Landslides and Squeakers: Spring Elections Produce New Executive Committee

• by Julie Adams, Executive Director, and Hoke Simpson, Publications Chair

The 1999 Spring Plenary Session of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges produced more than its usual share of electoral agony and ecstasy this year. When it was all over, there were changes in three of the top four officers’ slots, four new faces on the Executive Committee, and several shifts in offices held.

Adding to the drama was the fact that all four candidates for the two top slots of President and Vice President chose not to “trickle down.” This meant that three of the four were putting it all on the line. Presidential candidates Lee Haggerty and Linda Collins, and Vice President candidate Winston Butler, had each reached the end of their current terms, so that a loss for any of them meant a one-way ticket home. Hoke Simpson, the other Vice President candidate, had only served one year in his two-year Representative-at-large seat, and a loss would return him to that position. The results were a landslide victory for Collins and a squeaker for Simpson.

Collins expressed gratification at the Plenary Body’s recognition and endorsement of her work in the position of Secretary over the last two years. “This takes nothing away from contributions Lee has made over the years” Collins said. “I am honored that the faculty selected me. The high profile created by my breakouts and written work certainly helped. I am delighted to have such a fine executive committee—and look forward to working with them to represent the faculty of the state and to advocate for the needs of our students.” Simpson, too, was gratified by the outcome, but was also somewhat surprised. “Winston is an institution in the Senate,” he said. “He’s a wonderful person and a great contributor, and I really wondered whether I could challenge him successfully. But I’ve worked closely with Linda for the past two years, and I’m glad the Plenary Body thinks we’ll make a good team—I’m sure of it!”

The office of Secretary, now vacated by Collins, was hotly contested, and this time everybody was trickling. The candidates were Nancy Silva, from American River College, who was completing a two-year term as Area A Representative, and three new faces: Miki Mikolajczak, a past senate president and veteran of the recent wars at Saddleback; Ellen Ligons, four-term senate president...
Leadership in an Educational Environment

by Bill Scroggins, President

For as long as I can remember, there have been those who hold up the business world as an example of how our colleges should be run. The current emphasis on productivity, thinly disguised as accountability, is just the latest example. I submit that leadership in an educational environment is fundamentally different.

Any leader must have a good sense of the direction the organization needs to take, be it the academic senate, the college, or a business. As faculty leaders, we need a clear vision of what we would like to achieve on our watch. Unlike business, our bottom line is not monetary but rather the need to assure that our students achieve their full potential. Not that money isn’t important—we need adequate resources to serve students well—it’s just that the almighty dollar doesn’t (or at least shouldn’t) drive our decisions.

I know, your first reaction is that I’m dreaming. Our day-to-day experiences are so tied up with issues of resources that it seems this is all that matters to our leaders. That’s my point exactly. In fact, in my visits to our colleges, it is clear that those who put STUDENTS FIRST—and have a strong organization built around that goal—are the most successful.

Whereas the business environment is competitive, education flourishes best in a climate of trust and collaboration—hence the term “collegiality.” As educational leaders, that spirit must be one of our primary, if unstated, goals. By the way, one of those “leadership directions” I mentioned earlier, for my term in office, has been this very goal of building trust. I’m convinced the investment has paid many dividends. (Oops! I slipped into a business metaphor!)

Consider the three benefits of education to society: 1) the acquisition of skills and abilities that lead to earning a livable wage by the individual and provide a needed worker for the economy; 2) the personal and cultural enrichment of the individual that adds both to the enjoyment of life and to the advancement of civilization; and 3) the production of an educated citizenry that makes good decisions politically and participates vigorously in the community. Even the casual observer can detect that today’s productivity movement focuses on #1.

So we must go beyond having a sense of direction rooted in serving students and beyond devoting ourselves to building a collegial environment. We must reclaim the high ground in defining what “success” in education really is. Accountable? Yes, I’m accountable. I’m accountable to my students every day to assure their learning. I’m accountable to my colleagues to deliver the curriculum we have designed to the standards we have set. And it is we who must hold ourselves accountable. If we don’t, that external business model will surely be what we will face.
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It isn’t as if we don’t know how to hold ourselves accountable. The mechanisms of program review, curriculum approval, and peer review have been part of our lexicon for many years. These are the underpinnings of that “strong organization” which I mentioned earlier as being built around the goal of serving students. Colleges with strong organizations use these reviews to create institutional plans that then drive budget decisions.

So simple; just two measures. Does the college have effective reviews of programs, curriculum, and peers based on the goal of student learning? Does the college use these reviews in a meaningful way to create plans that drive the allocation of resources? We even have the mechanism to assure the role of faculty: collegial consultation with the academic senate.

Thus I call on the educational leaders at our colleges—yes, that’s you, too—to set a firm course for your achievements for the coming year, to maintain student learning as the touchstone of all you do, and to redouble your efforts to assure true accountability by being vigorous participants in review of your programs, courses, and peers and in the planning and budgeting process built on those reviews. Don’t settle for anything less. You will profit greatly, as will your students. (There I go again, using those business terms!)

Affirmative Action Committee Breakout

by Affirmative Action and Cultural Diversity Committee Chair, Lina Chen

The Affirmative Action and Cultural Diversity (AA/CD) Committee presented a breakout at the Spring Plenary Session on the Commitment to Diversity. The following information was disseminated: 1) the Community California College Commitment: Action Plan; 2) Affirmative Action Regulations: Guidelines with Questions and Answers; 3) Guidelines for Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination.

The presenters were Lina Chen from Los Angeles Trade Technical College, (Chair of the AA/CD Committee), Beverly Shue, Los Angeles Harbor College, Virginia Romero, Cerritos College, Edith Conn, Ventura College and Gus Guichard, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources.

The breakout proved to be most informative and clarified concerns. One question raised was, “If all documents indicate the importance of availability data and its impact of hiring diversity, when can we expect this data to be available?” Some have indicated that affirmative action concerns do not need to be addressed because there is no viable data. Gus Guichard responded that there is a committee presently establishing the data and under consideration are several components such as workforce and college graduate availability. He predicts that this data will be available after the summer of 1999. The Plenary Body expressed the importance of this data by passing several resolutions requesting that the Chancellor’s Office expedite this report (see Resolutions S99 3.03 and 3.07).

Business necessity was another item of concern. The question was asked regarding the legality of a person holding a position for four years under business necessity. Vice Chancellor Guichard indicated that a position could only be held for one year and then a letter must be sent to the Chancellor’s Office requesting an extension under section 53001(c), but again, this extension can only be for one additional year and must have gone previously to the campus Affirmative Action Advisory Committee.

It was recommended that we create a compliance or accountability task force, in order to assist schools. Vice Chancellor Guichard indicated that the Chancellor has such a task force, but perhaps the campus Affirmative Action Committee could assist more directly. There are funds set aside for this purpose.

The Breakout attendees commented that there is a myth that affirmative action does not exist and questioned how can this be remedied? Vice Chancellor Guichard stated that the continuation of informative workshops, such as the one being presented today, will create more avenues to disseminate correct information about affirmative action and the importance of having a diverse faculty. With a commitment from the Academic Sen-
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from Pasadena City College; and Debra Landre, from San Joaquin Delta College, a past Treasurer of the Academic Senate and, for the last two years, President of the CCA/CTA.

The first round of voting produced a runoff between Silva and Ligons—and when the last vote was counted, Ellen Ligons became the new Secretary of the Academic Senate. Nancy Silva trickled, and found herself elected to a familiar position: Representative for Area A. Miki Mikolajczak trickled and was elected to the two-year Representative-at-large position vacated by Beverly Shue, and Debra Landre was elected to the remaining one year of Hoke Simpson’s Representative-at-large slot. (The Academic Senate By-laws call for all officers to be elected for terms of one year and all other positions are two-years. The President is limited to two consecutive one-year terms.)

The fourth new face on the Executive Committee, complementing the addition of Ligons, Landre and Mikolajczak, is Barbara Sawyer, senate president from Diablo Valley College and, for the past two years, district senate president for the Contra Costa Community College District. Sawyer won the seat for Representative North.

Sawyer will replace Barbara Davis-Lyman, of Sacramento City College, who has chosen to retire from the Executive Committee at the end of her current term. Davis-Lyman has provided the Executive Committee with two years of outstanding service, and capped her career as this year’s Elections Chair, presiding over one of the smoothest elections ever.

Other successful candidates were Beverly Shue, from Los Angeles Harbor College, and current president of the Los Angeles Community College District, who moved from Representative-at-large to Representative South; Mark Snowhite, senate president of Crafton Hills College, who was re-elected to the position of Area D Representative; and Dennis Smith, CFT chapter president at Sacramento City College, who ran unopposed for another term as Treasurer. When asked about serving another year on the Academic Senate Executive Committee, Smith responded, “Service to our community has been a value in my family for generations. Among my predecessors have been teachers, ministers, musicians, politicians, soldiers, builders, and more. I am proud to continue the tradition of community service. As faculty, we all have the opportunity to contribute to the future of those individuals who come to our classrooms. The value of that contribution cannot be overstated. However, I have come to understand that through our academic senates we can also shape the state and local academic policies and programs that make our work in the classroom possible. As I begin my second year as a member of the Executive Committee, I am excited and overjoyed with the opportunity to make a difference in the future of California’s Community Colleges.”

The final transition occurred outside of the electoral process, and that was President Bill Scroggins’ assumption of the mantle of Immediate Past President, and the departure from that position of Janis Perry. Janis Perry has served on the Executive Committee for seven years, as Representative-at-large, Vice President, President, and Immediate Past President. She is truly one of the architects of today’s Academic Senate, and her dedication and expertise will be sorely missed.

Rounding out the 1999-2000 Executive Committee are those members whose terms do not expire until Spring 2000: Edith Conn of Ventura College, Area C Representative; Ian Walton, Mission College, Area B Representative; Loretta Hernandez, Laney College, Representative North; and Lina Chen, Los Angeles Trade Technical College, Representative South.
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Ian Walton and friends
Greetings from the Treasurer. At each plenary session I provide the delegates and attendees with a report on the financial activities and condition of the Academic Senate for California’s Community Colleges. The scope of the financial reports is generally limited to quantitative facts about past cash flows, future obligations, current fund balances, and the cost value of the Senate’s assets. These reports do not tell the entire story. The most valuable assets in the Senate’s treasury are not included in the financial reports at all.

There are three lustrous jewels in our Sacramento Office whose value is immeasurable. These gems aren’t rubies, emeralds, or diamonds. They are more precious. Our jewels are Julie Adams, Shelly Abe, and Suzanne Scheller. These women provide the answers to our questions when we ask them and the documents when we need them. They are essential to the success of the sessions, institutes, workshops, committees, legislative analysis, publications, and everything else the Academic Senate does. More importantly, they provide the human warmth that local senate leaders need when you contact the Sacramento Office for assistance or information.

Have you telephoned the Sacramento Office of the Academic Senate lately? If so, Suzanne Scheller has either answered your question, dispatched your call to the appropriate person, or taken your message. In less than one year, Suzanne has become an integral member of the Sacramento Office team. We welcome Suzanne who joined us when we discontinued the services of our outside accountant and then promoted Shelly Abe to the position of administrative assistant.

Shelly is brilliant. She exemplifies everything that has always amazed us all about so many community college students. Shelly is a full-time student, a loving single parent of a beautiful daughter, and all the while, is an extremely capable, dependable, good-natured, office team member for the Academic Senate. My own Sacramento City College recognized Shelly as one of our Outstanding Women Students at her graduation in May. Well done Shelly!

Congratulations are also in order for Julie Adams. Julie, the Hope Diamond of the Sacramento gems, is being awarded a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration with a concentration in Human Resource Management from CSU Sacramento. She will be entering a graduate program in the fall. Julie is the energy, the intellect, the heart, and the leadership of the Sacramento Office team. If you’ve attended any Academic Senate session, institute, or workshop in recent years then you’ve seen Julie at work. What most don’t see, however, is the incredible array of behind the scenes activities that Julie orchestrates every day in order to facilitate all the work that is done by the Academic Senate. To Julie’s two teenaged children and her husband who share her with us, we are grateful. End of Treasurer’s Report.
Learning Communities for Basic Skills Success • by Basic Skills Ad Hoc Committee Chair, Mark Snowhite

Low rates of success among basic skills students continue to be a source of frustration at most community colleges. In terms of retention (drop-out rates) and persistence (rates at which students enroll in the following semester), community college students who take basic skills courses do not fare well. According to reports recently published by the Chancellor's Office in The Fact Book (March 1999), just under 25 percent of students who enrolled in a basic skills course during 1995-96 showed improvement by 1998, improvement being defined as successful completion of a higher level course in the same discipline area. This information is particularly vexing when we note that at least fifty percent of our entering students are found to need basic skills instruction, according to the basic skills survey completed by the Academic Senate last year.

Undoubtedly, we must look at these numbers carefully before jumping to the conclusion that California's community college basic skills instruction fails its students. As Alexander W. Astin of UCLA has pointed out, a simple retention rate tells us more about how many severely under-prepared students an institution admits than it does about how well we design our programs and help our students learn (Chronicle of Higher Education, Sept. 1993). Nevertheless, some colleges have developed basic skills programs that have shown remarkable results in terms of raising retention and persistence rates, as well as eliciting expressions of student and faculty satisfaction, which remain respectable measures of success to most of us.

One such program was presented at the Basic Skills breakout at the Academic Senate's Spring Session in San Francisco in April. This exemplary program features a learning community approach.

San Jose City College's Gateway/Student Support Services provides underrepresented and under-prepared basic skills students with an integrated approach to math and English as well as counseling services. Charles Hunter, the program's developer and coordinator, explained that the program began in 1992 to strengthen basic skills instruction at San Jose City College. In 1993 the State Chancellor's Office designated this new program as the State model for retention, and provided a three-year grant for the program to continue and further develop. In 1996, San Jose City College applied for and received a Federal grant to expand the program from serving 80 students annually to serving 200. This grant has been extended for four more years and receives from the grant $194,000 annually.

With this funding, and a continuing commitment from the college, Hunter and his colleagues designed a program that provides self-identified underrepresented and under-prepared students with basic language, mathematics, and college readiness skills, including enhanced self-esteem and computer literacy. Students move to college-level courses according to a structured sequence. The success of the program results from the support of a variety of professionals working in a well integrated manner. The key features include block scheduling, in-class tutors, a designated academic and personal counselor, faculty who volunteer to teach in the program, a program aide, a guidance class, social get-togethers and cultural activities, regular review and changes to students' educational plans, and a monthly newsletter for the students in the program. Students in the program experience a strong sense of community and with that feeling comes mutual support. Support also takes the form of phone calls from peers to students with attendance irregularities or academic difficulties, study groups, motivational and informational speakers, in-class note takers, and E-mail correspondences with instructors.

Most of the elements in the San Jose City College program have been successful in other colleges. Puente programs develop a sense of community in much the same way as the Gateway program – with similarly impressive results. What it takes to establish such a program is clear enough: a faculty dedicated to student learning and eager to focus on the problems of underrepresented, under-prepared stu-
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Technology Everywhere
• by Technology Committee Chair, Ian Walton

Thanks to the fine work of the Technology Committee, the Academic Senate Office Staff, and many other committee colleagues, technology was everywhere at the 1999 Spring Session.

The most unusual and exciting event was the lunchtime general session that featured Secretary of Education, Gary Hart speaking to us by video-conference link and then engaging in a question and answer period. This proved to be an effective way of asking very specific questions of someone who would not normally attend the conference in person. Thanks are due to Pacific Bell for facilitating the event and to Jackie Siminitus, Linda Uhrenholt and Gary Fuson for making it all happen. The really exciting part, that was not apparent to delegates, was unexpected difficulty in maintaining the video link until just ten minutes before lunch.

This same videoconference setup permitted two additional breakout sessions in the ballroom. In the first session, Pacific Bell Education Advocate, Linda Uhrenholt, visited a variety of resource locations to show how educators could incorporate them in their classroom instruction. In the second session, Linda joined with Ann Koda of the @ONE Project to visit several community college sites that are actively using videoconferencing.

Technology was also the focus of several regular breakout sessions. Ian Walton, and Kathy O’Connor of the Technology Committee along with Beverly Shue of the Curriculum Committee guided participants through new advice to Curriculum Committees on the implementation of the changed Title 5 Regulations regarding instructor-student contact. At the Saturday session, delegates adopted the position paper “Guidelines for Good Practice: Effective Instructor-Student Contact in Distance Learning.”

Dennis Smith and Deborah Ludford led a discussion of joint senate/union issues in distance education and considered how to deal with many of the hot issues in technology by using both senate policies and collective bargaining contracts.

In an Educational Policies Committee breakout, Hoke Simpson, Elton Hall and Ian Walton presented a draft of the upcoming paper on “Academic Freedom, Privacy, Copyright and Fair Use in a Technological World.” This area features a large, constantly changing set of issues that involve both senate and union perspectives. Attendees provided feedback on what they would like included in the paper.

Ric Matthews, San Diego Miramar College, presented an update on the current state of technology planning at the Chancellor’s Office, including Technology II, Telecommunications Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) and Distance Education Technical Advisory Committee (DETAC), and provided a forum for faculty input to these ongoing planning efforts.

And of course, there was the now traditional selection of breakouts in the Technology Room:

Ann Koda, Catherine Ayers and Dan Mitchell from De Anza College described the current status of the @ONE faculty training project and showed material from two of the modules that they have recently developed: using E-mail and using websites to support instruction.

Kathy O’Connor and Susan Sargent of Santa Barbara City College demonstrated the material being developed by the Online Curriculum Resource Center project which will make curriculum and course development materials available statewide.

Marsha Chan of Mission College shared both her successes and tribulations in teaching ESL as an online course, and discussed the different ways technology can be used to enhance communication with students.

Jim Petromelli demonstrated materials developed by the San Mateo Community College District Center for Teaching and Learning and discussed the approach that they have taken to faculty training and development of web-based instructional materials.

Finally the technology room facilitated a session on web advising by the Counseling and Library Faculty Issues Committee.
“Curriculum 101” was the theme of the Curriculum Committee’s breakout at the Spring Session that focused on writing up or revising course outlines using the process of aligning course objectives, student assignments, and evaluation criteria. This breakout featured Diane Glow, San Diego Miramar College, walking the participants through the steps of reorganizing the way course outlines are written. In fact, this process substitutes check-off boxes for linkages of course objectives, how the students will achieve the educational objectives, and how the students will be evaluated to determine if the objectives have been met. How difficult will it be to change an existing course outline? Diane used an Economics course to show how most of the statements from the current check-off box course outline forms can be applied to this linked format. The same process could apply to any course.

Participants also received a quick synopsis of what is available on the Academic Senate Website when Beverly Shue passed out a handout on how to access the Academic Senate’s website and navigate to the curriculum section to search for sample course outlines in specific disciplines. This latter process involves choices beyond typing in the discipline and can provide for selecting information dealing with General Education and transferability of courses. The address is:

Bob Stafford, Luz Argyriou and Jane Sneed shared information on articulation and transfer issues related to curriculum, challenges in the operation of the curriculum committee, and issues in transitional education and basic skills. These presenters will be available as resources when the Curriculum Institute is held on July 28, 29, and 30th at the Disneyland Pacifica Hotel. The emphasis of the Curriculum Institute will be on getting the job of writing and revising course outlines done and curriculum committees getting the course approval curriculum process.

Have you ever wanted to participate on a state-level committee? Have you thought about how you can impact state policy? The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is in the process of selecting faculty to serve on standing committees, Chancellor’s Office advisory committees and task forces, and various other liaison committees. Contact the Senate Office at (916) 445-4753 for an application to serve or visit our website at: http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/Senate/Forms/nomination.pdf
Improving Major Preparation for Transfer

by Bill Scroggins, President

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) has been working for the last two years on a project to improve the lower division major preparation of students transferring to UC and CSU. The collaboration of the UC, CSU, and community colleges academic senates in ICAS has created a fledgling project called the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) based on the principle that direct, face-to-face meetings of discipline faculty are the best means of increasing articulation.

The IMPAC strategy consists of several steps. First, a representative group of UC, CSU, and community college faculty are brought together at a state-level meeting. These state meetings are planned to be in clusters of related disciplines. A pilot meeting was held in April for the “Science I” cluster: biology, chemistry, engineering, mathematics, and physics, facilitated by articulation officers through California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC). The goal is to describe a set of courses that would typically be required for transfer major preparation and then to write paragraph-level descriptions of these courses. Part of the meeting is devoted to just faculty in a given discipline and part to cross-discipline discussion of “service courses” such as algebra/trigonometry-based physics for biology majors. IMPAC is coordinating with the California Articulation Number (CAN) project to assure that these course descriptions can meet the intent of both IMPAC and CAN (cansystem.org). ICAS is also coordinating the work of the IMPAC project with ASSIST (www.assist.org), the official repository of articulation in the state. To take a look at the preliminary IMPAC work plan and some of the results of the April meeting, visit www.curriculum.cc.ca.us/IMPAC/system.htm.

Following the IMPAC plan, the major preparation course lists and descriptions will next be sent to UC and CSU departments for discussion and comment followed by regional intersegmental meetings, again by clusters of disciplines. The Science I Cluster regional meetings are being planned for this fall and winter in four areas: North, Central, Metro Los Angeles/Orange, and South. Faculty at these meetings will refine the course lists and descriptions and do their best to articulate existing courses to this model.

It is a central feature of IMPAC that not all UC and CSU departments are expected to follow the IMPAC curriculum to the letter. The baccalaureate degree should and must remain in the control of departmental faculty at UC and CSU. While the goal is to encourage movement toward a unified major preparation curriculum, if, for example, UC Davis physicists require an extra course beyond the core plan, so be it. IMPAC will include notations reflecting such variations from the basic course lists. That flexibility is a must and should not detract from the gains to be made by the project. Just imagine the beauty of being able to tell our transfer students which courses to take to prepare for a major in biological sciences at any UC or CSU—with only a handful of variations from campus to campus!

The IMPAC project is moving forward with the support of a $550,000 allocation in next year’s budget. Your Academic Senate is playing a major role in this work. Stay tuned!
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Affirmative Action and Cultural Diversity Committee and the Chancellor’s Office working together, the Vice Chancellor believes affirmative action and diversity can be accomplished by creating an educational environment that is supportive, inviting and embracing diversity.

Bill Scroggins commented that, “affirmative action are words on paper; we need to now put action behind the words.”
Distance Learning in California Community Colleges
• by Publications Committee Member, Carolyn Seefer

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges held its 31st Spring Plenary Session in San Francisco on April 15-17. Many breakout sessions dealt with the topic of distance learning. It is clear that this is a critical area that must be given high priority. Following is a summary of some of the sessions dealing with this very important topic.

“@ONE — Using E-mail and the Web: Training Courses for Your Campus”; presented by Ian Walton, Roberta Baber, Ann Koda, and Dan Mitchell: @ONE is an online network created by and for California community college educators. The @ONE website (http://one.fhda.edu/) offers a location where faculty can share experiences, share resources, search related news stories, obtain training, and find out how technology can be used to enrich learning. The Academic Senate and @ONE conducted a Technology Summer Training Institute at CSU, Monterey Bay, June 13-18, 1999. Visit http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/TechInstitute/thedaily.html for highlights of the Institute.

“Academic Freedom, Privacy, Copyright, and Fair Use in a Technological World”; presented by Janis Perry, Elton Hall, Hoke Simpson, and Ian Walton: The Educational Policies Committee has drafted a paper entitled “Academic Freedom, Privacy, Copyright, and Fair Use in a Technological World.” This is an issue that is being hotly debated on many campuses around the state. The paper is currently a work-in-progress, and we should be hearing more about it soon.

How are your campuses handling intellectual property/copyright of online courses? Who owns the courses? Do developing instructors have first right of refusal? These questions were all discussed and should continue to be discussed on your campuses.

“Guidelines for Good Practice: Effective Instructor-Student Contact in Distance Learning”; presented by Ian Walton, Kathy O’Connor, and Beverly Shue: The Technology and the Curriculum Committees of the Academic Senate jointly prepared this paper which presents recommendations on how local curriculum committees should implement the new instructor-student contact regulations. These revised Title 5 Regulations (Section 55376) were adopted by the Board of Governors in July 1998. They read:

...district governing boards shall ensure that:

(a) All approved courses offered as distance education shall include regular effective contact between instructor and students, through group or individual meetings, orientation and review sessions, supplemental seminar or study session, field trips, library workshops, telephone contact, correspondence, voice mail, e-mail, or other activities.

(b) All distance education courses shall be delivered consistent with other guidelines issued by the Chancellor pursuant to Section 409 of the Procedures and Standing Orders of the Board of Governors. Regular effective contact is an academic and professional matter pursuant to Title 5, Section 53200.

What this means in plain English is that college Curriculum Committees do not have to require that distance learning courses include any face-to-face meetings on campus, even if the course is transferable. Instead, as instructors we must be able to show our Curriculum Committees how we will ensure regular effective contact with our students. This paper, which was up for adoption during the session, gives instructors suggestions for how this can be accomplished.

“Distance Education and Other Senate/Union Joint Issues”; presented by Dennis Smith and Deborah Ludford: This session focused on the fact that many of the issues related to distance learning are clearly joint senate/union issues. It was also clear from this discussion that colleges all over the state are struggling with these
issues. The “hot” issues seem to be:

1. class size (some colleges have 20-30 class size maximums for online courses);
2. load/compensation;
3. intellectual property/copyright;
4. technical support (for faculty and students);
5. accessibility;
6. privacy;
7. reassigned time (some colleges are using TTIP money to fund; some colleges offer 20 percent+ reassigned time for online course development);
8. instructor training;
9. course suitability for online delivery;
10. integrity/quality of course/instruction;
11. preparation time;
12. accessibility to student services for online students;
13. effective instructor-student contact (this is where quality is protected); and
14. contracting out

The presenters strongly recommended that all colleges form a joint technology committee with senate representatives, union representatives, and administration to discuss and decide upon these issues. They said it is imperative that each campus have language/policy concerning distance learning and that the senate and union must be together on these issues or “everyone loses.”

The overall impression following these breakout sessions is that almost all California community colleges are interested in offering online courses, but few have put any policy into effect. Without these policies, many campuses are handling these issues on a case-by-case basis; faculty are forced to “make deals” with management, and this is unacceptable.

Faculty on all campuses need a mechanism whereby they can share their ideas about policy. It has also been suggested that the statewide Academic Senate write up guidelines for individual colleges to use.

Have any policies been implemented on your campus that you would like to share? If so, please forward them to The Rostrum. Working together, we can take the California Community Colleges into the 21st Century.