

Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate

8045 E Chapman Ave
Orange, CA 92869-4512

(714) 628-4831
FAX (714) 532-2055

Minutes-Approved

Senate Business Meeting

April 15, 2014

1:30 pm-3:00 pm B-212

Present:

Senators

Aguilera, Leonor
Cummins, Shawn
Deeley, Steve
Dela-Cusack, Lisa
Elchlepp, Elizabeth
Freidenrich, Leah
Frost, Alicia
Hovanitz, Eric
Matthews, Evangeline
Mettler, Mary
Nance, Craig

Salcido, Andrew
Shekarabi, Nooshan
Shields, Jolene
Sproat, Barbara
Taylor, Michael

Officers

Evelt, Corinna (President)
DeCarbo, Michael (Vice President)
Wagner, Joyce (Sec/Treasurer)
Rutan, Craig (Curriculum Chair)

Guests:

James, Scott
Mora, Aracely
Soberano, Hector (ASG)
Stringer, Martin

Absent:

Cannon, Cari
Carrion, Rudy
Deaver, Doug
Volz, Matt

To comply with recent changes to the Brown Act, the SCC Academic Senate will be recording votes of the Senators as follows:

- *Members recorded as absent are presumed not to have voted.*
- *If only yeas, the minutes will state that: "the motion passed without dissent."*
- *If there are nays and/or abstentions, the names of members voting in the minority and/or abstaining will be recorded, and all other members are presumed to have voted in the majority.*

- I. Order of the Agenda—No Changes.
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - A. **The minutes of April 1, 2014, were approved without dissent** (moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Sproat).
- III. Public Comments
 - A. Prof. Rutan thanked Prof. Evelt for the encouragement to run for a position on the Executive Board of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. At the recent Spring 2014 Plenary Session, Prof. Rutan was elected to a one-year position as South representative.
 - B. Prof. Sproat: The library faculty wanted it known that they were not responsible for the request for an associate dean position for the library.
 - C. Prof. Taylor: There is interest in exploring the possibility of having course fees associated with some of the high supply courses. Faculty at SCC had been told numerous times in the past that it was not possible at SCC, but apparently, SAC has such fees in place for courses like microbiology. (Prof. DeCarbo will bring up the issue at the Budget Committee. Prof. Rutan mentioned that there are Title 5 regulations on what you can and cannot charge for materials fees; anything a student is charged for, they must have something material that they end up with. Material fees must be listed in the course outline of record).
- IV. AS Executive Board Reports
 - A. President (Prof. Evelt):
 1. Profs. Evelt, Mettler, Rutan and Wagner attended the April 10-12 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Spring 2014 Plenary session in San Francisco. Written summaries of the various workshops and sessions will be attached to the minutes.
 2. The SAC ASG president was sworn in at the recent Board meeting as the student trustee for the month of April. The SCC ASG president will serve in May. They will receive compensation for accepting this additional duty.
 3. Two STEM students were honored at the Board meeting, including SCC student Haroon Kahn, who also received the coveted Director's Scholarship at the 2014 Honors Transfer Council of California Research Conference.
 - a. The Board gave kudos to faculty who assisted with STEM program.
 4. Next week some classes will move to classrooms in the first floor of the Humanities Building.

5. The tentative Academic Senate meeting scheduled for April 29 will not be held. The second reading for the accreditation self evaluation will occur on May 6.
- B. Vice President (Prof. DeCarbo):
 1. An email was sent out requesting nominations for the positions of Senate President, Vice-President, and Secretary/Treasurer.
 2. Encourage any promising adjunct faculty to consider running for Senate.
- C. Secretary/Treasurer (Prof. Wagner):
 1. The 2013-2014 Budget was presented.
 - a. Senate end-of-semester dinner:
 - i. It is scheduled for Thursday, May 29, at Jim Isbell's house.
 - ii. One of the purposes is to give faculty a chance to interact with the Board. Senators are strongly encouraged to attend.
 - iii. There was discussion about who to invite besides faculty and the Board.
 - b. There is some money left in the conference account; it was suggested that the Senate could send someone to the Faculty Leadership Conference in San Diego on June 12-14, 2014.
 2. The 2014-2015 Budget:
 - a. A lunch for department chairs is tentatively scheduled for the Fall flex week.
 - b. The 2013-2014 budget will be rolled over to 2014-2015.
 - c. **The budget was passed without dissent** (moved by Prof. Rutan and seconded by Prof. Nance).
- D. CIC Chair (Prof. Rutan):
 1. There has been discussion about continued compliance with SB 1440 and SB 440 (transfer degrees).
 - a. SCC cannot offer a Computer Science transfer degree because it would require students to take more than 60 units.
 - i. Students can choose to take more than 60 units, but they cannot be required to do so.
 - ii. It is unclear what the repercussions will be for not offering possible transfer degrees.
 - b. The Economics transfer degree should be in place by fall 2014.
 - c. The Chancellor's Office is now asking that colleges submitting transfer degrees document the possible number of units needed for students who use either the CSU or the IGETC general education plans.
 - i. If following one of the plans does not allow students to finish within the 60 units, students must use the other plan; this requirement must be indicated in the college catalog.
 2. There is considerable concern about the limited number of curriculum items launched at SCC so far this semester. Please encourage faculty to start moving curriculum along.
 3. At the CIC meeting on April 28, there will be a first reading on a stylistic guide to filling out the fields on the course outline of record.
 - a. If approved, it will be incorporated into the next version of the curriculum handbook which will come out after the transition to the CurricUNET Meta system.

V. ASG Report (Hector Soberano)

- A. ASG is collecting signatures for a petition to increase library hours at the end of the semester.
 1. More than 800 signatures have been collected so far.
 2. It may have already been decided to extend the hours to 10:00pm on the Tuesday and Wednesday of final's week.
- B. The ASG banquet will be held on May 30.
- C. Town Hall is being held on April 15 and 16. The goal is to get student opinions on various issues.
- D. The Book Run will be on Saturday, April 26, from 10:00-3:00, at the SCC soccer field. The proceeds from this event will help fund the buy-back and rental program at the SCC bookstore.
- E. The Earth day event, A Green Tomorrow, will be held on Thursday, April 24, at Stringer Plaza, from 10:00-1:30.
- F. Members of next year's ASG executive board are asking faculty for the opportunity to visit classes this semester and give a five-minute presentation about ASG.

VI. Action Items

- A. **Resolution SP2014.9:** Support of the Associated Student Government of Santiago Canyon College Student Trustee Representation Change—First reading
 1. Moved by Prof. Nance and seconded by Prof. Shekarabi.
 2. Some revisions were suggested for the third whereas: "Whereas, The current system places the RSCCD Student Trustee in an untenable positions having to, at times, *attend simultaneous events* and represent conflicting positions equally; and"
- B. **Resolution SP2014.10:** Approval of the Santiago Canyon College 2014 Self Evaluation Report for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges—First reading
 1. Moved by Prof. Deeley and seconded by Prof. Freidenrich.
 2. At the last Senate meeting, Senators had been assigned to read certain standards.
 - a. A questionnaire was passed out to each group asking faculty to list any information that does not seem to relate to their standard, list any information that seems unclear and needs additional explanation, list areas

that need additional evidence, provide additional information that might strengthen the response, and list any positive aspects and any other feedback.

- b. The groups spent about 15 minutes in discussions and Prof. Evett collected the responses.
- c. Some groups hadn't had time to completely read their sections because of spring break.
 - i. There will be three more weeks before the vote at the Academic Senate.
 - ii. Prof. Evett will send out the questionnaires so that Senators can continue to work on their responses.
3. There will be an accreditation forum meeting on Thursday, April 17, in H-106, from 2:00-3:30, to allow people to provide feedback and to raise questions and concerns.
4. The self evaluation report is still being revised.
 - a. The document that the Senate will vote on will be fairly close to the final version.
 - i. Final editing and proofing will need to be done.
 - ii. College Council will have their vote after the Senate vote.
 - b. The Senate should concentrate on whether the document is factual and whether there is enough supporting evidence.
 - c. It is not necessary to list all the supporting evidence for a particular standard.
 - d. It is possible that some evidence works for multiple standards; it may be repeatedly used or used in one section but not another.
 - e. There will be charts and graphs added to the final version.
 - f. Currently, there are over ninety-five planning agendas. The final version should only include those few that most globally move the college forward.
- C. **Resolution SP2014.7:** Adoption of Spring 2014 Budget Committee Governance Handbook Description—Second reading
 1. Prof. DeCarbo sent out an electronic vote to all members of the Budget Committee who then unanimously approved the handbook description.
 2. **The motion to approve resolution SP2014.7 passed without dissent** (moved by Prof. DeCarbo and seconded by Prof. Deeley).

***Approved resolutions are posted online: <http://sccollege.edu/Departments/AcademicSenate/Pages/resolutions.aspx> ***

VII. Discussion Items

- A. Mathematics & Sciences Division Update (Dean Stringer responding to questions and comments submitted in advance by faculty).
 1. *Upon how many STEM grants is the SCC Mathematics and Sciences Division currently working? Which, if any, of the grants require institutionalization? Has the division and/or the college made any steps to institutionalize any of the programs created by the grants?*
 - a. There are currently three STEM grants at SCC.
 - i. (STEM)² (Fourth year out of five years)
 1. The grant provides academic pathways to about 200 students.
 2. Participating students are required to complete two STEM-related activities and one counseling visit each semester.
 3. Participating students are eligible for priority registration to California State University, Fullerton (CSUF).
 4. There are no institutionalization requirements.
 - ii. Upward Bound Math & Science (Second year out of five years)
 1. Sixty-four total students each year from Orange High School and El Modena High School participate in a cohort model through their four years of high school.
 2. This is a federal grant with the possibility of renewal.
 3. Various activities for the students include Science Saturdays at SCC, a two-week residential summer program at CSUF, and a 4 week course offered at SCC.
 4. There are no institutionalization requirements.
 - iii. Title V grant (Fourth year out of five years)
 1. The grant helped fund the Star Center, Supplemental Instruction, and some of the learning assistants in the Math Study Hall.
 2. The grant requires that SCC adopt 25% of the funding in each of the 4th and 5th years.
 - b. A Senator mentioned that computer science is referenced as a component to STEM, but is not really under the STEM umbrella at SCC.
 1. SCC is not computer oriented at this point. Perhaps this issue could be brought forward at the Senate and College Council.
 2. There is also talk of broadening STEM to STEAM with the addition of Art (and Design).
 3. There has been talk of expanding Community Science Night to be a STEAM event.
 2. *Could you please describe the recent development of the biotech program that Denise Foley and others have been working on and for which they recently received state approval?*
 - a. SCC is part of a four-college collaborative which includes Irvine Valley College, Fullerton College, and SAC.
 - b. The first class in the biotech program was offered in Fall 2013 and another class is being offered this

- semester.
- c. Some of the biotech courses are housed at SCC and some at SAC; together, the District has a complete program.
- d. Perkins applications and USDA grants are being pursued in an effort to fund equipment and supplies.
- 3. *What would you say are the pressing, unresolved issues for the Science building? Have any steps been taken to resolve the issues?*
 - a. The fume hoods were recently tested and seem to be working better.
 - b. Air conditioning:
 - i. Several offices are experiencing extreme temperatures.
 - ii. A company, hired by the District, has started to work on the issue, mostly on weekends and evenings.
 - c. Blackout curtains are needed for the physics and astronomy programs.
 - d. Geology lighting will be a \$25,000 project.
 - e. Better signage is needed throughout the campus to help the public.
- 4. *What three things do you think would best educate SCC faculty about the needs of the Mathematics and Sciences Division?*
 - a. There are equipment and supplies that are necessary to support the delivery of instructional programs.
 - i. There should be budget line items for courses like microbiology and organic chemistry.
 - b. There is a need for more classified staff.
 - i. Grant facilitation has placed an additional burden on faculty.
 - ii. The kinesiology and athletic departments have lost multiple positions and legislation has placed increasing demands for documentation of compliance. The resulting reports are a burden for coaches.
- B. ASCCC Spring Plenary Update:
 1. The four attendees, Profs. Evett, Mettler, Rutan, and Wagner gave brief highlights from the ASCCC plenary session. Topics mentioned include:
 - a. Career readiness versus college readiness
 - b. The struggle in implementing Common Core
 - c. Upcoming legislation
 - i. The proposed community college baccalaureate degree
 - ii. The elimination of several noncredit areas
 - iii. A new form of performance based funding
 - d. The new evaluation tool for the ASCCC
 - e. Faculty peer evaluation
 - f. Unit bloat
 - g. AB 86 and adult education
 - h. Performance metrics for the community college system
 - i. OER
 - j. Credit by exam
 - k. Student Success and Support Plan and Student Equity Plan
 - l. Placement Testing
 - m. Academic Integrity
 - n. Accreditation
 - o. Resolution and election outcomes
 2. The summaries include more details (see attached).

VIII. Summary Reports Discussion (see attached)

Meeting Adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Wagner SCC-AS Secretary/Treasurer

Checking Account	Budget	Actual	Comments	Conference Account	Budget	Actual
Balance Forward	2985	2985.83		Balance Forward	0	0
Income				Income		
Senate Dues (~\$445/mo)	4450	3590.00			6000	6000
		50.00	Individual dues			
Total Income	7435	6625.83		Total Income	6000	6000
Expenses				Expenses		
Faculty Excellence	1500	1500.00		Curriculum	490	415
Faculty Ex Presentation	150	40.45	video (#330)	Fall Plenary (2)	920	771
		28.90	refreshments (#331)			
				Spring Plenary (3)	3675	3675
Contributions						
Miscellaneous				Faculty Leadership (?)		
Recognition	500	100.00	Mike Kelcher 10/17 (#329)	San Diego, June 12-14		
Flex Week	500	186.26	Committee Chair Lunch 8/20 (#328)	\$990		
Food	500	137.34	Fall Dinner--Michael (#333)			
		140.83	Tiffany Gause (#334)			
		345.00	Tacos (#332)			
Supplies	500					
Total Expense	3650	2478.78		Total Expense	5085	4861
Balance	3785	4147.05		Balance	915	1139

Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate

8045 East Chapman
Orange, CA 92869

(714) 628-4831
FAX (714) 532-2055

SENATORS

Business and Career Education

Deeley, Steve 2014
Salcido, Andrew 2015

Continuing Education (OEC)

Shields, Jolene 2015

Counseling & Student Services

Aguilera, Leonor 2015
Carrion, Rudy 2014
Mettler, Mary 2014

Humanities and Social Sciences

Deaver, Doug 2014
Elchlepp, Elizabeth 2015
Cannon, Cari 2015
Dela-Cusack, Lisa 2015
Shekarabi, Nooshan 2014

Fine & Performing Arts and Communication

Freidenrich, Leah 2015

Library

Sproat, Barbara 2015

Mathematics and Sciences

Cummins, Shawn 2015
Hovanitz, Eric 2014
Taylor, Mike 2015
Nance, Craig 2014
Frost, Alicia 2015

Adjunct

Matthews, Evangeline
2014
Volz, Matt 2014

OFFICERS

President

Evett, Corinna 2014

Vice President

DeCarbo, Michael 2014

Secretary/Treasurer

Wagner, Joyce 2014

Curriculum

Rutan, Craig Chair 2016

Resolution SP2014.9

Support of the Associated Student Government of Santiago Canyon College Student Trustee Representation Change

Moved:

Seconded:

Whereas, Equal representation in the governance process is a principle of high standing in the Rancho Santiago Community College District (RSCCD);

Whereas, The concerns of the Santa Ana College student body are legitimately different from those of the Santiago Canyon College student body;

Whereas, The current system places the RSCCD Student Trustee in an untenable positions having to, at times, represent conflicting positions equally; and

Whereas, The system of having one student trustee from one of the colleges represent all students in the district has often led to the perception that not all students are being equally represented;

Resolved, That in support of and in solidarity with the Associated Student Government of Santiago Canyon College, the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College urges the RSCCD Board of Trustees to adopt the policy of having a student trustee from each college each year.

Date Presented: 15 April 2014

Date Approved:

Santiago Canyon College is an innovative learning community dedicated to intellectual and personal growth. Our purpose is to foster student success and to help students achieve these core outcomes: to learn, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 9/10/13)

Santiago Canyon College Academic Senate

8045 East Chapman
Orange, CA 92869

(714) 628-4831
FAX (714) 532-2055

SENATORS

Business and Career Education

Deeley, Steve 2014
Salcido, Andrew 2015

Continuing Education (OEC)

Shields, Jolene 2015

Counseling & Student Services

Aguilera, Leonor 2015
Carrion, Rudy 2014
Mettler, Mary 2014

Humanities and Social Sciences

Deaver, Doug 2014
Elchlepp, Elizabeth 2015
Cannon, Cari 2015
Dela-Cusack, Lisa 2015
Shekarabi, Nooshan 2014

Fine & Performing Arts and Communication

Freidenrich, Leah 2015

Library

Sproat, Barbara 2015

Mathematics and Sciences

Cummins, Shawn 2015
Hovanitz, Eric 2014
Taylor, Mike 2015
Nance, Craig 2014
Frost, Alicia 2015

Adjunct

Matthews, Evangeline
2014
Volz, Matt 2014

OFFICERS

President

Evett, Corinna 2014

Vice President

DeCarbo, Michael 2014

Secretary/Treasurer

Wagner, Joyce 2014

Curriculum

Rutan, Craig Chair 2016

Resolution SP2014.10

Approval of the Santiago Canyon College 2014 Self Evaluation Report for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Moved:

Seconded:

Whereas, Santiago Canyon College (SCC) participates in the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges' (ACCJC's) accreditation process;

Whereas, SCC engaged in college-wide collaboration to create its 2014 Self Evaluation Report for the ACCJC per its six year accreditation cycle; and

Whereas, the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College has the responsibility of reviewing and approving the college's Self Evaluation Report;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of Santiago Canyon College approve the Santiago Canyon College 2014 Self Evaluation Report.

Date Presented: 15 April 2014

Date Approved:

Santiago Canyon College is an innovative learning community dedicated to intellectual and personal growth. Our purpose is to foster student success and to help students achieve these core outcomes: to learn, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 9/10/13)

Academic Excellence: Strengthening Our Core Spring Plenary Session

ASCCC

April 10-12, 2014

Summary and Notes Respectfully Submitted by Corinna L. Evett

Thursday Sessions

From Punitive to Instructive: Changing the Conversation on Academic Integrity Dolores Davison, Don Gauthier, Debbie Klein, & Cynthia Napoli-Abella Reiss

Summary

This session included a rich discussion about ways that educators can instill a spirit of integrity in students. We also identified reasons why students may cheat, plagiarize, and/or behave without integrity, such as culture, GPA pressure, \$300 a unit, need to get out in two years (or think that they need to since we are two year colleges) and transfer pressures. We also discussed ways to encourage a college wide culture that supports integrity, such as obtaining writing samples on 3x5 cards with a paragraph of introductory information to learn how students write as well as having a discussion with students about what cheating and plagiarism looks like in addition to engaging in college wide discussions about standards. In addition, we spoke about the need for faculty to also maintain high levels of integrity as well as to model said behavior: make it to class on time, grade assigned work, stay home if call in sick, and don't use cell phones in class. We also discussed collaborative work and helping students understand the difference between collaboration and cheating. The presenters also suggested various tools to assist with encouraging integrity in the classroom, such as having different tests each semester, altering assignment types, and encouraging variety in assignments and assessment strategies. Move from punitive to instructive—senate and students worked together at Foothill College. Things to think about at SCC: Do we have a problem with faculty integrity? Do we have issues with student integrity?

Accreditation: The Revised Standards Roberta Eisel, Adrienne Foster, & Phil Smith

Summary

Presenters provided a historical account of the evolution of ACCJC standards that included the current process for the revised standards. Presenters also highlighted new language and new portions of the standards. There was a lot of discussion about the lack of language related to the academic senate and participatory governance throughout the standards, the possibility of encouraging grade inflation, the enhanced focus on completion—changing community college mission to that of earlier junior college missions, the possibility of SLO data being used in faculty evaluation, the frequent use of business/corporate language throughout, the use of the word “achievement” throughout. In standards II-III, many references to diversity and equity have been omitted in the revised standards. Review the

Annual Report and its questions to see how some of the words are defined, such as “achievement.”

California Community Colleges: An Evolving Mission to Serve Our Great State Bryce Harris: State Chancellor

Mission History

- 1907 Established “public junior colleges: to teach first two years: transfer mission
- 1917: mechanical and industry arts, household economy, agriculture, civic education and commerce were added (CTE added)
- 1960: Donahue act sets primary missions of college
- 1976: name changed to community college and added community services to mission
- 1988: AB 1725 set priority for us that brought up: lower division arts and sciences, transfer, vocational, remedial, and adult-noncredit added (Adult Ed added)
- 1996: added work force improvement

Mission Tampering

- 2008 told to prioritize transfer, CTE, and basic skills/adult ed
- Governor influence in 2013: focus on adult education

Mission Creep

- CCC—Applied Baccalaureate
- CSU—EDD

Why Offer CC BA?

- Support educational needs of our students
 - Students need BA in areas that are impacted or that are unavailable elsewhere
- BA more important to employers than ever before
- Meet workforce needs
- Keep CA competitive

Why Not Offer BA?

- Insufficient funds
- Unknowns—too many unintended consequences
- Will stop being community colleges—shift too far away from our core value

Questions in Need of Answers

- Who will decide which colleges offer BA? (BOG)
- Who will decide the degrees offered? (BOG)
- Who will set student fees? (We don’t want local boards or BOG to set fees—legislators raise fees—we want that to remain in the hands of the legislature who would also be responsible for maintaining the fees.)
- What about accreditation?

- What will be the level of state funding? (Unreasonable to expect community colleges to offer—do funds come out of state operational budget or from lottery prop 98 dollars?)
- What impact will there be on local faculty? (Academic and collective bargaining implications)

Why Is This Important Now? Why Are We Facing This Now?

- Legislation: Some out and some that is on the horizon.
- Chancellor's Office created a task force

Is there support for the CC BA?

- Yes. Letters and resolutions from boards. Community also supportive of such a move.

Who will make the decision?

- Legislature will make the decision.
- We can support, oppose, or influence it.
- Senator Block has sought input from Chancellor's Office and has revised the bill as a result.
- Ultimately, Governor decides to sign or not to sign it.

What would be the timing of a typical CA community college offering a BA degree?

- Soonest would be four years, but it would probably be more like 5-6 years.

What position does the BOG have? How about Chancellor's Office?

- At first, Chancellor Harris had reservations. In the past year, however, in support—with research, task force results, positive economical outcomes of 22 other states
- 22 other states in country have the BA at community college level
- Community Colleges would determine what BA degrees we'd offer: Currently, degrees tend to be offered career occupational technical areas—nursing degree is the poster child
- 1 bachelor degree per college is being proposed
- 8 year pilot
- There is momentum building on this topic
- ASCCC needs to advise the BOGs on our position

State Technology Issues

John Frietas, Tim Calhoon, Dan Crump, et. al.

Technology Initiatives: A Brief History

- Three technology initiatives funded by 2013-2014 state budget
- Chancellor's Office RFAs Sept. 2013
- Grant awardees announced in November 2013
- Projects began Dec. 2013
- Steering Committee Meetings March & April 2014

- Websites: Common Assessment Initiative: ccassess.org; Education Planning Initiative: cccedplan.org; Online Education Initiative: cccolined.org

Common Assessment Initiative

- About better placement
- Key Objectives:
 - general purpose assessment platform
 - Math, English, ESL = a lot of faculty involvement
 - Assessment preparation
 - Multiple measures
 - Professional development
 - integrate data across the system (data warehouse)
 - SB 1456: Won't get matriculation funds unless adopt this common assessment

Education Planning Initiative/Grant

- Key Objectives
 - Student portal to consolidate, personalize, and sequence information and activities
 - Want to provide personalized information for students—we get a bunch of pertinent information during their application process that will allow us to message students with specific invitations to various services
 - Message students to promote positive actions
 - Provide online planning and guidance services
 - Support all colleges
 - With our without existing education planning systems/degree audit
- Integrate academic data from across the system
 - Articulations, transcripts/courses/programs
- Provide funding for electronic transcripts, C-ID, and Assist Program
- Provide technology tools to assist counseling to reach more students
- Enhance and increase the ability of what counselors do—transfer isn't easy

Online Education Initiative

- \$57 million over 4 ½ years
- Focus on ADT—Associate Degree of Transfer programs and courses
- Integrate with Common Assessment and Educational Planning Initiatives to avoid duplication and work together
- Utilize existing programs when possible:
 - @One, CCCConfer, CVC, C-ID, 3CMedia
- Main components:
 - Establish online education consortium
 - Provide a common course management system (colleges can take advantage of if they choose to)

- Support colleges in developing ADT programs & courses (in consultation with faculty)
- Support other degree applicable courses (in consultation with faculty)
- Support basic skills instruction
- Improve online retention and success
- Facilitate credit by exam
- Provide professional development (provide a variety and plentiful prof. dev. opportunities so that faculty know how to utilize new tools.)
- Develop online student support tools—a number of how to tools for students
- Provide robust reporting and analytics
- Ensure accessibility
- Improve the overall online student experience
- Everything is ADA approved—accessible to all
- 9 faculty members on this steering committee—library, tutorial and student services, and DE coordinators.
- Working to make sure that any of these courses will not adversely affect local courses or to harm local programs—not working to dismantle anyone.

Question Time

- What are the timelines for the new systems/portals/deliverables?
 - Online education: 2015—Phase I production Fall 2015
 - Common Assess and Ed Plan: Looking at other states and systems—taking environmental scans—look for colleges to pilot various initiatives—Does SCC want to pilot anything? First steering committees for ongoing efforts. Build out product through spring, summer, and fall—deliver by winter of 2015.
- What options will there be for local control? What will be standardized?
 - Common Assess & Ed Plan: Universal Portal with customization abilities for colleges to modify and personalize for each college’s needs.
 - Online Education: Advantage with technology to provide a standardized platform for individual use to meet local needs.
 - Assessment: Local control comes to cut-off scores and placement. Will be beneficial to have data collected statewide, and then apply data analytics to each college—it will be unique to us for our local populations. Have the ability with data warehouse to continue to track student progress and evaluate what worked, which allows for ongoing evolution of improvement.
- How much pressure will there be to adopt the “standard”?
 - Common Assessment is optionally standard
 - Ed Plans & Online Ed = optional—hope that local colleges will want to participate—completely district decision
 - Try to build something that faculty love—use—so that we will all want to use it.
- How will information be communicated to faculty?
 - Through our nine representatives who have already been great contributors
 - We have people at the table influencing the direction of all three projects
 - Refer colleagues to websites so that they can keep informed

- Ability to sign up for an interest list in order to keep up with project developments
- Will attend the district or college to share what's going on with stuff
- How will faculty provide feedback?
 - Use crowd sourcing info as did with SSTF—present ideas for popular votes
 - Share with representatives
 - Involvement in pilots
- Will much of the opportunity to provide feedback occur during the summer?
 - No. Too much work to do during the summer, so they will focus on the work over the summer and gear up for feedback/input gathering activities after summer.
 - Information gathering and environmental scans will be the primary focus—it will set the groundwork for everything.
 - Common Assessment & Ed Planning = lay out schedule of meetings for the summer when send out invitations for pilot participation.
- Concerned about the timeline for Course Management System (CMS)
 - Need a vision before procurement
 - Ed Plan is meant to fulfill student success requirements—also trying to maximize the limited amount of time that counselors have with some students. So students work out a plan before visiting with a counselor—seems to assist with the counseling visit.

Community Colleges Offering BA Degrees?: Possible Responses to the Chancellor's Office Task Force Report
David Morse & Beth Smith

Summary of National Arguments in Favor of the Community College Baccalaureate

- See PPT slide

Study Group Report

- Values and principles
 - AA is still primary mission
 - New degrees should not detract from other degrees/programs
 - Strategic and targeted: what's needed and where?
 - Meet need of students
 - Should be a local decision not forced
 - Quality programs that are comparable to 4 year colleges
 - Allow students to pursue Master's degrees
- Opportunities
 - Serve underserved folks
 - Respond to workforce needs
 - Benefit state economy
 - Part of national trend
 - Removes barriers for completion
 - Compensates for lack of university capacity in some areas

- Challenges
 - Need for additional funding
 - Capacity issues (physical and programmatic)
 - Mission creep (or mission evolution?) Right now is not part of our mission—is a mission change—not a conscious evolution—not a choice—just happening—CSUs and UCs began the mission creep jargon—is it more of a mission evolution?
 - Faculty hiring issues—collective bargaining complications
 - Legislation needed
- Questions to be considered
 - Should this be part of a total reassessment of the Master Plan for Higher Education?
 - What statewide or regional needs to be addressed first?
 - How/why are CSU, UC, and others unable to fill the need? Why? Should we increase their capacity before taking over for them?
 - How should the Baccalaureate Degrees be funded?
 - Differential tuition?
 - State aid?
 - Local budget discretion?
 - Other?

Study Group Charge

- BA degree program complement
- Articulation strategies
- Accreditation implications
- Ability to support BA degree programs—money, space, and other resources
- Chancellor Office changes
- Data collection and evaluation
- Also see slide

Two Different Arguments for CCC Bachelor's Degree

- CSU does not offer the degree
 - Industry standard now demands a bachelor's degree
- CSU cannot meet demand

SB 850 (Senator Block from San Diego Area): Public Postsecondary Education: Community College Districts: Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program

- Senator Block has been quite persistent—is very interested in this. Some think it's great; others are unsure—and everything in between.
- We need to identify the faculty needs and how we will address them.
- Some good support in both houses—not sure what the governor thinks.
- When CA does it, it really makes the news.
- Enables local districts to propose to accreditors and implement one bachelor's degree per campus
- State Chancellor/BOG to determine pilot districts based on data

- Evaluation and report to legislature

What Happens Now?

- Study group report released (CCCCO.edu>Academic Affairs>Baccalaureate Degree)
- What does our degree look like? Applied bachelor's degree?
- We can take a new position on this—the new resolution changes a previous position that could have been influenced by the stark budget times in 2010.

General Group Discussion

- Architectural Design is an area that would benefit from getting a BA—only Cal Poly has a program, and they only accept 15 transfer students per year, so students have to go to private colleges that cost \$30-60,000 a year.
- Automotive mechanic/technician Auto Tech—baccalaureate degrees are offered out of state.
- Real reason people fight this at UC and CSU level is because they held primary position that is deemed higher value in the Master Plan.
- Would there be admission criteria? Currently, we are open access, but that is not the same for BA or BS degrees.
- We are cheaper to run because we run our institutions on the backs of adjunct faculty—it's wrong but true. CSUs and UCs also have a number of adjunct professors. The universities aren't funding tenure track positions.
- Universal problem of not enough tenured faculty.
- Why just nursing? If not creep—why only nursing?
- Funding is a big issue. Need an approach that makes sense.
- Makes sense to add prudent caveats that include funding requests.
- Bachelor Degrees in other states: How do they approach upper division requirements? Problems with for-profits take spots at the hospitals from CC students.
- Curriculum: how do 10+1 relate to bachelor degrees? How do you define the bachelor degree vs the applied bachelor degree? A number of our CTE programs have lots of units that could easily turn to bachelor degrees. We'll need to offer upper division classes—prereqs for other disciplines—upper division GE classes. Can students who are not in the program take upper division GE rather than waiting for a class at UC or CSU?
- How did other 22 states evolve as they transferred into offering Bachelor degrees at the community college level?
 - No state like CA that has as much input on programs through 10+1.
- For whom are we doing this? What are the needs of the students? Let's be clear on this before we consider how we will do something. Need answers to this before seeming to compete with CSUs and UCs.
- Do employers really need degrees? Have we asked advisory boards?
- Have issues been explored?
- We need more information—taking our responsibility seriously—not enough info upon which to make a decision.

- Let's assume that we have the ability to offer at least one Bachelor degree—it will be an issue as to how to determine. Community need—should get information before decide.
- Northridge is the only CSU that has American Sign Language
- Higher calling mission to be able to offer students a bachelor degree at the CC level—less expensive.
- Current accreditation limit = minimum of one bachelor degree per college.
- ACCJC already has standards for bachelor degrees for institutions with less than 50% of its students who are enrolled in bachelor programs: includes 120 semester hours for a bachelor degree as well as specified numbers of courses.
- Community colleges can switch to WASC if we offer more than one bachelor degree.
- Hard for us to figure out things, but
- In philosophy should we have bachelor degrees in community colleges? = one question
- Second question is: Should we explore the pilot as presented in SB 850.
- We need funding to do everything.
- **Faculty:** Pay, Minimum Qualifications, Senate dynamics—different levels of faculty: noncredit, credit, library, counselors, bachelors faculty, etc.
- Timing—this might be the last time for us to get this type of legislation through—we have money and support, and it could be something good—if we don't do it now, we may lose the window of opportunity.
- A number of senates have signed resolutions in favor of this—Contra Costa is one. Any colleges that don't want to do this?
- Help underserved students = CCC mission—bachelor degrees at CCC will improve the livable wage—
- **Students:** What would the application process look like? Students could get trained just enough to stop taking classes before they get the degree. The training is valued—not so much the degree with some employers. From AA to Bachelor program—we should create a seamless transition for students. No articulation process—just our program if students go through our bachelor degree programs. Admission requirements could be a local determination—depends upon programs and students.
- **How do we keep middle class from shrinking?** Could be through offering bachelor degrees at CCCs.

Periodic Review of the Academic Senate for California Community Operational Oversight Committee

Resolution Tasks

- Present recommendations
- Begin periodic review in fall

Fall 2013 Plenary Breakout Feedback

- Initial proposal too complicated
- Focus on whether the senate is accomplishing its goals and achieving its purpose

- Focus on the actions and effectiveness of the Exec Comm in meeting the mission of the organization and serving faculty
- Effectiveness, timeliness and report of results of implementation of approved resolutions
- Random selection of reviewers

Current ASCCC Mission Statement

- Needs to be central to the process

Proposed Review Process

- 9 reviewers and 1 non-voting chair
- Random selection process—chair determined by the task force members. Certain numbers from south and north—certain numbers from areas—all rejected for random preference
- Reviewers will determine areas of concern
- Review 7 domains—6 from ethics policy with grants, programs, and planning that are the additional 1 and are not in the ethical policy.

Proposed Review Process

- Self-evaluation component for exec committee
- This spring, in fall consider pulling together a committee who won't start review until following year—a four year cycle—will evaluate the process—bring reports to reviewers and chair

Roles and Responsibilities of the Reviewers

- Be available to attend both fall and spring plenary sessions
- Chair attend both—other reviewers just attend one
- Submit report to Exec Comm in Feb.
- All reviewers attend all meetings
- ASCCC finances reviewer attendance

Considerations for the Reviewers

- A Senate and a nonprofit organization
- Therefore, there are additional responsibilities

Why Are We a Nonprofit Organization?

- First incorporated in 1974
- Why: Tax exempt
- What: Under corporate laws
- Benefits: eligible for private and public grants
- Organizational perpetuity
- Protection from personal liability
- Employee benefits
- Corporate structure

New Timeline

- Select task force in spring 2015 and have first review completed by spring 2016. Report back in spring 2017.

Comments, Questions, or Concerns?

- Why spring 2017? Body see results in spring 2016 in form of a report. Need time to come up with a response on whole process for spring 2017. Also some resolution based changes—allow it for fall.

Friday, 11 April 2014

State of the Senate

Beth Smith

- Budget: More money coming to community colleges
- Bachelor degrees
- Legislation
- Mission
- SB 1456
- AB 86
- Bob Shireman
- Common Core K-12
- Accreditation: We haven't seen the standards that have been created that relate to bachelor degrees—lack of consultation
- Student equity is a challenge in our system. The Scorecard has highlighted a number of gaps. Governor's budget sets aside a lot of money for college student equity plans.
- C-ID and SB 1440: Doing a great job of meeting requirements. Many more degree options for students today. Still work to be done. Haven't finished TMCs, nor have we evaluated them.
- Full Time Faculty: We need more; we don't have enough. We lost a lot of part and full time faculty. Many unfilled faculty still. Yes, some classified and administrator vacancies as well. We have to do more.
- Curriculum: Measure the system as a whole. ACCJC has us making goals/benchmarks/metrics. How will we evaluate the metrics? How will we establish them?
- Reduced staff in the Chancellor's Office—Barry Russel left in December, and in April, we still do not have a replacement.
- Identity: What is our identity? Who are we as the ASCCC? We need to address this topic. Are we going in the right direction? What do we have from our past to guide us? Where do we want to go in our future?
- Happy Birthday! We're 45 years old. 1969-2014
- Deal with five stages of transition:
 - Awareness: Growing acknowledgment of what's going on
 - 113 community colleges with a new college this year: Clovis College
 - Student success initiatives giving us an edge in the capitol.
 - ASCCC named in legislation that affects our mission—sets a priority for our work, which can supersede our resolutions.
 - Google listserv changing
 - Internal policies and legal documents not aligned
 - Crisis
 - May lose Title 5 protection of academic senates

- We may lose a college this year (City College of San Francisco)
 - Legislative mandates re-prioritizing the work of the Senate
 - Identity
 - Accountability and performance goals in legislation
 - Workload beyond current human resources
- Sorting out (fact)
 - Uncertainty around City College of SF
 - Uncertainty around legal challenge to academic senates
 - Performance and metric goals
 - Need expert advice to reconcile policies
 - Need healing
 - Exec Comm needs more reassigned time
 - Engage more faculty
 - Legitimate closed session times
- Vision
 - Where are we going?
 - We need a relevant senate
 - We need a healthy organization
 - We need communication that supports the sharing of ideas
 - Academic excellence
 - Increased senate funding: faculty need reassign time to do the work
 - Strengthen ASCCC role around the state
- Action
 - If we have a vision, then we need to take action.
 - Begin healing process: how many retreats? Town hall meetings to hear from faculty
 - Reconcile our dual roles: Nonprofit organization and a faculty led senate
 - Create new communication venues: Regional meetings—best way to have the communication?
 - Use professional services to align policies
 - What are we going to do about legislative mandates? How do we align legislative mandates to the system for our appropriate role in governance
 - Push for more full time faculty: Union leads already talking about how to make this a joint effort. Bring in a team.

What Does “Career Readiness” Mean?

- Common Core State Standards
 - Outlines what students should know and be able to do at the end of each grade in K-12
 - Standards include both content and curriculum
 - The new standards are much higher than the standards established by “No Child Left Behind”
 - Students are struggling to meet the new standards
 - Field testing of the new assessments for common core has already begun
 - Full implementation of common core is expected by 2015-16 but full implementation has not been divined.
 - There are two assessment efforts, Smarter Balanced and Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers. California is using the assessments developed by Smarter Balanced.
 - Full generation of students are underprepared for common core after being educated under NCLB. It is accepted that 70% of students will not assesses college ready.
- Resolution 13.04 S13 stated that ASCCC views that college readiness and career readiness are the same thing
- What is career ready? Is it different than college ready?
- Could the 70% of students that are not college ready be some degree of career ready?
- The current efforts to define career readiness have been broken into 16 different sectors.
- Each framework contains four levels defining English Language Arts and mathematics skills
 - Thourough
 - Adequate
 - Partial
 - Minimal
- More about these sectors can be found at www.onetonline.org
- State adoption is optional
 - Will these rubrics affect existing curriculum alignment?
 - What is the effect of the message “You don’t have to be college ready to be CTE ready?”
 - Would adoption by the California Department of Education make the rubrics universal?

Legislation and Advocacy: What's Coming and What Local Senate Can Do

- We are currently in month 3.5 of the second year of a two year legislative cycle.
- ASCCC provides unbiased information on legislation. FACCC advocates and lobbies for faculty positions on legislation.
- A bill dies in Sacramento because it doesn't comply with the calendar
- AB 1271 (Bonta) - Inmate Education
 - Would waive the open course requirement and allow credit courses offered in jails and other correctional institutions to be funded at the full credit rate. Currently, these courses are funded at the noncredit rate even if they are offered for college credit.
- AB 1348 (Perez)
 - Creates a replacement for CPEC
 - Not clear what the authority and composition of this group would be
- AB 1451 (Holden)
 - Eases restrictions on concurrent enrollment and might allow basic skills courses to be offered through concurrent enrollment.
- AB 1942 (Bonta)
 - Would allow the Board of Governors to determine the accrediting agency for the California Community Colleges
- SB 1068 (Beall)
 - Opens up the choice of accrediting agency, similar to AB 1942
 - Would authorize the Board of Governors to explore the creation of a new accrediting agency for the California Community Colleges
- AB 2558 (Williams)
 - Removes outdated language from Education Code about the funding for professional development but does not suggest any new language to replace it

- Still need set funding for professional development
 - FACCC is currently trying to obtain 10 million dollars in funding for professional development
- AB 2705 (Williams)
 - Changes the designation of full time and part time to regular faculty, contract faculty, and associate (may become contingent) faculty.
- AB 2247 (Williams)
 - Would require colleges to make all accreditation documents public on the college website
- SB 173 (Liu)
 - Reduce the number of areas in noncredit to only include those areas currently under CDCP
- SB 850 (Block)
 - Create a Bachelor's Degree pilot program
 - Waiting to see if the bill will be amended to specifically prevent degrees in nursing
 - Would this reduce the value of an Associate Degree?
- SB 1196 (Liu)
 - Fund colleges based upon their performance in specific metrics. This is a new form of performance based funding.
- Advocacy by Local Senates
 - Four step process
 - Bite-Size Information
 - Relevant Analysis
 - One Minute Advocacy
 - Clear Communication

The Changing Ecology of Higher Education

- US higher education is a legacy of the cold war (revolution 1)
- Chronic cost/funding problem has become a political issue (revolution 2)
- Current tumult can be leveraged for improvement in creating a better integrated and more effective education
- Revolution 1: 1945 - 1978/89
 - Mass expansion subsidized by federal funding, state funding, and philanthropy
 - Implicated in the geopolitics of the cold war
 - Trying to maintain strength and military superiority
 - Able to have nearly free education despite not being a socialist country
 - Higher education is an investment, not a cost
 - All higher education is publicly subsidized
 - Who benefited?
 - Eligible students
 - Employers
 - Colleges and universities themselves
 - Faculty who were given the privilege of self governance with minimal oversight on instructional quality
- Revolution 2: 1978/89 -
 - Post proposition 13
 - Chronic contractions of state higher education budgets
 - No net capacity expansion
 - Ambitious new providers - for profit institutions
 - Facing an accountability imperative
 - New delivery media and data analytics
 - New philanthropies seeking to architect a new higher education (Gates Foundation, Lumina, etc)

- Context of long term globalization of manufacturing
- Who should pay for a college education and how do we pay for it?
- Who should govern postsecondary education and how?
- How should colleges' performance be measured?
- What is college?
 - How many years?
 - How many providers?
 - Where?
- Opportunities
 - Need to make better use of our capacity

Faculty Evaluation: Peer Review

- Peer review is a required portion of faculty evaluation (specified in education code §87633) but it cannot be the only part of the review.
- CCC are experts in their discipline, but we are not required to have any training in effective teaching.
- If you have never been trained on effective teaching practices, are you qualified to evaluate the teaching of a colleague?
- Peer review is intended to help us improve our teaching but, how can the reviewer provide meaningful feedback when they aren't sure what to look for?
- Training of peer evaluators is necessary to ensure useful and consistent peer review.
- Before going to observe a colleague, make sure that you review their syllabus to see what will be covered and the expectations that have been set for the course.
- Suggestions for your observation
 - Stay for the entire class time. While you might be able to see everything that you need in 10 to 15 minutes, you can't judge every part of that class period if you are only there for part of the time.
 - Staying the entire time lets your colleague know how important you think the observation is.
 - Take detailed notes during your observation. Your observation notes should include whether the class started on time, whether the instructor reviewed previous materials, what techniques were used to engage the students, what were the parts of the class that worked really well, and what were areas where improvement might be possible.
- After the observation, try to speak with your colleague before submitting your final summary. They should have a chance to discuss your observation to explain why they chose particular techniques for that class. After the discussion, your view of the class that was observed may change.
- The college must provide professional development opportunities to help instructors improve. If evaluations cite areas for improvement, the college must provide training opportunities to help facilitate that improvement. These could consist of college wide development sessions or attendance at a discipline specific conference. If the college is unwilling to help instructors improve, should they really have a right to cite areas for improvement?
- How does the evaluation of online instruction differ from the evaluation of traditional instruction? If an instructor is teaching a combination of online and traditional classes, does the online section have to be observed?
- Does your college require the observation of every section taught when an instructor is being evaluated?

Summary Report—ASCCC Spring Plenary 2014

Joyce Wagner

Unit Creep and General Education Bloat: What's a Faculty Leader to Do?

- Higher unit courses absorb units available for financial aid and may affect priority registration.
- Higher unit courses affect the ability to create transfer degrees that are limited by 60 units.
- Should college instructors be spending time in class on homework?
 - A Carnegie lecture unit is one hour in class and two hours outside of class.
 - Instructors try to make up for students not doing homework outside of class.
 - This may be a disservice to students because they are not being trained to work appropriately in a college environment and may struggle after transfer.
 - Are we teaching to the weakest students?
 - Opportunities could be made available outside of class like SI, tutoring, etc.
 - Course student success tends to be better in higher unit courses.
- There is a sense of a “norm” unit value that could be found on C-ID descriptors or CSU and UC classes.
- Sometimes more units than assumed on a C-ID descriptor are a condition for articulation.
- Courses that meet a particular C-ID descriptor must be accepted by other community colleges that have courses with that descriptor even if the number of units varies. (e.g. A college that offers a 5 unit course must accept a 3 unit course from another college if it meets the same descriptor)
- Discipline experts don't have the sole authority to determine the number of units. The institution owns the curriculum and the CIC is the guardian.
- IGETC for STEM is currently only available for Chemistry, Biology, Nursing, and Engineering.
 - The student must make up some of the GEs at the transfer institution.
 - There are only 60 more units available at the CSUs for students after transfer.

What Local Senates Should be Doing in Response to AB 86 (Adult Education)

- The LAOs office had recommended that all Math and English courses below English 1A and Intermediate Algebra should be offered as noncredit.
- Instead AB 86 mandated the creation of regional consortia to make plans for noncredit and adult education.
 - This is a 2 year planning process finished in spring 2015.
 - The consortia are tasked to find gaps in services, evaluate the current offerings, and find ways to maximize the return on investment.
- AB 86 promised more funding for noncredit basic skills, High School subjects, short-term career, apprenticeship, and classes for immigrants and disabled.
- AB 86 excluded older adult programs, parenting, home economics (which include career choice and consumer courses), and health and safety. There is a proposal to cut these classes entirely, but currently they are under local control.
- Since the decisions being made affect curriculum, articulation, and professional development, faculty need to be involved.

Noncredit Success from Indicators to Student Completion

- Santa Ana College presented what they had done with ESL.
 - Noncredit offers 6 basic and intermediate ESL classes. Credit no longer offers their bottom 3 ELS courses.
 - The noncredit and credit ESL departments worked together to match courses and determine the pathway a student moves into credit.
- Noncredit courses can be a possible prerequisite for a course and long as it is available for students or other options exist.
- Concern was expressed about noncredit courses not being counted toward a load for financial aid.
 - If a student places such that they need to take a noncredit course, then they would need to take an extra credit course to maintain their load.
 - It was mentioned that pedagogical decisions should not be based on either financial aid or apportionment. The goal should be to find the best way for a student to learn a skill.

Performance Metrics and Goals for the CCC system

- There are 10 proposed goals that fall into 4 categories.
 - They are being worked on by the scorecard group
 - The Board of Governors will review them again in May.
- Student Success (from Scorecard)
 - Completion Rate— increase by 1% each year
 - Persistence (3 consecutive terms) –increase by 1% each year
 - 30 units rate—increase by 1% each year
 - Math and English Remedial to College Level rates—increase by 1% each year
 - CTE completion rate—increase by 1% each year
- Equity
 - Completion rates among different subgroups= completion rate of subgroup/completion rate of system x 100 (general view is that if result is <80 then there is inequity)—increase the ones that are less than 100 by 1 each year
- Student Services
 - Percentage of students with education plan—increase by 3% per year
- Efficiency
 - Average FTES per student = FTES/# of students—increase by ????
 - FTES spent per scorecard outcome

Helping Students Understand the Importance of General Education

- There is a need to communicate to students the value of courses outside their majors.
- GEs could be tailored to specific areas. (e.g. Math for automotives, Writing for sciences)
- The 2013 Survey of Employers highly ranks oral, written, and quantitative skills.
- Disciplines could recommend specific GE classes for their majors.
- Some colleges have agreements with their local CSU that if a student takes a particular set of GEs they could be granted a minor.
- Some colleges have students complete a module during orientation regarding institutional learning outcomes.

Plenary Summary Reports---Mary Mettler

Student Placement: Predicting Student Success in Courses

Presenters discussed that students taking placement exams can be misplaced if only a single measure is given (1 in 4 for math, 1 in 3 for English; Clayton, et. a. 2012). The state-wide Common Assessment will include both the assessment tests and multiple measures (e.g., transcripts, high school GPA, EAP). The weight of the multiple measures will be determined locally by discipline faculty, counseling and research. CCC will track data over time to determine the most predictive multiple measures.

Your Role in the College Student Success and Support Plan

This presentation focused on the required SSSP Plan and the Student Equity Plans that are both due in the fall of 2014. Discussion included the roles of faculty and non-instructional faculty in the development of these plans and the fact that future monies will be tied to the success of these plans.

Open Educational Resources (OER)

Senate Bills 1052 & 1053 the California Open Educational Resources Council (CERC) and the California Digital Open Source Library. The CERC is comprised of representatives from 3 CCCs, 3 CSUs and 3 UCs and has funding for 6 OER books. This library will have an Amazon-like review system for both instructor and students.

Strengthening Ties with Instruction and Student Services

This presentation addressed the SSSP Plan and the Student Equity Plan in relation to shared governance committees. Both plans must be approved by their respective college's Academic Senate Committees. Further discussion recommended that Student Services have a standing item on the senate agenda for each meeting.

Awarding Credit Where Credit is Due: Effective Practices for the Implementation of Credit by Exam

Presenters discussed explained policies for the Credit by Examination (CbE) process. These policies include that the exam will yield a letter grade (Title 5). The CbE courses must be publically listed. Each discipline faculty determines what courses are offered for CbE , as well as the nature and content of the exam.