for all our local student populations. Planning meaningful ways to address local achievement gaps while also trying to create best practices to help all students complete their educational goals requires careful consideration among constituent groups. Efforts to mitigate disproportionate impact must be embedded throughout Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) plans as well as with other categorical plans and programs, such as local Basic Skills Plans. Faculty are essential to the success of these efforts. With such monumental planning and implementation work to be done, local academic senates must be effectively engaged and colleges must utilize clearly defined shared governance procedures to best advocate for student success.

With the deadlines for several plans—including the SSSP and Basic Skills Initiative plans—hitting campuses in close succession, established shared governance timelines may be challenged, and local academic senates can feel pressed for time. Given that these plans require the involvement of administration, staff, students, and faculty, one of the bits of good news that came in September was the extension of the deadline for Student Equity Plans: they are now due January 1, 2015. This extension provides a welcome bit of breathing room while colleges continue their planning efforts. Improving equity is a difficult project, and time is needed to wrestle with the concept in order to come to a clear understanding of what equity means as well as how equity ought to work on a practical level. While equality refers to ensuring similar treatment and resources for all, equity means that all populations reach the same outcome, which in this case is student success. With this definition in mind, colleges must now plan how they will mitigate disproportionate impact, tackling the evidential and structural conditions that disproportionately affect target student populations in the areas of access, course completion, ESL and basic skills completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer rates.

Importantly, we are witnessing history in terms of student equity efforts. The SB 860 budget trailer bill in June put in statute the requirement

that all colleges develop and maintain a Student Equity Plan in order to receive SSSP funds, which had previously only been in Title 5 regulation. We now also have legislation for $70 million in equity funding for California community colleges with the most funding going to the neediest districts. However, this legislation also increased the number of distinct populations colleges must analyze in their Student Equity Plans, for plans must now include analysis of students disaggregated along gender lines and include ethnic and gender subpopulations, veterans, low-income-students, foster youth, and students with disabilities. Because these changes in plan requirements came several months after colleges received the equity plan template, the template does not align with what is now in law. Rather than having to redo plans before January 2015, however, colleges are expected to be allowed to submit an additional outline for how they will address these new requirements going forward and should receive further instructions from the Chancellor's Office within the next two months.

Local academic senates must stay engaged in conversations regarding these plans. Per Title 5 §53200 and the 10+1 areas of academic and professional matters, faculty have the right to make recommendations regarding student success, assessment and placement, and professional development. Therefore, faculty must participate in local discussions related to planning and writing their campus SSSP, Basic Skills, and Student Equity Plans. In addition to having informed faculty serving on shared governance committees, local academic senates should also provide time during academic senate meetings when faculty can more pointedly discuss various goals and activities delineated in these plans. Since local senates now have until January to finalize their Student Equity Plans, senates can take advantage of the extra time to ensure that faculty voices join those of administrators, classified staff, and students in the creation of such significant

planning for equity in student success. On many campuses, the accelerated deadlines for the SSSP or Basic Skills Plan interfered with normal shared governance process timelines, and faculty were not provided an appropriate opportunity to participate in planning. Going forward, to prevent similar situations in the future, local senates should work with administrators to review effective shared governance practices and ensure early communication and inclusion. This moment is an opportune time to progress toward a campus culture where collaboration between senates, staff, and administrators is the natural, default approach, rather than perpetuating the longstanding tradition of working in the silos that undermines all of our efforts.

As colleges commit to improving student equity with specific goals and interventions in their Student Equity Plans, they must also make determinations as to how their state-allocated equity funds will be spent. Local academic senates should fully engage in their local participatory governance procedures pertaining to planning and budgeting so that faculty can contribute to informing decision-making related to the spending of equity funds. All equity fund expenditures must come from goals and plans documented in Student Equity Plans. Most broadly speaking, funds should be focused on the areas where the greatest achievement gaps are identified without negatively impacting other student groups. Another guiding principle to consider is spending funds on data-backed interventions that most directly impact students.

Undeniably, the rather sudden requirements to simultaneously produce a Student Equity Plan and an SSSP plan have created stress for faculty in California community colleges. Overall, though, local senates should recognize this unprecedented opportunity to increase collaboration among faculty, staff, administrators, and students to positively

impact student success. Research strongly suggests that these projects do not need to start from scratch; rather, resources already exist, such as "A Matter of Degrees" from the Center for Community College Student Engagement[1] and "Student Support (Re)defined"[2] from the RP Group, that identify practices known to be effective. In addition, the state has provided funds to assist colleges with exploring and implementing new interventions on their campuses. Finally, with this focus on equity that includes identifying and removing achievement gaps, faculty have a practical way of realizing the primary mission of California community colleges: providing access to higher education for all of California's citizens.

To access your copy of the Student Equity Template, as well as to find more information including guidelines and how to understand disproportionate impact, go to: *extranet.cccco. edu/Divisions/StudentServices/ StudentEquity.aspx*

---

1   Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2013). A matter of degrees: Engaging practices, engaging students (high-impact practices for community college student engagement). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Community College Leadership Program retrieved from *www.ccsse. org/docs/Matter_of_Degrees_2.pdf*

2   *www.rpgroup.org/system/files/Literature%20Review%20Brief%20FINAL.pdf*

# Success of Latino Student Achievement

by James Todd, Area A Representative Chair, Equity and Diversity Action Committee

Jeff Burdick, Clovis Community College Center, Equity and Diversity Action Committee

The Equity and Diversity Action Committee (EDAC), which was reinstated for 2014-15 as a standing committee of ASCCC, has been charged with responding to Resolution 13.06, "Success of Latino Student Achievement," from Spring 2012 Plenary. The resolved clauses are as follows:

*Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges identify appropriate structures to support current and emerging Hispanic Serving Institutions in meeting the needs of Latino students and increasing their success, and report the findings to the body; and*

*Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support closing the achievement gap for all students.*

While researching the available literature, EDAC found an informative, critical research document that addresses Latino college success directly. The publication is by the initiative Excelencia in Education and is entitled, *What Works for Latino Students in Higher Education: 2013 Compendium Profiles of Selected Programs.* [1]

EDAC recommends that local senates, especially those of Hispanic Serving Institutions, use this publication as a planning tool to close the achievement gaps for students. Many of the practices described in this document will be useful for all students.

---

1   Excelencia in Education. (2013). What works for Latino students in higher education: 2013 compendium profiles of selected programs. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from *www.edexcelencia.org/research/2013-what-works-latino-students-higher-education*.

# There and Back Again:
## Serving on an ACCJC Accreditation Evaluation Team

by Kale Braden, North Representative

T he Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) *Policy on Commission Good Practices in Relations with Member Institutions* states that the Commission will "include faculty members among the academic representatives on comprehensive evaluation teams" (p. 48). The commission solicits recommendations regarding faculty to serve on evaluation teams from college presidents and college accreditation liaison officers (ALOs). The commission has at times had difficulty finding enough faculty members who are able to serve on evaluation teams. Yet, some faculty have reported an apparent disconnect between expressing an interest to serve on an accreditation evaluation team to their college president and actually being chosen as potential team members. Faculty who are interested in serving on an accreditation evaluation team may employ certain strategies to maximize their chances of being appointed and might also benefit from a sense of what it is like to serve on a team.

### GETTING APPOINTED

To serve on an accreditation evaluation team, a faculty member must be recommended by his or her college president. An ALO may recommend a faculty member to serve, but ultimately the college president must approve the faculty member being appointed. This requirement is both to ensure that the college president feels that the faculty member would be appropriate to serve on a team and to ensure that the college will provide the resources to allow that faculty member to serve, such as release time from classes and substitute instructors to cover the missed days. A first strategy to maximize a faculty member's opportunity to be appointed to a team is to make certain that the college president actually supports him or her as a potential team member. If the college president agrees to recommend a faculty member, the next step is to get that recommendation officially submitted to the ACCJC.

An official recommendation could take the form of a college president emailing the commission; however, a more efficient way of submitting that recommendation is to use the ACCJC's Bio-data form, available at: *http://bit.ly/1nbfNuv*. The form includes sections on the current position held, professional education, professional experience, and special qualifications and requires a "CEO Recommendation" signature. The biographical information provided on this form is what the commission uses to develop

"the peer evaluation team from a roster of experienced educators who have exhibited leadership and balanced judgment" (ACCJC, 2012, p. 4). A faculty member who is interested in serving on an accreditation evaluation team should fill out the Bio-data form, get his or her president's signature (which serves as an official recommendation), and then send the form directly to the commission.

After a faculty member submits his or her Bio-data Form, the next step should be to take the ACCJC *Accreditation Basics Course.* This course is an online training developed by the ACCJC and is available at *http://bit. ly/1sQRO2N.* The commission expects that new team members will have completed this course prior to serving on an accreditation evaluation team (ACCJC, 2012, p. 4). Completion of the course provides a potential team member with a certificate of completion and puts him or her into the list of "course completers" that the commission may search when looking for faculty to serve on teams.

### CONSIDERING THE APPOINTMENT

If the commission selects a faculty member to serve on an evaluation team, the commission will send an *Invitation to Serve on an Evaluation Team* email. This email provides information on which college team the applicant is being considered for, who the team chair will be, and when the team training will occur. The potential team member will be asked to review potential conflicts of interest which could compromise his or her ability to be impartial in a review of the institution and the expectation of evaluators. The potential conflicts and the commission's expectations are enumerated in the *ACCJC Team Evaluator Manual* (p. 6-7). The faculty member will be responsible

for arranging any travel to training and the team visit. The college being evaluated will organize the reservation for the hotel rooms for the team, but team members pay for their own rooms. Team members will be reimbursed by the commission but will be responsible for the upfront costs of their travel and hotel stay.

The commission has had some difficulty in keeping faculty members on evaluator teams. When one is considering serving on a team six months ahead of a visit, reading large quantities of material, missing a day of classes for the training, and then missing three or four more days for the campus visit may sound feasible. However, when faculty are in the middle of the semester, the loss of an entire week of instruction can appear far more daunting. An ACCJC Commissioner confided that some issues have arisen with faculty withdrawing from teams after they had been appointed and agreed to serve, sometimes at the last minute before a team visit was to occur, leaving the commission to scramble and find a replacement. Therefore, faculty members must be honest with themselves when signing up. The faculty member's college should provide substitute instructors for his or her classes during the visit, which is part of what the CEO agrees to when submitting the faculty name, but substitute instructors are not always feasible depending on when the visit will fall in the semester. While on the team visit, working on team business will be all that a faculty member will have time for. The three days of the team visit will be packed with individual meetings, meetings with groups, all-college sessions, intensive scrutiny of the provided evidence, and writing. While on site for the college visit, team members will have

> Serving on the team provides a unique experience of digging deep into the operations of another college and seeing how others have chosen to meet the accreditation standards.

little time for anything else, so all should plan on being 100% present for those three days. Before accepting a role on an accreditation evaluation team, a potential team member should carefully consider the timing of the training and visit, the potential impact on his or her students, and the upfront cost of serving on a team. On the invitation to serve email, the commission has the following request: "If for any reason you feel you will not be able complete the entire process, please decline the invitation to serve by completing the enclosed [*Reply to Invitation to Serve on ACCJC Evaluation Team*] form."

### SERVING ON THE TEAM

Two to three months prior to the scheduled visit, the college to be evaluated will send the team its Self Evaluation Report, College Catalog, Class schedules, a thumb-drive containing all evidence cited in the Self Evaluation Report, and information on accessing online courses. Evaluators are expected to thoroughly read and evaluate the documents and evidence in the context of the Accreditation Standards and Policies. Before the college visit, the evaluation team will come together for an ACCJC team training session. This session provides general training on the accreditation standards and what is expected of team members. In preparation for the college visit, the team chair will assign team members specific standards and policies to focus their evaluation on. Each team member's job is to evaluate the institution in regards to those standards and policies as thoroughly as possible. This process will include coming up with additional questions which may need to be asked, people or groups that each team member would like to speak with while on the visit, and additional data that may be needed to evaluate how well the college is complying with Accreditation Policies and Standards.

Serving on the team provides a unique experience of digging deep into the operations of another college and seeing how others have chosen to meet the accreditation standards. Once one is able to get past the "that's not how we do it!" reaction, it is often fascinating to see how smart colleagues from another college have come at similar problems in completely different ways. The California community college faculty voice has to be a part of the accreditation process: it is not a peer evaluation if no faculty members are on the team. If a faculty member wants to understand accreditation, to really dig deep into the standards, policies, and the mechanisms accreditation, the best way to do that is be on an evaluation team.

For faculty interested in serving on an accreditation evaluation team, the following summary offers some proactive steps that may increase an applicant's likelihood of being appointed:

- Discuss your interest in being appointed with your college president or ALO.

- Complete the Bio-data Form, get your college president to sign the form, and then send the form to the commission.

- Take the ACCJC *Accreditation Basics Course* to get yourself on the "course completers" list.

- Be honest with yourself about your ability to pay the upfront costs, make it to the training session, do the prep-work, and miss at least four days of classes.

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. (2012). *Team Evaluator Manual.* Retrieved from *www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Team-Evaluator-Manual_2012.pdf*

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. (2014). *Accreditation Reference Handbook.* Retrieved from *www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Accreditation_Reference_Handbook_July_2014.pdf*

# CB 21, C-ID, and the Ongoing Challenge of Defining Basic Skills Curriculum

by Michelle Grimes-Hillman, South Representative, Curriculum Committee Chair

Janet Fulks, Bakersfield College

Ginny May, Sacramento City College, Curriculum Committee

At its inception in 2006, the Basic Skills Initiative placed a focus on the importance of discipline faculty expertise in curricular decisions. This initiative led to a great deal of good work that continues to affect a majority of community college students. The current academic year has seen a renewed focus on discussions of basic skills curriculum due to the ongoing development of the Common Assessment Initiative (CAI), the emphasis on the Student Success & Support Program (SSSP) and Student Equity Plans, and an unknown future with the AB 86 adult education planning[3]. For this reason, faculty experts in basic skills disciplines were recently called together to begin a process of building further on previous curricular efforts.

The basic skills funding model developed throughout prior years and initiatives included the tracking of Chancellor's Office Management Information System (MIS) data. The data in the MIS system includes all course information each term organized through a series of coding elements. One such element is labeled CB 21, "Course Prior to Transfer Level**."** CB 21 coding is used only for non-transfer level courses in English writing, English reading, and mathematics. ESL is the only discipline allowed to code CB 21 for transfer courses. This information is used for accountability reporting, which is employed to justify investments and expenditures in basic skills.

The CB 21 project, conducted from 2008 to 2010, represented the collaborative work of hundreds of discipline faculty, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, and the Chancellor's Office in order to improve, update, and correct the coding used to track and report student progress through basic skills. The result was a set of rubrics aligned for both credit and noncredit courses even though the courses might be taught very differently with a disparity of levels, numbers of courses, and methodology of teaching

With the development of the CB 21 rubrics, colleges were directed to correctly recode basic skills math, English reading, English writing, and ESL courses to identify the levels of various courses in the MIS database using the rubrics. This data was then tracked for each student to determine successful progress through the pathway. The project resulted in the following benefits:

---

3    *http://ab86.cccco.edu*

- Clearer documentation of the basic skills credit and noncredit pathways for institutions, students, faculty and researchers.

- Alignment of credit and noncredit basic skills and ESL courses.

- New and more accurate reporting metrics for student progress and assessment levels by individual disciplines.

- Actionable data for each basic skills and ESL discipline, rather than the previous data that aggregated English, math, and reading as one metric.

- Statewide comparability for success and progress along the basic skills pathway.

The CB 21 project provided faculty the opportunity to examine innovations at individual colleges, pointed out the need to present accurate accountability reporting to the legislature and other external groups, and identified efficiencies where colleges could use placement and transcript data from other community colleges to enroll students in the appropriate course level.

In September 2014, basic skills faculty again came together in the north and the south of the state to reexamine the work done on the Basic Skills CB 21 rubrics in light of innovations in basic skills instruction and curricular changes to see whether the rubrics were still relevant. Overall, these discipline experts suggested slight changes in wording but felt the levels below transfer identified in the rubrics were still relevant to the majority of the colleges and basic skills work. Attendees also considered ways to better document accelerated courses using the coding in order to track progress when levels were skipped.

Faculty at these meetings were reminded that the rubrics are not standardization of basic skills courses, they do not drive curricular changes, and they are not intended for common course numbering or articulation. With this in mind, faculty were asked to compare alignment between English and ESL, reading and English, and credit and noncredit as well as details of knowledge, skills, abilities, and competencies and to consider whether C-ID descriptors beginning at highest levels below transfer would be appropriate. If descriptors could be created, then the descriptors and the rubrics could be used in discussions for the common assessment and multiple measures work under the CAI. C-ID descriptors could also be used to help colleges conduct discussions of possible curricular revisions in light of AB 86 Adult Basic Education planning and the increase in funding for career development and college preparation noncredit planned for 2015-16.

Students may also benefit directly from the continuing work on basic skills rubrics and descriptors. Students do not always understand the various levels of basics skills coursework. Often they only know that they have one, two, or more courses to complete. They may become discouraged, or they may travel to another college only to be reassessed and placed into a very different system of leveled basic skills work. Finding comparable descriptions of course work may help students better identify the skills they need to be successful in their educational goals.

Although the rubrics have been examined, the current work on basic skills curriculum is not done. The next step is to examine comparable basic skills courses and, where appropriate, to develop C-ID descriptors. This project will be initiated soon by inviting discipline faculty to participate Discipline Inquiry Groups. We hope that all faculty will participate in this and other important projects statewide to aid our students through our very complicated system. To receive the announcements of these events, sign up for the disciplines listserves via the ASCCC website at *www.asccc.org/ signup-newsletters*. 🖋

# Professional Development: Come One, Come All

by Dolores Davison, Area B Representative, Professional Development Committee Chair

Arnita Porter, West Los Angeles College, Professional Development Committee

Recent months have seen a burst of activity on the faculty professional development front. From the Chancellor's Office *Report on the California Community Colleges Student Success Initiative Professional Development Committee Recommendations* in September 2013 to the launching of the Academic Senate for California Community College's first Professional Development College module on leadership in June 2014 to the passage of AB 2558 (Williams, 2014), professional development is a hot topic at all levels. While these discussions, plans, and opportunities have actively included full time faculty, administrators, and staff, comparatively scant attention has been paid to the needs of part time faculty.

Questions have been raised about the need to include part time faculty in professional development plans at all levels. When funding was scarce, some may have argued that the needs of full time faculty had to be weighed against those of part time faculty as well as the needs of staff and administrators. Additional arguments exist: part time faculty may be difficult to include because they are often teaching at multiple colleges and their schedules are complicated, they do not understand the culture of their colleges and therefore would not be able to engage in the activities to the same

degree as full time faculty, they are teaching online and would not be able to attend activities campus, or they are simply not interested in professional development. Occasionally, one may even hear comments implying that part time faculty are not equal to full time faculty and therefore are not entitled to the same types of activities and opportunities in which full time faculty participate. However, as more funding for professional development and opportunities for activities are becoming available, strong arguments can and should be made for including part time faculty in professional development on all California community college campuses.

First, part time faculty can bring a wide range of experiences and contributions to professional development activities at their colleges. Part time faculty are often relatively recent alumni of graduate programs, and as such they may bring informed and recent pedagogy to the discussion. They may also bring a variety of experiences to the discussion that more seasoned faculty may not be aware of in terms of pedagogical training and methodologies. Because many part time faculty teach at a variety of institutions, including not only community colleges but four year institutions as well, they bring with them experiences that tenured or tenure track faculty at the community colleges might not have had the opportunity to be exposed to.

More information about institutions students might be transferring to and the pedagogies or methodologies used there can only benefit full time faculty in preparing our students.

Additionally, part time faculty are often working in their disciplines and can bring that information to both their students and their fellow faculty. This situation is especially common in career technical education (CTE) fields, where the experiences and expertise that part time faculty bring to the classroom might provide far greater understanding to students and faculty than simply reading a textbook. Demonstrating abilities in CTE fields, whether it is nursing or automobile technology, can provide professional development to faculty in those fields who might not have the experiences that so many part time faculty do.

Part time faculty are also involved in teaching a wide range of classes, including many parts of sequences and classes which would not be available to our students otherwise. As such, colleges should ensure that all faculty working with their students are well trained, regardless of their employment status. Students in all three major areas of the community colleges' focus—basic skills, career technical education, and transfer—benefit from having the most well trained faculty possible. Faculty professional development training in terms of classroom skills and techniques, pedagogy, and technical skills benefits all faculty and students and ensures that the best trained faculty are those in the classrooms.

Providing professional development opportunities to part time faculty has an additional benefit in that it may assist them in their search for permanent full time employment. Many community college part time faculty actively seek full time employment in the California Community College System. Involvement in faculty professional development, as well as other campus activities, can only strengthen the candidacy of a part time faculty member. Part time faculty who are involved in professional development will be able to bring those skills to the classroom when they become full time, which helps to inform and improve teaching and learning. In addition, colleges that choose to hire part time faculty who have been actively engaged in professional development will benefit from the information and skills that they are able to bring to the campus. Ultimately, engaged part time faculty are likely to transition to engaged full time faculty, which will benefit both the college and the students.

Finally, inviting and encouraging part time faculty to participate in professional development activities engages those faculty and includes them in the community of scholars at the college. Giving part time faculty a sense of belonging to the institution can benefit both the college and the faculty members. Research by organizations such as the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (*www.ccsse.org*) indicates that students who feel as if they are part of the community are more likely to persist and to have favorable opinions of the college they are attending. The same principle applies to part time faculty members. Engaged part time faculty are more likely to become involved in campus activities, both on a college and a department level.

Because so many part time faculty members teach at multiple campuses, they may not always be available to attend professional development activities that stretch over an entire day or more than one day; for this reason, colleges interested in developing the best trained faculty possible might consider scheduling events in a variety of different time slots and of different durations. In addition, administrators can be encouraged to provide substitutes for part time faculty who wish to engage in faculty professional development activities on their campuses when those activities conflict with their scheduled classes. More participation from part time faculty can only benefit California's colleges, students, and full time faculty members. 🖋

# Trojan Horse or Tremendous Godsend?

## Retooling Adult Education in a New Era

by Leigh Anne Shaw, ASCCC Noncredit Committee

Candace Lynch-Thompson, ASCCC Noncredit Committee

Since 2010, sweeping legislative changes have radically altered the future of adult education in community colleges. Among the various significant pieces of legislation on this topic, Assembly Bill 86 (2013) emerges as particularly pivotal in its ambitious goal to do the seemingly impossible: join two education systems that have current gaps and overlaps in serving adult Californians. Many faculty fear a legislated "Trojan horse" whose impact may not be fully grasped before mandates demand compliance. Others perceive this historic act as the long-awaited empowerment of faculty at the California Community Colleges (CCC) and Adult Schools to enact real change in serving students. Regardless of how AB 86 will be viewed in time, several conversations need to be initiated in order to implement the bill's intent.

### BACKGROUND

In 2013, the legislature passed AB 86 (Education Omnibus Trailer Bill, 2013-2014) to amend California Education Code §84830 and create regional consortia to implement a plan to "better serve the educational needs of adults" in areas that include basic skills, ESL, citizenship, high school diploma, adults with disabilities, short-term CTE, and apprenticeship. Seventy consortia are currently planning ways to join the strengths of both K-12 adult education and CCC noncredit systems to better serve students.

For many years, the CCC system and K-12 adult education have operated under completely different funding models. However, thanks to the passing of SB 860 (Education Omnibus Trailer Bill, 2014), career development and college preparation (CDCP) FTES will be funded at the same level as the credit rate beginning in the 2015-16 fiscal year. This change will likely eliminate one of many existing disincentives for CCCs to create and maintain noncredit programs.

AB86 legislation charges the CCC and K-12 adult education partners to identify gaps in services for their respective adult education needs and make local plans to address those areas. In order to ensure success, these discussions must take a student-centered approach to this fast-paced and crucial planning for the future of California's adult learner population. The faculty members currently serving adult students have the clearest finger on the pulse of those needs, but in some areas no such programs are in place. In addition, some districts have large physical distances between colleges and adult schools, while other currently have credit, noncredit, and adult education programs all operating. As the clock ticks on the expiration of the maintenance-of-effort allowing adult schools funding to operate, colleges will need to have serious conversations in several critical areas.

## CONVERSATION 1: ENSURING STUDENT-DRIVEN, NOT FUNDING-DRIVEN, CHANGE

Adult education providers must maintain a student-first approach that does not bend to the pressures of funding, political notions, or insufficient timelines. While the goal is to alleviate the barriers and gaps between community college and K-12 programs, the architects of this project must never lose sight of the fact that only a plan that has the best interests of student success at heart will produce the results that the state so desperately needs. When funding incentives come into play, faculty will need to vigilantly monitor their campuses' responses in order to ensure that the changes are curriculum-based, not funding-based.

At the recent AB 86 Adult Education Regional Planning Summit held in October 2014, many attendees were heartened to hear Assembly member Joan Buchanan encourage the consortia to ask for more time. Effective change requires thoughtful planning, and education depends on planning and funding that will last long enough to ensure successful implementation. The panic felt by the adult schools, whose funding will completely disappear in 2015, combined with CCCs funding structure that does not allow confident predictions of a budget scenario beyond six months, can make for hastily conceived solutions that may not be in the best interest of students. In order to effectively re-design a system that will be sustainable, paradigms must shift, but they cannot do so with insufficient time to plan, imagine, speculate, and field-test. In order to carefully craft the ultimate framework for adult education, faculty must argue for more time to ensure student success.

Shifts in paradigms mean envisioning new and improved pathways to success. One idea for addressing such pathways is via the C-ID course descriptor process. Creating C-ID course descriptors for courses one or two levels below transfer college coursework can create clearer articulation into these courses. The ASCCC will be entertaining a resolution at the Fall 2014 Plenary specifically addressing the need for C-ID course descriptors to be revised.

## CONVERSATION 2: ADDRESSING INEQUITIES BETWEEN EXISTING SYSTEMS

The worlds of CCC credit, CCC noncredit, and adult education noncredit have few common structural denominators. The focus on transfer and degrees places CCC credit faculty in the realm of student success-aimed faculty governance; meanwhile, 95% of noncredit instruction in the CCCs is delivered by adjunct faculty members who are rarely included in campus dialogue in a meaningful way. Furthermore, adult education noncredit faculty are often shunted to the edges of a K-12 system that overlooks their needs and input and can shift their funding away at a whim. Faculty participation is key to meaningful planning for student success initiatives such as setting up clear pathways for students, considering common demographics, and aligning curriculum between the two systems. However, under the current situation, noncredit faculty's voices are reduced to a faint whisper when they should be heralded as advocacy for the state's neediest students.

The inequities are not merely practices but systemic entrenchments. For example, noncredit instructors are not included in Faculty Obligation Number (FON) calculations, creating a situation that provides little incentive for colleges to create and sustain healthy and robust noncredit programs that could be a vital voice in this planning. Also, in those few cases across the state where noncredit faculty exist in large enough numbers to have actual departments or programs, heavy noncredit workload issues often inhibit faculty participation outside of the classroom. Finally, another major disadvantage facing noncredit practitioners across the state is the inequity in pay between credit and noncredit.

## CONVERSATION 3: ADDRESSING A LACK OF REPRESENTATION OF FACULTY IN AB 86 PLANNING

While many AB 86 consortia are moving forward with varying faculty engagement, a recent ASCCC Executive Committee survey of local senate leadership revealed that 32% of respondents

indicated that they had not been invited to participate fully in their AB86 consortium discussions. These respondents indicated that the curricular changes being prepared for their consortia's reports, including pathways to careers, degrees, and transfer, were in fact being made by administrators with no input from faculty at all. As curriculum is squarely in faculty purview, such deliberate lack of involvement of faculty is inexcusable and cannot be permitted.

Because each district operates differently, the idea of a one-size-fits-all solution is daunting at best and can appear dangerously ineffective to faculty knowledgeable of their own demographics' needs. Larger districts will feel impact differently than smaller districts. Some districts have well-established noncredit programs, while others have no history of noncredit at all. In some districts, healthy relationships between CCC and adult education exist, while in others, the relationships are nonexistent or lacking trust and communication. Long histories of funding inequity, differences in minimum qualifications, and disparate pay-versus-load ratios have created deep-seated frustration that has prevented collaboration. Legislative mandates cannot force quality educational pathways where faculty have not been allowed to develop a dynamic and interactive understanding of each other's programs or have not been able to thrive in a structure that develops good relationships.

### WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Colleges that have existing noncredit programs are promised that funding inequities will be resolved in 2015. However, work load issues and lack of inclusion of noncredit faculty in the FON will continue the inequities between credit and noncredit programs. These inequities will cause problems for smooth implementation of any plan that develops through the AB 86 process. The FON calculation must be changed, and workload issues must be examined and ameliorated.

Colleges that do not have noncredit programs can expect an uphill learning curve in the introduction of noncredit and will need to have conversations about the appropriate placement of ESL and basic skills courses. Conversations of contextualization and blending of adult basic education and general education development, apprenticeships, and career technical education programs will need to involve providers from the entire education spectrum. Colleges that currently offer math and English booster programs will need to discuss the most appropriate delivery of such services. Fields such as ESL, which fought many years to be recognized as its own discipline, will need to remind their campuses of the importance of credit and transferable ESL but will also be forced to have conversations about content delivery in both credit and noncredit.

Mandates to professional practices via legislative order appear unique to the profession of education. Legislators do not, for example, convene task forces to re-design the professional fields of medicine, engineering, or law, directing doctors, engineers, and lawyers to provide data and outcomes and to develop ways to align systems that were never designed to work together. Yet, this practice happens routinely in education, and it can have the effect of putting education at risk of radical, poorly-conceived changes that fail to actually address students' needs, however well intended they may be. Nevertheless, the outcomes of these changes, good or bad, inevitably fall upon the faculty. For this reason, faculty must be at the forefront of these very critical changes and reduce the chances of this legislation becoming a Trojan Horse. Our role as faculty assumes deepest commitment to our students, and their future depends on us. Faculty need to unite as a voice for a well-funded, carefully planned, and well-executed re-design of community college and K-12 systems whose alignment is long overdue.

# Guidelines for the Development and Implementation of Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs):

## An Update on the Academic Senate Paper

by Julie Bruno, Vice-President

Michelle Pilati, C-ID Coordinator

n fall of 2013, Resolution 9.01 called for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, "in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University develop guidelines and/or best practices for the development and implementation of ADTs and report to the body by Fall 2014." In response, the ASCCC Executive Committee convened an ADT taskforce to begin work on writing a paper that would outline the processes and procedures involved in interpreting a Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) and using the TMC to develop an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT). The need for this paper is well understood, but the writing of the paper has been a challenging process with twists and turns and bumps and bruises along the way.

## TWISTS AND TURNS

The ADT taskforce made great progress over the summer and now has a working draft of the paper that will ultimately be brought forward to the body for adoption. The paper includes the history of and rationales for the use of TMCs in the implementation of Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla, 2010), an overview of the processes that lead to a TMC, and a discussion of effective practices relating to the review of

a TMC and factors to consider when deciding whether or not to develop an ADT. It continues with the outline of a process for creating an ADT at a campus, including the roles and responsibilities of faculty, articulation officers, curriculum committees, academic senates, institutional researchers, administrators, and curriculum specialists. It also includes a discussion of Chancellor's Office Templates (COT) with special attention to the timelines for approval of the ADTs as mandated by SB 440 (Padilla, 2012). Additionally, the paper covers critical topics such as student messaging and marketing, reciprocity agreements, and credit by examination policies. Finally, it addresses special considerations including course unit considerations, area of emphasis degrees, IGETC and CSU GE Breadth for STEM, and collaborative programs. As Senate tradition dictates, the paper will conclude with Academic Senate recommendations for establishing effective ADT policies, processes, and practices.

The writing of the ADT paper continues to be a collaborative effort that includes discipline faculty, counselors, articulation officers, and curriculum chairs. The draft paper has also been vetted through the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup, which is comprised of CCC and CSU

faculty including articulation officers, as well as Chancellor's Office staff from both the CSU and CCC. Before it is brought back to the ASCCC body for approval, the paper will be submitted to the C-ID Advisory Committee for discussion and input as well as other constituent groups as necessary to ensure that the accurate information and effective practices are included for all areas covered. After many months of work, this document is shaping up to be a useful and complete guide to developing an ADT.

## BUMPS AND BRUISES

Although the paper is well on its way to completion, some issues remain that are in need attention. With the goals established by the Board of Governors for ADT creation as well as the legislative mandates called for in SB 440, colleges were and still are primarily focused on submitting ADTs to the Chancellor's Office. Less consideration has been given to student messaging and marketing, including how best to communicate with students on the benefits of ADTs and the difference between ADTs and local AA/AS degrees. Although the paper includes useful information on specific strategies, not all faculty have engaged in the conversation and shared their experiences. As a result, effective practices for student messaging and marketing of ADTs are not as easily accessible as in other areas of ADT development, and therefore this area of the paper requires further development.

In addition to student messaging and marketing, some questions remain on specific requirements as well as Board of Governor's and legislative mandates for ADT development. These questions include the following:

1. What is the consequence of not achieving the college's stated Board of Governor's goals for ADT development?

2. Does a college have to inactivate its existing degree if it has a transfer degree in the TOP Code and is not able to create an ADT?

3. Does the existence of a degree with a CTE goal in a TMC TOP Code create a degree-creation obligation?

4. Do colleges need C-ID approval by June 30th, 2015 for all courses on an ADT that have a C-ID designator or just courses that appear in the CORE and LIST A?

5. Given that a C-ID determination of "Conditional Approval" or "Not Approved" can be made at any time and, potentially, could happen shortly before the June 30 deadline for approval, will the CCCCO hold harmless colleges that have acted in good faith and permit them additional time to obtain C-ID approval?

6. What is the consequence of not creating an ADT as required by SB440?

7. What is the process for modification of an existing ADT?

Because the answers to these questions are still under discussion or investigation, the ADT taskforce has determined that the paper would not at this time be the comprehensive document envisioned by the resolution and therefore has recommended that the Executive Committee delay the presentation of the paper to the body for adoption until Spring 2015.

This delay is unfortunate indeed, but the ADT Task Force believes it necessary to ensure the accuracy and currency of the paper so that it can be most useful to faculty and colleges in developing ADTs. The task force will continue to work with our colleagues across the state to obtain the best information and practices on ADT development and implementation and will pursue responses to the questions still unanswered. Please feel free to contact either Julie Bruno (*jbruno@ sierracollege.edu*) or Michelle Pilati (*mpilati@riohondo. edu*) with any questions or concerns. ✒