In an effort to develop strategies for addressing the challenges of the future for California Community Colleges, the Board of Governors and the Chancellor created a task force within the consultation process to recommend actions necessary from now until the year 2005. The task force developed the 2005 Task Force Report which is a compilation of four papers prepared by Chancellor’s staff and research from other agencies such as CPEC and RAND. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges was represented by Janis Perry, Past President, and Linda Collins, Secretary, on the task force. Points highlighted in this article are taken from the report. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate has voted to support the draft report at their regular meeting in September 1997. The following points were made in the report:

- “Tidal Wave II” estimates are that an additional 400,000 students will attend community colleges by the year 2005.
- The Rand study points out that the real earnings of workers with only a high school education will be about 40% less in the year 2015 as compared to their counterparts in 1976.
- When population projections are combined with the declining postsecondary education participation rates among some ethnic minority groups in California, the likelihood of a polarized economic and social order in California is increased.
- The CSU system has adopted a policy that reduces its remediation function, which will likely direct more postsecondary remediation to the community colleges. If UC and CSU attempt to increase upper division access, more lower division requirements will be shifted to the community colleges.
- Major welfare reform being implemented by the federal and state governments impacts the role of community colleges in helping welfare recipients make
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Strengthening the Academic Senate Role in Governance

Your state Academic Senate provides a great deal of support to you as a local faculty leader. One of our major goals for this year is to enhance that support even more. As a local faculty senate leader, it is vital for you to start off on the right foot.

Each June the Academic Senate conducts the Faculty Leadership Institute, four days of intensive training and networking to prepare you to be an effective senate leader. Last year 75 faculty from throughout the state attended workshops and were led through exercises and situation analysis by the experienced members of our Executive Committee. In addition, Institute participants get a resource book that is valuable on a day-to-day basis. This year’s Institute will be held in Palm Springs from June 25th to the 28th.

Our Geocluster Network arranges senates in regions of 6 to 10 colleges with a local leader to facilitate exchange of information and plan 3 to 4 meetings each year. These meetings provide an opportunity for neighboring senate leaders to get together and share common concerns and successful strategies. They also provide a forum for geocluster leaders and regional Executive Committee members to discuss late-breaking state issues. To contact your geocluster leader, look in your senate directory or call the Sacramento office.

When you have an urgent need or a pressing question, you can always call me directly at our Sacramento office. One of my personal goals for the year is to return your calls promptly. If I cannot meet your need myself, I will put you in contact with someone who can. The officers and members of the Executive Committee are also available to come directly to your campus. I personally have visited 30 to 40 colleges a year, presenting on topics such as shared governance, curriculum, program review, matriculation, and teaching/learning styles.

Our Executive Committee members have expertise covering a wide range of topics. You may have attended one of our Fall Session breakouts and thought of the number of faculty at your college who would benefit from hearing such a presentation. By contacting our Sacramento office and making arrangements through me as Senate president, our presentations can be brought directly to you! We usually ask that you cover the travel and materials costs and make whatever additional contribution your budget allows. However, cost is not a barrier. If you have a need that we can meet, we will be at your doorstep even if you do not have local resources.

(continued on next page)
Many times the problems you face relate to an issue you have with your president, chancellor, or governing board. If you have tried to solve the problem and feel like you are at a stand-still, outside help or mediation may be what you need. The Academic Senate and the Community College League (representing CEOs and trustees) have agreed on a set of shared governance guidelines and a technical assistance process which is available to you. If you are at a point where such intervention may be required, call the Sacramento office for more information.

While the shared governance guidelines and assistance process have proved extremely valuable since their creation in 1992, our issues have become considerably more complex since then. In response, the Senate and the League have formed a task force to write an additional set of guidelines on these recent issues and to discuss refinements of the technical assistance process. Lee Haggerty, Lin Marelick and Nancy Silva will join me in meeting with League representatives next month. We plan to have a document ready for presentation at Spring Session.

One of the ways that we at the state level can provide support for your efforts at the local level is to build in defined roles for the local senate. Of course, you are familiar with the collegial consultation process in Title 5 sections 53200-204, written to implement Education Code 70902(b)(7). However, you should not neglect other portions of the AB 1725 reform legislation that strengthened the role of local senates in governance. These are summarized in the box titled “Academic Senate Authorities in the Education Code.” Title 5 also has additional authorities assigned to the academic senate which are summarized in a similar box.

### Academic Senate Authorities in the Education Code

1. **Equivalency to Minimum Qualifications** [Ed. Code 87359(b)]
   - The process, as well as criteria and standards by which the governing board reaches its determinations, shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate and approved by the governing board. The agreed upon process shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate to determine that each individual employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications specified in regulations adopted by the board of governors...

2. **Hiring Criteria** [Ed. Code 87360(b)]
   - No later than July 1, 1990, hiring criteria, policies, and procedures for new faculty members shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by the representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board.

3. **Administrative Retreat Rights** [Ed. Code 87458(a)]
   - The process by which the governing board reaches the determination shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board. The agreed upon process shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate to determine that rare and compelling reasons exist to grant tenure...

4. **Tenure Evaluation Procedures** [Ed. Code 87610.1(a)]
   - ...the faculty’s exclusive representative shall consult with the academic senate prior to engaging in collective bargaining on these procedures.

5. **Waiver of Minimum Qualifications for Tenure** [Ed. Code 87615(b)]
   - The process by which the governing board reaches the determination shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board. The agreed upon process shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate to determine that rare and compelling reasons exist to grant tenure...

6. **Evaluation Procedures** [Ed. Code 87663(f)]
   - ...the faculty’s exclusive representative shall consult with the academic senate prior to engaging in collective
The 29th Plenary Session of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges was held from October 30 to November 1, 1997 at the Los Angeles Airport Marriott. During that session, 105 Faculty Delegates, along with six (6) members of the Board of Governors, the Chancellor and portions of his staff, students and staff of the community colleges, reviewed and collaborated on the major academic, legislative and institutional issues facing the community colleges. There were 86 resolutions presented to the Plenary Body, of which 63 were approved.

The Legislative Committee of the Academic Senate proposed and presented three (3) breakouts to the body and invited experts within the state system to provide information and answer questions concerning policies and decisions, as well as the effects of the changes being proposed and implemented.

Chancellor Tom Nussbaum and former Chancellor Jerry Hayward discussed the ramifications and procedures for the reform and elimination of sections of the Education Code, for which Nussbaum has hired Hayward to take responsibility. Nussbaum and Hayward were asked about other issues such as the lack of compliance by colleges to the 75/25 Hiring Ratio and Shared Governance provisions, his unwillingness to include a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for New Faculty positions to the Governor and expenditures for new technologies.

Chancellor Nussbaum was asked about other issues such as the lack of compliance by colleges to the 75/25 Hiring Ratio and Shared Governance provisions, his unwillingness to include a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for New Faculty positions to the Governor and expenditures for new technologies.

Chancellor Nussbaum was asked about other issues such as the lack of compliance by colleges to the 75/25 Hiring Ratio and Shared Governance provisions, his unwillingness to include a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for New Faculty positions to the Governor and expenditures for new technologies.

The Chancellor was asked to comment on the contents of the “State Of The System” address he had previously given to the Chief Executive Officers group. There were specific concerns about the Academic Excellence proposal the Chancellor presented to the Board of Governors, his legislative package for the community colleges and the effects new welfare reform legislation will have on the community colleges.

Patrick McCallum, Executive Director of the Faculty Association for California Community Colleges, and Christopher Cabaldon, Vice-Chancellor of Governmental Relations, presented a second breakout session for the Legislative Committee focusing on legislation and the state budget.

Patrick McCallum discussed the Governor’s Budget for California Community Colleges and gave information on the politics of the legislature and the legislation passed by that body. He discussed the effects those bills will have on the community colleges and explained the political issues of the Board of Governors, the Department of Finance, the Chancellor’s Office and the Legislature. He said that faculty have the ability to influence that process, and he encouraged increased involvement from all through advocacy.

Christopher Cabaldon discussed the legislation proposed and passed in this session of the California Legislature and shared his perceptions of the ramifications of the actions taken. He expressed his views on how the leaders within the community colleges could influence the Governor and the Legislature to gain more support from them. Christopher is a recent acquisition of the Chancellor’s Office and indicated that he would report additional developments by way of the scheduled Legislative Advocacy meetings and the Consultation Process.

A third legislative session included Jennifer DuCray-Morrill, Deputy Chief Executive, Office of Governmental Affairs, Policy and Program for the State Teachers Retirement System (STRS), covered the
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Technology Training

by Ric Matthews, Technology Committee Chair

With the buildout of the Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) in conjunction with the California State University (4Cnet), and the establishment of minimal technology hardware standards on each community college (T1 line, Videoconferencing, and satellite download) it is time to turn our attention to applications. Utilization of the infrastructure is tied in large part to the training available. Therefore, as part of the TTIP funding, there is a statewide coordination of training grant which identified DeAnza College as the fiscal agent. This project has been initially named the 4C@ONE project (California Community College Consortium at Outcomes Network for Educators), and it represents a collection of 10 coordinating college partners who are leading the planning and delivery of technology training for faculty and staff across the state. The partner colleges are Butte, DeAnza, Fresno, LA Trade, Las Positas, Marin, Santa Ana, San Diego Miramar, Santa Monica, and Santa Barbara.

The two year grant calls for two studies to initially occur prior to training. The first study involves two and four year colleges to review and establish benchmarks of good practice in the various uses of technology. The results of this survey will serve as a starting spot in planning future training and will be made available to the field. This work was completed in late November. The second phase of surveys will be to poll the faculty in a selected statistical survey of representatives. A questionnaire will be placed in the hands of the involved faculty by mid-January, with the results due back in early February. This data will be tabulated and analyzed by a researcher and the consortium team to provide the basis for future planning.

We have many common issues in the arena of technology training, and it seems to make sense to coordinate our efforts and maximize the use of the staff development dollars. The idea behind the consortium is to coordinate regional training both on your campus and regionally as appropriate. A training schedule will be coming forth in the mid-Spring. An important component of the technology training will be a multiple day live-in/hands-on opportunity cosponsored by the Academic Senate and 4C@ONE, to give faculty a experience with the hardware and software, and to come away with tangible products and skills.

Watch for announcements from both groups and apply early.

Affirmative Action/Cultural Diversity at the Fall Session

by Edith Conn, Executive Committee Member

The Affirmative Action/Cultural Diversity Committee sponsored two breakouts at the Fall Session, focusing on teaching and learning diversity and the effects of Proposition 209.

Led by Toni Forsyth, DeAnza College, and Neelam Canto-Lugo, Yuba College, the Teaching and Learning Diversity breakout featured a discussion by Toni Forsyth who is director of the “Center for the Study of Teaching and Learning Diversity in Higher Education” at DeAnza College. Funded by a grant from the Chancellor’s Office, the Center is sponsoring a national conference April 8-11, 1998 at the Doubletree Hotel in Monterey. One of the features of the conference is an emphasis on different teaching and learning styles, reflecting needs of our diverse study body. In order to illustrate a diverse teaching style, Neelam Canto-Lugo used those attending the breakout as students in an experiential activity, involving one group playing the role of indigenous people and the other group playing the role of invaders trying to impose new cultural standards. In a discussion following the activity, there was extensive discussion and comment of how it felt to be in both groups and how the (see “Affirmative” continued on p 6)
groups tried to work together and separately to fulfill their roles.

In another breakout entitled “The Post Prop 209 World” Vice Chancellor for Human Resources Jose Peralez was joined by Ron Cataraha, director of Human Resources at Rio Hondo College, and Annjennette McFarlin, from Grossmont College, in describing the community college world now that Proposition 209 has been declared the law in California, following judicial review of several challenges brought by Prop 209 opponents. Vice Chancellor Peralez reported that on October 10, 1997 the Governor was given “standing,” the legal status to proceed with his lawsuit asking that many community college laws and regulations be declared unconstitutional under Proposition 209. However, numerous updates have been issued by the Chancellor’s office advising districts to continue to adhere to guidelines regarding employment, affirmative action and minority, women and disabled contracting goals. State statutes still direct districts to undertake these activities. Districts must continue to comply with these laws until an appellate court declares them to be unconstitutional or until the Legislature amends or repeals them. In the course of the breakout there were members of the audience, supporters of Proposition 209, who challenged the Vice Chancellor, who very effectively countered their arguments.

Also on the panel Annjennette McFarlin, speech instructor at Grossmont College, reported on the very effective intern program that she directs for the San Diego area. Many of the interns have been hired full time in the community colleges. Ron Cataraha, human resources director at Rio Hondo College, discussed efforts at his college to maintain diversity despite the adoption of Proposition 209.

According to a Board of Governors agenda item for the November 12-13, 1997 meeting it is hoped that “a comprehensive system consensus will emerge that commits sufficient resources to ensure that we find and fund new ways to maintain our commitment to diversity in a post-Proposition 209 environment.” (This article is indebted to the Board Agenda Item 6.3 November 12-13, 1997 for some details.)

********************************************************************

Center for the Study of Teaching and Learning Diversity in Higher Education Sponsors a National Conference on Teaching and Learning Diversity in American Higher Education

Toni Forsyth, Senate president and English faculty member at DeAnza College is the director of the Center for the Study of Teaching and Learning Diversity in Higher Education, funded at DeAnza College under a Chancellor’s Office Grant. Many research and other activities are being carried out and planned by the Center, but one of particular interest to community college faculty is the National Conference on Teaching and Learning Diversity in American Higher Education planned for April 8-11, 1998 at the Doubletree Hotel in Monterey.

The Conference features notable addresses and dialogues with, among others, Broadway award winning actor B.D. Wong who will open the conference with an address entitled “All the World’s a State: Supporting the Transformation from Exclusion to Inclusion.” Other speakers include Claude Steele speaking on “How Stereotypes Shape Intellectual Identities: Minority Students Achievement and Success;” Susan Johnson discussing “Teaching and Learning Alternatives,” and Jose Cuellar, “Higher Education at the Crossroads: Hanging Out at the Corner of Lecture and Arts.” In addition to breakout panels on a variety of topics and issues, there will be pre-conference workshops with community college faculty offering full and half-day presentations on such topics as “Crosscultural Communication in the Classroom,” “Learning Styles and Teaching Skills,” and “Micro-Teaching: A Teaching Skills Workshop.” In addition there will be a unique “City as Text” workshop using the special Monterey environment as a subject for aspects of teaching literature, history, and environmental studies.

Proposals for those wishing to make presentations are still being accepted. Please Contact Toni Forsyth at DeAnza College for more details, including registration information and a conference brochure: 408-864-8993.

(see “Affirmative Action” next pg)
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION / CULTURAL DIVERSITY RESOLUTIONS

At the 1997 Fall Session several resolutions were adopted relating to affirmative action and cultural diversity issues. Among the issues addressed by the resolutions were these:

1. Calling on the Chancellor to search the Education Code and Title 5 to remove gender-biased words/phrases and replace them with gender neutral terms in areas of the law and Title 5 that relate to community colleges.

2. Urging local senates to continue to ensure that affirmative action regulations be enforced on their campuses, citing the Senate’s many positions in support of affirmative action over the years.

3. Direct the Executive Committee to work with the Chancellor’s Office to hold a series of affirmative action workshops that will involve teams of attendees from all segments of the colleges in order to address ways of promoting diversity efforts in community colleges.

4. Working with the Chancellor’s Office in its review of Title 5 to include “sexual orientation” in the anti-discrimination statement for California Community College system.

5. Urge local senates to support affirmative action by including training for hiring committees, promotion of faculty intern and mentoring programs, and to continue outreach efforts to hire diverse recruitment efforts.

6. Urge the Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Governors to be aware of, and to stop, discriminatory practices in hiring at some colleges using “lateral transfer” as an excuse and to correct regulations which permit hiring loopholes under the guise of “business necessity” and college “reorganization.”

This document will be mailed to your campus Senate Office and will be on the senate Web Site: www.academic_senate.cc.ca.us.

A series of resolutions also passed concerning a redefinition of the Title 5 language, which many had come to know as the face to face requirement. It was moved that this language would become “Effective Instructor-Student Contact,” where the emphasis is on requiring that the faculty member needs to insure that there is “effective” contact with their students. The resolution also recommends that the Ed. Code be amended to include interactive forms such as email, chat rooms, video-conferencing, and the telephone. The Executive Committee will be working with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) on defining effective contact that is acceptable for articulation. This underscores the primacy of the faculty in establishing effectiveness as a key to maintaining the quality of the curriculum. The Executive Committee will come forth with guidelines for effective interaction at the Spring session. The steps necessary for these resolutions to actually change the language of Title 5 will be for the Executive Committee to agree on the exact language in early January, take the item to the Consultation process in mid-January, and to the BOG for a first reading in January. A second reading by the BOG will take place in March following public hearings. If all are in agreement, it could become

(see “Technology” on p 10)
The Academic Senate for CCC held its 29th Fall Plenary Session at the LAX Marriott Hotel October 30 - November 1. Over 350 people attended the session representing 107 Community College faculty. The participants addressed a number of important issues during the 41 breakouts presented by the ASCCC Executive Committee. This year’s theme, Access And Excellence: The Primary Role Of Faculty, evoked a variety of topics such as: Changes in “regular personal student contact” requirement for distance education in Title 5; rewriting of the Education Code as being done by the Chancellor’s Office; implementing the new CalWORKS legislation; implementing Prop. 209; and program discontinuance.

Although the session was made up predominately of faculty, other participants included Board of Governors members David Lawrence, Vishwas More, Phil Forhan, Julia Wu, Yvonne Boddle, Pat Siever, and CC Chancellor Tom Nussbaum and a number of his staff. This added some counter discussion (if not unifying points of view) to the three days of diverse, informative and often provocative educational activities. Pat Siever, new Board of Governors member, past VP ASCCC and Professor of History in the LACCD, received a standing ovation after an inspiring speech at the Friday luncheon. As many faculty commented, it was good to have one of our own as a member of the Board of Governors in attendance at our Fall Session.

Other speakers included: Jacqueline Woods, Liaison for Community Colleges; David Katz, Global Education Industry Manager for 3Com Corporation; and Sally M. Havice, California State Assemblyperson. Anthony Gamble, Senate President, West LA College gave the opening welcome on Thursday.

The positions that the Senate takes on important statewide issues ultimately affecting local college concerns were informed at the traditional voting session on Saturday. This year 86 resolutions were presented. The final breakdown on the disposition of the resolutions was: 63 adopted, 2 non-urgent, 10 failed, 5 referred to the Executive Committee, 3 moot, 2 withdrawn, and 1 called out of order. As of this writing the Fall 97 resolutions in final form have been mailed to faculty Senate Presidents at each college statewide and should be available for your examination.

Although a lot of work was accomplished during the three days, there was time for participants to unwind and have a little fun. The Thursday night dinner and entertainment, which included the outstanding dance performance by the Lula Washington Dance Troupe, was enjoyed by all of us. The
Halloween party after dinner included a “howling” dance performance by the Executive Committee. The performance began as a ghoulish resurrection from an imaginary cemetery where members drifted into the audience and dragged bystanders back onto the dance floor. Exec. members who anticipated foul play (ask Len Price about this) hid while the others gathered for the pre-dance instructions. It was a hoot!

“2005” continued from p 1)

...the transition to family-supporting work.

• In 1996, legislation was passed adding economic development to the community college mission statement. There is an increasing trend for community colleges to develop partnership programs with business and industry to provide continuing education for the currently-employed workforce.

• While immigrants comprise nearly 20% of California’s population, they represent nearly 50% of the population growth between now and 2005. The rising number of immigrants, particularly from countries with lower per capita educational levels, increases the need for ESL and basic skills development.

• The Community College participation rate of African-American males was cut in half between 1977 and 1995 while the rate for African-American females dropped by nearly one-third.

• Another cause of concern is the low participation rates of Hispanic students when compared with other ethnic populations.

• Accommodating the “Tidal Wave II” increase in the 18-24 year old cohort along with a modest correction in the participation rates of African-American and Hispanic adults will require an increase of 10 “points” to a participation rate of 68 per 1,000 adults.

(see “2005” on p 16)
At the Fall Session 1997, a special election was held for the office of Treasurer. Debra Landre, San Joaquin Delta College, who held the office of treasurer as of Spring 1997, resigned last June when she was elected CCA President. Also in June, the Executive Committee appointed Lin Marelick, Mission College, as Interim Treasurer. Lin had been serving on the Executive Committee as North Representative. In anticipation of Marelick’s possible candidacy for Treasurer at the Fall Session, the position of North Representative was announced in the Fall Session mailing. If Lin Marelick decided to run for the office of Treasurer and was successful, then an election would need to be held to fill the vacancy for North Representative. Four senators declared themselves as candidates if a North Representative election was held. The candidates were Jim Higgs, Modesto Jr. College, Kevin Twohy, Diablo Valley College, Ian Walton, Mission College, and Angela Willson, Yuba College.

Lin Marelick was successful in her election for Treasurer and an election to fill the North Representative vacancy was then held. In the election for North Representative, Ian Walton and Angela Willson were successful in accumulating the most votes. A run-off election was then held between Walton and Willson. Walton received the majority of the votes in the election and was elected to the Executive Board in the position of North Representative.

The election was conducted by the Election Committee, which is comprised of Allen Boyer, Modesto Jr. College, Donna Ferracone, Crafton Hills College, and myself, Nancy Silva, Election Chair, American River College. Tellers for the Fall 1997 election were: May du Bois, West LA College, Dan Crump, American River College, John Pelleoni, Cerritos College, Julie Willard, Irvine Valley College, George Carlson, Citrus College, Ann Holiday, Coastline College, Robert Wachman, Yuba College, Sheila Martin, Fresno College.

General elections will be held at the Spring 1998 Session for the offices of President, Vice-President, Secretary, and Treasurer. Elections will also be held for the Executive Committee member positions of North Representative, South Representative, Area B, Area C and At Large Representative. Announcements for the Spring general elections will be sent out with the session mailings.

misinterpretation of the regulations can jeopardize the articulation agreements of all campuses. Several resolutions addressed the need to secure additional funding for technology. While many individuals see technology as some magic panacea for all the ailments we have it is obvious that we will need increased and ongoing funding to support the purchase, maintenance and technical support for the best tools to do the job. The importance of technology was underscored by the resolution ensuring the access to computers and other technology by faculty in locations most productive to faculty (i.e., their office), with the appropriate support, and ongoing maintenance. A resolution also broadened the definition of technology beyond the computer.

A final resolution directed the Executive Committee to look at models for a new instructional curricula, where technology mediated instruction might offer courses that have very different start and ending dates than the traditional campus based courses.
The First Report Cards that Assess Community College Vocational Education programs will be disseminated March 31, 1998.

SB 645 (Johnston), The Job Training Report Card bill was signed into law October 11, 1997. Under this law the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) is responsible for oversight of employment and training programs at the state level.

This bill would require the State Job Training Coordinating Council to establish a subcommittee with a specified membership to develop an education and job training report card program to assess the accomplishments of California’s work force preparation system. The bill would require the subcommittee or an operating entity under contract to the subcommittee to compile information on the performance of state and federally funded education and training programs, as specified, and to issue annual report cards for all providers of these programs measuring the effectiveness of the individual providers and of the various programs that constitute the state’s work force development system. The subcommittee or operating entity would also issue a statewide report card measuring the effectiveness of the entire system of work force preparation.

This system shall measure the performance of state and federally funded education and training programs. Programs to be measured may include programs in receipt of funds from the Job Training Partnership Act, the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act, the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills program, the Food Stamp Employment and Training program, the Wagner Peyser Act, the employment Training Panel, adult education programs as defined by paragraph (9) of subdivision (b) of Section 10521, vocational education programs, and certificated community college programs.

The outcome measures that have been approved by the committee to be in the report card are:
1. Employment Rate
2. Length of Employment Retention
3. Earnings Before and After Program Participation
4. Rate of Change in Unemployment Insurance Status
5. Rate of Change in Status from Tax Receiver to Tax Payer
6. Rate of Advancement to Public, Post-Secondary Education

As SB 645 did not specify the customers for the report cards, the PBA Committee identified the following:
• State and federal funding and oversight agencies such as the Governor, the legislature, and the federal Departments of Labor and Education
• State and local-level agencies that provide workforce preparation services and service delivery system operators such as the California Community Colleges, operators of other state and federally-funded programs, and One-Stop Career Centers operators;
• Individuals interested in jobs and careers; and,
• Employers interested in selecting training providers for their employees, employers interested in hiring training providers’ graduates, and employers desiring to have an influence on the quality of workforce preparation programs.

The Applied Management Planning Group has been contracted by the SJTCC to produce the report card. The following is part of a report they made to the SJTCC.

Public dissatisfaction with the perceived performance of job training and vocational education has generated a host of new federal and state performance requirements to improve the accountability of programs. These requirements are part of a larger effort to improve the transition from school to work and to speed the transfer of displaced workers to new jobs. New legislation proposed by the Clinton administration embodies many of these national goals. The National Research Council’s Committee on Post secondary Education and Training for the Workplace recently conducted a comprehensive study which concluded that improved information is the key to

(see “Report Card” on p14)
The Academic Senate, along with representatives from the Chancellors Office, University of California, California State University, and other public and private education institutions in California, is part of Governor Pete Wilson’s design team for the California Virtual University (CVU). The design team is charged with proposing to the governor a blueprint for serving the needs of California students and employers through emerging technology-enhanced educational programs and distance education. The faculty of California’s community colleges and their Academic Senate support efforts designed to expand educational opportunities to all students in our state and nation and to utilize more effectively new technologies (e.g., the Internet). We therefore support Governor Wilson’s initiative to create a virtual university. At the same time, California faculty have some concerns about distance education generally and Governor Wilson’s initiative in particular, concerns that the Academic Senate will address as a member of the CVU design team.

The idea for a CVU arose from Governor Wilson’s decision not to participate in the Western Governor’s University, a consortium of colleges and universities throughout our neighboring states. Rather, Governor Wilson chose to showcase California’s premiere higher education institutions by creating an alternative program headed by Joe Rodota, the Governor’s deputy chief of staff. Unlike the Western Governor’s University, which is intended to be an accredited, degree granting institution, the CVU is being promoted as a brokerage house, a clearinghouse of information for prospective students and employers. Interested persons will be able to log-on to the Internet and receive information on those colleges and universities in California that offer distance education classes. A pilot website on the Internet has been created and can now be viewed at http://www.vudesign.ca.gov/Default.htm.

The Academic Senate of California Community Colleges is committed to both the success of the CVU as well as its academic and professional integrity. The Senate’s Mission and Academic Policy committee, working with President Bill Scroggins and the Technology Committee, has identified several concerns about the CVU. Among our principal concerns are accreditation, articulation, course and program development and delivery, technological infrastructure, student support services, and fees and cost recovery.

**Accreditation**

Each college or university that offers courses through the CVU will be responsible for granting credit and ensuring academic standards. However, community colleges are subject to numerous regulations, restrictions, and procedures in approving distance education classes, some of which are contrary to the spirit of the CVU. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges, for instance, has different definitions and standards for courses offered at a distance than those offered in a traditional lecture/discussion format. The WASC requires colleges to seek separate approval for distance ed courses. Similarly, Title 5 requires colleges to have a separate review process for their distance education courses. Title 5 also requires community colleges to have significant face-to-face contact between students and faculty in all distance education classes, a requirement that is contrary to the spirit of the CVU. To assist faculty in navigating these complex and contradictory requirements and to develop new offerings, the Academic Senate has adopted guidelines for the curriculum committee approval of technology mediated classes. The Academic Senate also resolved at its Fall 1997 Plenary Session to seek repeal of the face-to-face requirement. The Academic Senate will also press the CVU design team to confront and resolve the many issues surrounding accreditation so that community colleges will not be disadvantaged in the provision of distance education offerings.

**Articulation**

For community college students to benefit from a virtual education, they must be able to plan a course of study with some assurance that classes taken through the CVU must be fully accepted by our transfer institutions. At present, community colleges have
received no assurances from UC, CSU, or private universities that CVU courses taken at participating campuses will articulate. Indeed, community colleges already have serious, unresolved articulation problems with more traditional instructional delivery methods. Project ASSIST may offer one solution to difficulties faced by our students in making important decisions about course selection in the absence of adequate articulation agreements. While this database has greatly improved, students have no assurances that ASSIST will be hot-linked to the CVU website and thus enable them to determine whether their proposed program will really be articulated with transfer institutions. Our public and private sister institutions, as well as the CVU design team, need to resolve this issue.

Course and Program Development and Delivery

Few community colleges in California are equipped to deliver courses utilizing this new technology. And relatively few faculty have been trained to prepare classes that effectively utilize this technology. Courses designed and tested for a classroom setting may not easily be delivered at a distance, where the student has a greater independence and burden for self-directed learning. Colleges have provided few incentives and little support to help faculty convert courses for distance delivery. Neither the governor nor the design team nor the Chancellor’s Office has identified funding support to promote adequate curriculum and faculty development in these areas.

Infrastructure

Most community colleges also lack the physical infrastructure to deliver courses at a distance. The Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Initiative is a step in the right direction and the necessary backbone is beginning to appear. But many colleges are not ready to participate fully in the CVU. Hardware for communication lines and servers need to be available to support this effort. Technical support must be adequate to maintain this equipment. We need to be sure that this infrastructure is robust enough on each of our campuses to ensure that they will support the delivery method consistently.

Student Support Services

Counseling, financial aid, library resources, and tutors are essential for most community college students. The CVU design team has yet to resolve the problem of access to such services for students served at a distance. Indeed, technology mediated instruction may be simpler to deliver than technology mediated student services. California community colleges should not have to sacrifice their historic mission as open admission educational institutions in order to participate in the CVU. But unless the unique needs of our diverse student body are recognized and addressed, we may be forced to forgo participation.

Fees and Cost Recovery

Distance education may be a better way to teach some students, but it is not a cheaper way to teach. Particularly if the requirement of effective student-teacher contact is fulfilled, class sizes may have to be smaller for courses delivered at a distance compared with more traditional classroom methods. Faculty across the state are already swapping stories about the avalanche of email received from their traditional students. Certainly, the current structure of FTE funding for community colleges may not allow those institutions to capture fully the additional costs (new technology, faculty development, additional faculty load) associated with technology mediated instruction. The CVU design team has yet to address issues of apportionment and instructor load/compensation, issues that may prove critical to the initiative’s success.

These are just a few of the issues that are unresolved as of this writing. Other matters include: what information must be posted on the CVU home page and which must be on the college home page? Who will post this information? Who will keep it current? How will the campus curriculum committee play a role in maintaining the quality and integrity of these offerings? As the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and its representatives on the design team grapple with these questions, we urge local academic senates to take a proactive and cautious role in their campuses participation in the CVU, until these issues are more fully addressed. We must not compromise the integrity of our programs or colleges in an attempt to meet a politically determined time-line.
“Retooling” the Curriculum for CalWORKS

by Jackie Butler, Long Beach City College,
Member of the Academic Senate for CCC Welfare Reform Ad Hoc Committee

What is retooling?
How do you do it?
Why should you retool?

Curriculum should be timely and competitive. As faculty, we know we should constantly update course content, learning objectives, etc., but curriculum change is a time consuming process. Most of us wait until program review or some other type of college wide mandatory process before we make changes.

What is retooling? Retooling is taking a current, fresh look at what employers/industry expect from our graduates, and incorporating these expectations into the curriculum. The CalWORKS guidelines require curriculum that is competency based, industry driven, completed in less than eighteen months, and that works well for students, such as open entry classes.

How do you retool for CalWORKS?
The easiest way is NOT TO DO IT ALONE. Have a meeting with colleagues who teach similar courses and rewrite the curriculum together. Sound impossible? Six interior design faculty members from Southern California did just that, and developed a three tier program starting with a certificate, then an Associate degree, and finally the Bachelors degree. They would never have done this amount of work individually, but collectively it was less threatening, and actually intellectually stimulating.

Keep your advisory committee informed about what you are planning, and get input from them. Ask them to list the competencies (job skills) they require from a new employee in a variety of entry level positions.

DESIGN CLASSES AROUND THESE COMPETENCIES.

Rethink the traditional 3 unit, eighteen week semester. Design classes that are SHORT TERM (for example, 1 unit class offered 6 hours a week for 3 weeks) and block these classes in time periods to meet the needs of working students and not the faculty.

CUT THE EXISTING NUMBER OF UNITS NECESSARY FOR A CERTIFICATE OR AA DEGREE INTO TWO OR THREE PARTS. Think in terms of six months, nine months, or one year and write the courses accordingly. Offer certificates of completion at each level.

Why should you retool?
1. CalWORKS students will add to your FTE.
2. You will get a great deal of professional pride in knowing your courses are relevant to the world of work.
3. CalWORKS is just the first wave of changes in high education where educators will be held accountable for teaching real life skills - get a jump start on this.
4. It is exciting to be part of a new system - particularly when you work with other faculty and do not have to do all the work alone!
5. There is money to pay for curriculum revision so contact academic deans or the person in charge of CalWORKS at your college to get “retooled.”

“Report Card” continued from p 11

improving post secondary training. In the words of the Committee:

“The absence of good information about results...means that individuals seeking training have to select among available options without knowing much about the track record of different training routes or providers. The lack of reliable evidence regarding impacts also makes it impossible to judge the cost effectiveness of much post secondary training...Finally, this lack of information about results makes it difficult for policy makers to allocate public resources to programs that are most likely to help their intended audiences.”

California can take the lead in addressing this problem by creating a comprehensive follow-up system for vocational education and training programs which includes occupational information as well as data on earnings and employment.
bargaining regarding those procedures.

7. Faculty Service Areas [Ed. Code 87743.2]

...The establishment of faculty service areas shall be within the scope of meeting and negotiating pursuant to section 354.3.2 of the government code. The exclusive representative shall consult with the academic senate in developing its proposals.

Academic Senate
Authorities in Title 5

1. Hours of Instruction - Late Retirement [Title 5 53310(g)]

Districts are required to fill position(s) by the following Spring primary term unless designees for the district governing board and academic senate jointly agree that it is in the best interests of the district to delay the filling of the position...

2. Student Equity Plans [Title 5 542320(b)]

These plans should be developed with the active involvement of all groups on campus...

3. Curriculum Committee [Title 5 55002(a)(1)]

The college and/or district curriculum committee recommending the course shall be established by the mutual agreement of the college and/or district administration and the academic senate. The committee shall be either a committee of the academic senate or a committee that includes faculty and is otherwise comprised in a way that is mutually agreeable to the college and/or district administration and the academic senate.

4. Distance Education Course Quality Determinations [Title 5 55374]

Determinations and judgments about the quality of distance education, under the course quality standards in Section 55372, shall be made with the full involvement of faculty in accordance with...Sections 53200 [et seq.].

5. Matriculation Plans [Title 5 55510(b)]

The plan shall be developed through consultation with representatives of the academic senate, students, and staff with appropriate expertise, pursuant to Section 51023 et seq.

One of the ways your state Academic Senate has sought to have these various local senate roles acknowledged is by requiring faculty sign-offs on key documents:

1. Matriculation annual budget report (October)
2. Grant applications, e.g., Fund for Instructional Improvement (March and at other times)
3. Accreditation Self-Study, including the right to file a minority report (every 6 years)
4. IGETC and CSU GE-Breadth course submission forms (December)
5. New program approval applications (as locally developed)
6. Staff development plans (every 3 years)
7. CalWORKs comprehensive plans (November)

These faculty sign-offs acknowledge that academic senates have effectively participated in the development of recommendations in academic and professional matters and other issues identified in the Education Code and Title 5. Do not take these sign-offs lightly. Many state faculty leaders have struggled mightily to assure your participation in the decision-making process. Be sure that those who are responsible for preparing these reports and applications know that full faculty senate involvement is required.

Your state Senate has been working with the Chancellor's Office to be sure that all pertinent documents are mailed to local senate presidents as well as to the college contact person on each issue. Read these announcements carefully, get your senate involved immediately, and calendar the due dates to be sure your response is ready.

Keeping up with this flood of information is certainly a challenge for local faculty leaders. One of my personal goals for the year is to assure that essential information is in your hands in a timely and usable fashion. One strategy has been to use our Academic Senate web site more effectively. To that end, we have established a new domain at www.academic_senate.cc.ca.us and expanded the topics covered. Much appreciation is in order for Dave Megill and the faculty at Miracosta College for hosting our site for the last three years. We have a few kinks to work out in our new site, and the Executive Committee will be

(see “Governance” on p 16)
“2005” continued from p 9

- While analyzing long-term postsecondary education needs, the state must also consider the immense costs from not addressing the educational and training needs of the state. Low levels of education for the populace mean increased expenditure for welfare, unemployment and incarceration. From 1975 to 1995, as community college participation rates decreased from 88 to 58 per 1,000 adults, the incarceration rate increased from 92 to 392 per 100,000 adults. In addition, the cost to educate one community college student is $3,500 per year while the cost of incarceration of an individual is $23,500 per year.
  - In 1991, a long-range capital outlay community college growth plan was developed identifying the need for $3.2 billion by the year 2005, but this did not include the costs of new technology or new instructional delivery systems. CPEC projections for “Tidal Wave II” indicate that 78% of the increased enrollments in post-secondary education will occur at the community college level.
  - State allocations to community colleges as compared with K12, UC and CSU demonstrates that community colleges would have needed to receive an additional $800 million in 1995 to equal the smallest of the cumulative increases in the other segments.
  - The percentage increase in community college funding is significantly less than other state general fund expenditure increases and net income of private corporations for that same period of time.
  - The community college system has not maintained its relative position from 1975 and is not receiving its fair share of state resources. Compared to other states, in 1994, California spent $3,554 per student while the national average was $6,022 per student.

Some revenue alternatives proposed are: 1. Institutionalize the Proposition 98 split. 2. Change laws governing local bond elections to allow for passage by majority vote and allow funds to be used to equip buildings as well as construct them. 3. Constrain student fees in a manner that is moderate. 4. Increase the number of public-private partnerships. 5. Change federal regulations to insure California receives its fair share of federal revenue. 6. Introduce a change in existing tax laws to provide for a tax increase with the funds dedicated to all levels of public education.

“Governance” continued from p 15

reviewing the design in January, but then we should be able to move ahead.

The site will feature all Senate papers and Plenary Session resolutions in a key word searchable format. Documents can be viewed on line or downloaded in formatted versions. An on-line directory of senate leaders will allow you to contact any of your colleagues by phone, email, or snail-mail. Announcements of workshops, institutes and plenary sessions will give complete information including proposed new position papers and resolutions which will be available in a timely fashion for debate on your campus prior to their consideration at plenary sessions. Issue forums will allow you to pose questions and get responses from faculty throughout the state. Distribution lists of academic senate presidents will allow the state Senate and local senate presidents to communicate quickly with colleagues throughout the state. We will distribute our publications online as well as by mail: the creative and inspiring annual Forum, the in-depth analysis of issues in the quarterly Rostrum, and brief summaries of current events in the president’s monthly Update.

Being an effective faculty leader requires the tools to do the job. Training, networking, collaboration, and access to information empower you to represent your faculty well. It is our goal as your state Academic Senate to put those tools in your hands!

“Legislative” continued from p 4

issue of faculty summer and overload compensation being included as a part of the benefit deduction when determining the base retirement payment amount for retired faculty. This is an issue for the Legislature, the STRS and the Community Colleges.

Not only is the structure of the State Teacher’s Retirement System being affected by the policies of the Legislature, but more and more, the community colleges are becoming inextricably connected to the Legislature.

The Legislative Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provides the avenue for faculty, students, and staff to become more active in this process. Feel free to contact the Academic Senate Office for more info.