

ROSENSTRUM

ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES NEWSLETTER

In Defense of Idealism

by Kate Clark, President

As the political season is upon us, and the mudslinging and name-calling has begun. I just didn't anticipate that it would be me they were calling names. Most recently, Rod Paige, Secretary of Education, called me a "terrorist." More accurately, he called the union that happens to represent faculty at my college, a "terrorist organization." By extension, then, I too am a terrorist. That troubles my little pacifist heart.

But the appellation that troubles me most is the assertion that I am an idealist. It is troubling not because I have been pegged for what I truly am (I am indeed an idealist), but because the mantle was thrown at me with such disdain, as a pejorative that would rank up there with calling me, well, a midwesterner, a rube, a Cornhusker (which, admittedly, I also am). My name-callers see us faculty idealists as slow-moving, self-indulgent, perpetuating the status quo. Idealists, they say, still live in ivory towers, do not understand economic realities, hold onto principles that are outmoded and cannot be afforded. As John Galsworthy once said, "Idealism increases in direct proportion to one's distance from the problem."

Fie! I say. First, we have a very genuine sense of present economic straits. There is nothing isolated about the collegiate "tower" in which we community college faculty live. We know all about "downsizing" that also occurs within our institutions, about belt tightening and rising health care costs, about the "outsourcing" of instruction that makes no progress toward 75/25 goals, or the outsourcing of faculty-driven tasks to new consultants. Though hardly on the scale of Tyco's corporate excesses, we are also aware of those few community college boards of trustees or CEOs who continue to engage in cronyism and to lavish upon themselves perks such as cars, huge insurance policies, aides, lavish offices, and other ostentatious signs of their presumed success. All the while, others suffer. Full-time faculty are not hired, part-time faculty are not rehired, classes

President's Message	2
75/25—the Faculty Obligation Number	3
The Human Side of Section 508.	4
Defining "Basic Skills"	10
Honoring Excellence.	11
Less is Not Always More.	12
On the Way to Session	14
Conversations about Leadership	18
Disciplines List Review.	20
AA/AS Degree Requirements.	21
Separate but Equal?:	22
Principle and Integrity in the Academy	24
Counselors and Librarians—What's Up!	26

are cut, needed purchases of instructional equipment are withheld, professional development evaporates.

Even more significantly, to use the corporate lingo some of those name-callers were so fond of a few years ago, what about the "customer"? Now where is their concern for our student "clientele"? While the critics of idealism are resistant to discuss the imposition of taxes on some of the Californians they represent, they are perfectly willing to tax our students by increasing community college fees 136% in one year, fees that are not returned to the colleges but go to the general fund to pay for prisons or



Kate Clark

President's Message

by Kate Clark, President

Members of the Academic Senate Executive Committee are always delighted to hear from our colleagues across the state: you help us gauge the significance of proposed legislation or system changes, you enable us to promote the superlative instruction offered to California's community college students, and you redirect our work when we appear to have wandered. Sometimes your comments are contradictory, however, and we're left in a quandary of sorts. My current *Rostrum* article is a case in point.

A number of you responded to my December article that built upon our Fall Plenary theme of "A Principled Perspective," and that incited faculty, well, *urged* faculty to take action. Some of you mused that you were exhausted merely reading the list contained in that article. That message and its list of "busy work" was intended to help us clean our houses, to strengthen local senates, to ensure that whatever the new year brought, we would all be positioned to protect and provide our students' educational experiences.

Yet in the months that followed, in your emails or in my encounter with you during visits to your campuses, you noted that you were still feeling isolated, impotent in the onrush of new proposals issuing from Sacramento and the uncertainty of the budget—despite the relatively generous treatment the Governor's proposed budget offered community colleges. If the entropy of Fall 2003 gave rise to our wariness and anxiety about what might be lurking behind closed doors, then the energy that emanates now seems likely to produce outright panic this spring. The only preventative is shared information and strategic action on all fronts, including the three below.

The System

Internally, the Chancellor's Office is undergoing its own metamorphosis, and change often brings heightened fears. Having suffered what is hoped will be the last of the mandated staff reductions within

the agency, Chancellor Drummond has convened a Task Force to review the functions of that Office. The Academic Senate is represented on this Task Force, and we will use your resolutions and solicit your comments as we seek to identify functions faculty feel are most crucial to preserve as we consider creative restructuring.

Of more lasting significance, however, is the proposal being legislatively crafted that would remove the Chancellor's Office from agency status (and Department of Finance control) and would create it as a 73rd or *ur*-district, having the same abilities to hire staff, set salaries, and accept grants that our own local districts have. At the same time, it would not offer instruction. The functions of the Board of Governors and its relationship to local boards would remain intact. Those sketchy details are all we have at this moment; thus, my caveat about the importance of shared information.

Funding

The budget debate is only beginning, as legislators with their own views and principles weigh in on such matters as the elimination of categorical streams and the proposed fee waiver for redirected students. Internally, we must come to consensus regarding equalization; the Governor seems committed to providing some funding to that end, and legislators have the will and the inclination to resolve it for us, if we cannot reach agreement.

Our Students

All the attention being given to our students this spring suggests proponents of change all have students' best interests at heart. But as you will hear at the Spring Plenary session, and as you have read in local news accounts, the devil is in the details. As UC and CSU, under budget constraints of their own, close their doors to new and transfer students and seek to "redirect" them to us, the implications for our colleges and particularly for both our traditional and entering students will be enormous. Fee waivers, changes in Cal Grants, and potential cuts in

Continued on page 15

75/25—the Faculty Obligation Number or Why are We Not All There Yet?



Ian Walton

by Ian Walton, Vice President

Considerable statewide activity and local interest in the faculty obligation number (FON) or 75/25 ratio in the past year prompts this article. In it, we will look at some of the history as well as the events of the last year.

Background

You may—or may not—recall (depending upon your years of service) that the intent of the Legislature and the Board of Governors at the time of the enactment of AB1725, in 1989, was that the system should reach a goal that at least 75% of credit instruction hours should be taught by full-time faculty. Section 70 of AB1725 stated:

The Legislature finds and declares that...

...because the quality, quantity, and composition of full-time faculty have the most immediate and direct impact on the quality of instruction, overall reform cannot succeed without sufficient members of full-time faculty with sufficient opportunities for continued staff development, and with sufficient opportunity for participation in institutional governance.

In order to accomplish some of these lofty ideals, more specific direction regarding full-time faculty numbers appeared in Section 35 of AB1725 and became chaptered as Education Code Section 87482.6:

...the Legislature wishes to recognize and make efforts to address longstanding policy of the board of governors that at least 75 percent of the hours of credit instruction in the California Community Colleges, as a system, should be taught by full-time instructors.

One possible method of achieving this longstanding goal, was described in this same section of Education Code that specified conditions under which districts were required to spend a portion of program improvement funds in order to improve their full-time to part-time faculty percentage. Sadly, program improvement funds were not included in the state budget after 1991. Education Code also specified that the Board of Governors should adopt regulations for the effective administration of this section, including a penalty for non-compliance.

Meanwhile, the Board of Governors adopted several Title 5 Regulations to implement and enforce this goal (mainly 51025, but also 53301, 53302, 53308, 53309, 53310, 53311, 53312 and 53314).

Although both the concept and implementation are popularly referred to as “75/25”, there never was a regulation that specifically examined the ratio of full-time to part-time instructors implied by the “75/25” label. Section 53308 defined a “full-time faculty percentage” of credit hours of instruction with detailed rules on what components to attribute to full-time faculty specified in Section 53309, and the corresponding rules for part-time faculty contained in Section 53310.

Several interesting details appeared in these rules:

- ▶ Full-time faculty overload is excluded from the calculation.
- ▶ Full-time faculty sabbatical is included in the full-time portion and part-time replacements are excluded from the part-time portion.
- ▶ Full-time faculty reassigned time is included in the full-time portion and part-time replacements are excluded from the part-time portion.
- ▶ Full-time faculty unpaid leave is included in the full-time portion and part-time replacements are excluded from the part-time portion.

If a district’s full-time faculty percentage equals or exceeds 75% the district is deemed to have met the requirement.

If a district’s full-time faculty percentage is less than 75% then a new mechanism comes in to play involving the full-time faculty obligation (commonly known as Faculty Obligation Number or FON). The base and subsequent changes in this number (caused by increases or decreases in certain apportionment dollars) are described in Sections 53311 and 53312. This full-time faculty obligation number specifies the minimum number of full-time faculty that must be employed by a district in order to avoid reduction in apportionment for non-compliance. It is recalculated annually for each district, but the recalculation does not involve any examination of a full-time/part-time ratio, which of course also depends on part-time hiring actions.

Continued on page 16

The Human Side of Section 508

by Patrick Hudak and Michelle Pilati, Technology Committee Members



Patrick Hudak



Michelle Pilati

This article builds upon information first presented by Laurie Vasquez, Santa Barbara City College, at the League for Innovation in the Community College's "Innovations 2004" Conference.

As technology becomes an integral part of teaching, so do issues relating to accessibility. While issues of having access to technology (i.e., having use of a computer and the Internet) have long been discussed, today the emphasis has shifted to ensuring that the technology used in teaching is accessible to everyone and that the technology can be used by those with some form of disability. In addition to simply being something that must be done in order to accomplish our mission of serving the community, Section 508, an amendment to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, requires that all electronic and information technology that is federally funded be accessible by people with disabilities. California Senate Bill (SB) 105 codifies Section 508 to apply to all state agencies as of January 1, 2003. Thus the requirements of Section 508 are now applicable to community colleges whether or not California continues to receive federal funding.

Ensuring that courses and classrooms are accessible is something that we must do as law mandates it, and it is something that we should do as students are harmed when accessibility issues are overlooked. While previous articles have addressed how to ensure accessibility, this article will address why accessibility matters to our student population. This article will focus on the human side of Section 508, that is, the side that involves the problems faced by disabled students using technology. In addition, some practical approaches to help colleges comply with Section 508 will be discussed. Beyond the need to comply with Section 508, why should we invest time and energy into making our courses accessible?

Consider the scenarios that follow and how they illustrate the importance of accessibility.

Scenario 1

Jonathan is taking two courses through mediated technology at his local community college. He is an honors student, works full time, and is learning disabled. Due to Jonathan's work schedule, he needs the flexibility of courses offered through distance learning. One of his courses utilizes the college's adopted Course Management System (CMS). However, the instructor for the other course has chosen online courseware provided by the publisher. Due to his learning disability, Jonathan needs extra time when taking tests. While the college's CMS can accommodate him, the instructor who is using the publisher's online courseware does not know how to increase the allotted time for exams. He has referred Jonathan to the DSPS office to take the test on campus.

The assistive technologies specialist had to become involved to remind the instructor that as an online course, all students must have equal access to online tests. The specialist had to call the publisher of the course to find out how to increase time for tests for individual students. The publisher had never received such a request but worked with the assistive technologies specialist to resolve the issue. The specialist then contacted the instructor and provided him with the steps to accommodate the student.

Scenario 2

(adapted from "How People with Disabilities Use the Web" [working draft], Julie Berger, Ed. <http://www.w3.org/WAI/EO/Drafts/PWD-Use-Web/>, retrieved March 15, 2004.)

Ms. Martinez, a deaf woman, is taking several distance learning courses in physics. She had little trouble with the curriculum until the college upgraded their online courseware to a multimedia approach, using an extensive collection of audio lectures. For classroom-based lectures, the college provided interpreters but for web-based instruction no such accommodations were made. The college staff did not recognize the need to ensure that their online courseware was accessible and claimed that they had no idea how to provide the material in accessible format. The college staff also claimed that they were not required to find a way to make the material accessible. Ms. Martinez persisted and was able to demonstrate to college officials that the college was clearly covered by a policy requiring accessibility of all online instructional material. The college then had the lectures transcribed and made this information available through their website, along with audio versions of the lectures. For an introductory multimedia piece, the college used a SMIL-based multimedia format enabling synchronized captioning of audio and description of video. The school's information managers quickly found that it was much easier to comprehensively index the audio resources on the accessible area of the website, once these resources had been captioned with text.

The professor for the course also set up a chat area on the website where students could exchange ideas about their course-work. Although she was the only deaf student in the class, she quickly found that the web-based chat format, and the opportunity to provide web-based text comments on classmates' work, ensured that she could keep up with class progress.

How could the students have been better served in the preceding scenarios?

► **Knowledge of Section 508**

According to Section 508, each student must be provided with full and equal access to all of the dimensions of the online course, including online test taking and accessible multimedia formats. In the first scenario, the instructor

thought that he was accommodating the student by allowing him to have the extra time, but was unaware that he had to provide the test in an online format. In the second scenario, the college staff was unaware that they needed to provide accessible online format for the multimedia portion.

► **A Proactive Approach**

Although the students were helped in a timely manner, some of the problems they experienced could have been minimized and possibly avoided if the faculty members had taken a more proactive approach. In the first scenario, the instructor had the freedom to choose the publisher-based courseware over the college's CMS. However, by doing so he created some problems that he didn't anticipate. Moreover, the student was frustrated that he had to use (and learn) two different course management systems instead of one. In the second scenario, the college staff could have taken into account accessibility issues when upgrading to a multimedia format for their online courseware.

The preceding scenarios also demonstrate that collaboration is the key to minimizing our students' down time to accessing course content. The student, assistive technologies specialist, the instructor, the

Continued on page 19

► **Section 508**

"Achieving Accessibility: Demystifying Section 508 Compliance."
<http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us/Publications/Ros.htm>.

<http://www.section508.gov/>

<http://www.cerritos.edu/assistive-tech/Section508.htm>

<http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/legal/opinions/opinions.htm>

1194.22 Web-based intranet and Internet information and applications.

http://webwork.nasa.gov/policy/508/docs/508webTA_original.pdf

► **Training new faculty about universal design, access and disabilities**

<http://4sbccfaculty.org/lessons/paradigm/index.php?id=default>

► **How people with disabilities use the web**

<http://www.w3.org/WAI/EO/Drafts/PWD-Use-Web/>

<http://www.webaim.org>

► **Policy design and guidelines**

<http://www.ittatc.org/laws/stateLawAtGlance.cfm>

<http://www.cabrillo.cc.ca.us/instruct/tlc/accessibility/levelone.htm>

In Defense of Idealism

Continued from page 1

underfunded social services elsewhere. Our woes may not make the pages of the *Wall Street Journal*, but we understand. No cock-eyed optimists are we!

In a rather retaliatory spirit then, we idealists are tempted to cast our political and corporate critics in an equally pejorative vein. We see our name-callers as cynics—corrupt, self-serving, immoral, greedy in their quotidian affairs. Or, as Oscar Wilde wrote, “Cynics know the price of everything and the value of nothing,” especially, it seems the value of education.

Thus, I’d like to arm an oxymoron of my own making, akin to the concept of the Peacekeeper Missile, to lob back at my cynical opposition—*pragmatic idealism*. The Greek etymology of “pragmatism” comes from the word *pragma*, meaning action; couple it with “idealism” and we can embark upon what William James might have envisioned in his 1904 lectures on pragmatism: to “develop a [ideal’s] meaning” by determining “what conduct it is fitted to produce: ...conduct is its sole significance.”¹ In short, an ideal exists only as it produces suitable action that, as Bishop Berkeley and others argued that ideals reflecting truth and justice, that serve the greater social good are not merely noble standards but are forces that compel action.

So while I acknowledge warnings about provoking an us/them mentality, I, for one, feel under attack, and I prefer to stand in defense of my ideals. The cynics contend that there is little we can do in these economic times, thought they are not quiescent. As an idealist, I suggest engagement, resisting, outflanking, outmaneuvering. And thus begins my counter assault. For this feels like warfare, opponents are carving out territories, and someone has made faculty the enemy.

Defensive of any position requires action. To illustrate how ideals precipitate action, let us briefly survey three sets of action-provoking ideals, long articulated and sustained within our California Community colleges and by the Academic Senate: Access and Success, Fairness and Equity, and Comprehensive Educational Choices. As the cross references will demonstrate, these are intertwining principles, not isolated ideals. Armed with all the military metaphors I can muster, I will explore the context or battlefield and then try to

identify the problematic struggle before us. Finally, I will suggest what some actions might be, what conduct those ideals might initiate, and how we rally the faculty troops in support of those ideals with hard empirical evidence and specific political strategy.

Ideal #1: Access and Success

The Context: We’ve been forced to defend the most basic tenet of access: who can enter our colleges and what barricades may turn them away. Currently, the community college system has agreed to support our budget proposal focusing on three areas that will induce access and success: fees, growth, and equalization.

The Problems:

- ▶ **Fees:** Cynics say we can no longer afford the promise of the Master Plan, that students have an obligation to pay more—and presumable taxpayers pay less. Our Academic Senate Educational Policies Committee is preparing a significant paper for adoption in Fall 2004 on student fees, our first such researched paper in 22 years. Some of their findings will also be shared at the Spring 2004 plenary session, including their attack on many of the myths regarding student fees. In the current draft of that paper, the authors note

the vast majority of community college students work and pay taxes while they attend college. But more importantly, the result of investment in their college attendance will be improved salary and a lifetime of higher tax payments... . The alternative case can be made: it is California business that is getting the free ride. Businesses pay taxes along with everyone else, including students, but they benefit enormously from the job training and skill enhancement received by community college students.

This argument counters the demand of business and industry members, including the California Business Roundtable, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), and the Community College League of California, now participating in the Campaign for College Opportunity. This newly formed non-profit coalition supports the Master Plan, but in its most recent brochure² calls for a three-part solution to ensure its original aims: increase state support for higher education, make efficient uses of existing resources, and “match student costs more closely to ability to pay”

¹ William James (1904). “What is Pragmatism” (Lecture II in a series of 8); compiled as *Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking: Popular Lectures on Philosophy* (1907). Rptd. as *Pragmatism* (1925). New York: Longmans, Green, 1925.

² Campaign for College Opportunity. (2004). “Turning College Students Away: The Consequence of California’s Broken Promise.”

(p. 6). This third component is a “deal-breaker” for industry participants who insist they will not do battle on behalf of the Master plan without students’ willingness to assume more fiscal responsibility for their own education. Two such proposals have emerged since January.

1. **General fees:** We all know that the proposed increase in student fees from \$18 to \$26 dollars has been erroneously pegged to the Pell grants. Faculty seem to have convinced the system as a whole to fight these presumptions, especially the “high-fee/high aid” and Pell-Grant myths. Consultation Council did the math: For example, for 2003-04, if fees were raised from \$18/unit to \$26/unit as proposed, the most severely disadvantaged full-time students would receive only an additional \$112 in federal Pell aid. Assuming the Chancellor’s Office estimate of approximately 135,000 such students is accurate, our California students would capture approximately \$15 million in additional federal grant money. However, the millions of other community college students who do not receive Pell grants would contribute their additional \$8/unit, or approximately \$65 million, to the general fund (with no guarantee any of those dollars would be returned to community colleges). It is an inordinate burden to place on the many to benefit the few, and a regressive tax to boot.

2. **Differential fees:** Most baffling of all is the proposal for a return of the differential fee for holders of bachelors degrees. Unlike wine, this package hasn’t gotten any better over time. Some core group in Sacramento seems unaware that degreed students most often return to community colleges because they have lost their livelihoods, or require retraining, or as with many affiliated health providers, must renew certification or acquire skills to retain their present employment.

- ▶ **Growth:** We acknowledge the Governor’s proposal to provide 3% growth to the community colleges. With it, however, we are expected to accomplish too much:
 1. attract and re-admit many of the 175,000 missing students;
 2. continue to offer higher education to new students in the Tidal Wave II population;
 3. provide for the 7,000 students redirected from UC or CSU;
 4. accommodate some of the additional 16,700 students CSU will be turning away;
 5. serve our continuing, traditional students;
 6. retain our students ready for CSU transfer who are being delayed or turned away;

7. accommodate students now enrolled or planning to enroll in California’s private postsecondary institutes who will be unable to do so because of cuts to the Cal Grant program;
8. attract and enroll Californians—over 900,000 of them—who are without high school diplomas, a number many argue will only increase as a result of high school exit exams.

Given these demands, the system believes a growth target of 5% is not unreasonable.

- ▶ **Equalization:** This principle is indivisible from the ideals of Equity and Fairness. Since our fall plenary session discussions, there has been growing will to address this lingering inequity, and some funding to ensure at least an initial volley. Throughout this spring, as the allocation for this purpose vacillates between \$25m to \$80m, and as the system continues to debate the merits of various equalization models, the Academic Senate will observe the ideals you have articulated over the years. Because allocation of this pot of money (whether as a one-time or on-going basis) may well be distributed on an FTES model, your Consultation Council Representatives have insisted that the funding must be accompanied by movement toward program-based standards, particularly full-time/part-time faculty ratios.

Call to Action:

The Academic Senate will: continue to carry forth your perspectives expressed in decades’ worth of resolutions; seek to establish written agreements among Consultation Council participants on the matter of equalization; offer testimony and provide legislators with necessary data; participate in further conversations across the state regarding equalization plans; work with the system to defeat the “Pell grant” myth; work with other faculty groups on strategies to pursue our shared ideals.

Local senates can: register students to vote; encourage students to share and publish local stories about student hardship in local newspapers, before TV cameras, and in legislative hearings; encourage petitions to be sent to local legislators; urge other groups with members on your campuses—affiliations of Transfer Center Directors, Admissions and Records Directors, EOPS directors—to issue statements and send letters to legislative and administrative groups (with copies to the Academic Senate, of course) to correct misstatements or misunderstandings they observe in print or in proposed legislation; make presentations to local civic groups to explain the promise of the Master Plan and the role of Community Colleges in California’s post-secondary schema; research the local impact of fees—differential and

other increases—on your students over time (e.g., what were the losses, when/if they returned, etc); research the impact differential fees may have upon employees of local industry, businesses, and health and safety providers; anticipate how the presumed loss of students as a result of differential fees will impact particular courses or programs.³

Ideal #2: Fairness and Equity

The Context:

Cynics have publicly argued that in these economic times, institutions will have to make “hard choices,” including who is “worthy” of being educated! This elitist remark seeks to divide our students into phalanxes of the “worthy” and “unworthy.” We would be able to turn those comments aside were it not for the following very explicit maneuvers. Targeting fees and funding, our opponents may pay lip service to ensuring student equity, but their actions contradict their words.

The Problems:

- ▶ **The Prop 98 Split:** Since the early 90s, we have been denied our constitutionally guaranteed 10.93% portion of Proposition 98 funds. We would be able to provide equitable distribution of funds to ensure that the poorest and those historically non-college-going populations were protected, if legislators didn’t cynically play fast and loose with this voter-approved division. The bottom line, if they honored the law, we wouldn’t have to worry about these matters:
 1. Increased fees, including differential fees (see Ideal #1 above).
 2. Sustained 03-04 cuts in matriculation funding—as we approach a year of increased demand for these services, demonstrably linked to student success.
 3. Continued loss of backfill for the health fees waived under BOG waivers. Ironically, as the need for BOG fee waivers increases, so does the loss of revenue to maintain campus health centers and their health education offerings. In some areas of California, where reductions in state or county social and health funding have decimated services, the campus health service is the last refuge for students to receive immunizations, TB and other health screenings. For some campus centers, the possibility of closure is very real.
- ▶ **Eliminating Categorical Distinctions:** While we understand the Governor’s interest in reducing the number of categorical programs community colleges must account for, we do not experience the plethora of categoricals that K-12 must control. The system opposes these shifts of categorical programs into general apportionment.
 1. Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP): The Governor’s budget proposes allocation on an FTES basis rather than according to its current per college model. In fact, this particular categorical program, if it does not retain its current allocation model, will negate other principles espoused by this administration: economies of scale, regional and local control. De-categorizing these funds would work to the decided disadvantage of smaller, rural locales.
 2. Part-time Faculty Equity Package (for salaries, benefits, and office-hours): The system does not support this shift; even the CEO representative argued that such a shift would reward districts that have not acted in good faith to reach agreement with their faculty’s bargaining unit, while penalizing districts that have. The current categorical state of these funds continues to be useful to all—especially, we hope, to the legislators who initiated them.
- ▶ **Waiver of Fees.** As an inducement to those UC and CSU students to attend community colleges for their first two years, the Governor proposes to waive their community college fees, regardless of their financial need. “Worthiness” in this instance seems to be predicated upon college-readiness, not economic need. Though idealists need to focus on the empirical evidence, it’s hard for me not find this proposal morally repugnant and antithetical to the ideals of equity and fairness.

Call to Action:

The Academic Senate will: continue to lobby, provide information and advice as called upon; respond to other groups similarly challenged by proposed budgetary provisions (EOPS, Librarians, etc.).

Local senates can: research and publicize the health services provided; identify for all campus faculty the local benefits of TTIP funding; educate your legislative representatives in Sacramento on the loss your college might endure if TTIP funding is shifted—a suggestion particularly appropriate for more remote colleges where local voters strongly supported the recall of Gray Davis and the election of Arnold Schwarzenegger; educate students about the impact increased fees will have on them and encourage them to speak with others; work with the local bargaining unit representing part-time faculty to ensure their interests have been negotiated.

³ For example, a Vice-President of Instruction recently commented to a Consultation workgroup that in one distance-education accounting course, 80% of the students enrolled already held a bachelors degree.

Ideal #3: Comprehensive Education and a Full Range of Educational Choices

The Context: We aspire to provide and our students expect the best educational experience possible. Our multiple missions offer our students—new, continuing or returning—a wide variety of educational offerings, including the opportunity to discover new interests and to explore other career or personal objectives. Those latter options are under siege, however, assaulted by legislative and segmental proposals and, most regrettably, by the decimation of vocational programs viewed by cynics as “too costly.” To paraphrase a line from a Delbert McClinton ballad, “we were reaching for a life-line and they threw us a noose.”

- ▶ Our advocacy for life-long learning is under explicit attack when the Department of Finance sets priorities for allocation of our funding.
- ▶ Students’ ability to change majors or take additional courses of personal interest that enrich their understanding and expand their cultural or civic awareness may be deeply curtailed if CSU establishes a 60-unit threshold AND ceiling for transfers into its system. This proposal, once described as a *minimum* for acceptance, seems soon to become the sole package: 60 units of coursework, including general education appropriate for the selected major, some lower division major preparation, and other coursework locally negotiated. No longer would coursework “unnecessary to the major” be accepted as part of the transfer package.
- ▶ The proposals for “redirection of students” remain beyond our predictive ability: will UC and CSU-eligible students turn our direction once refused by those systems? Will they come—or will they, as suggested at a recent Board of Governors meeting, see the promise of a fee-free community college education⁴ offer as a “consolation” prize after working hard to meet UC/CSU eligibility? If they come, will they overwhelm our traditional students’ ability to secure classes for themselves? Within the classroom, will they inspire or intimidate others? Will the redirected students’ demands for transferable

⁴ Note that this concept, appearing in the Governor’s proposed January budget, has not yet been debated by the Legislators, but has a seemingly been adopted as policy by the University of California whose press releases tout the claim that fees will be waived at community colleges for freshmen students turned away from UC for Fall 2004. No one, however, seems to have asked our Community College system about this proposal! As noted above, it is patently unfair to our traditional students whose fees are waived only the basis of demonstrated need.

courses shift our pattern of course offerings? Will we need to reduce or add to the basic skills offerings? Will we be able to sustain our full complement of vocational and certificate offerings in the face of this new demand? While the UCs have begun to turn away new students, we are unlikely to know until fall how many of them amass before our portals.

- ▶ Rhetoric in Sacramento acknowledges that (1) community colleges contribute significantly to economic growth and workforce preparation, and (2) we offer genuine opportunities for economic stability to the less academically prepared students. Unfortunately, legislation now in the hopper belies that. Our career ladders approach enables our students to pursue lateral and vertical goals; but current legislation would restrict the students to whom we offer chances. Federally, actions and words don’t align either. President Bush’s affirmation of community colleges in the “Jobs for the 21st Century Program” would seem to deposit \$250 million; however, those funds would be taken from the Perkins programs and from the Workforce Investment Act (WIA)—both existing programs that serve low-income or displaced workers.

Call to Action:

The Academic Senate will: work with ICAS to strengthen intersegmental planning rather than unilateral actions; will work with CoFO partners to present a unified faculty voice on these issues; try to remain civil in the presence of idiocy. [Sorry—I just wanted to see if you were actually reading this far.]

Local senates can: educate state and local legislators regarding the need for increased rather than diminished funding if new jobs are to be created and a new workforce is to be fully employed; debate the strategies for accommodating new students while protecting our traditional base; support the full and continual training of counselors, articulation officers, and transfer center directors who must to cope with the ever-shifting landscape of transfer; initiate discussions with local CSU faculty to explain these impact proposed changes will have on students now in the trenches with us.

We pragmatic idealists must continue to articulate our ideals, according them influential weight and influence over our actions, and affirming the world that ought to be—and can be—rather than the constricted world the cynics would impose upon us. I have indicated my willingness to act on behalf of our stated ideal; over the coming weeks and months, I hope you will share with us, through your Area Representatives or other Executive Committee members, your own crusades.



Mark Lieu

Defining “Basic Skills” – How Hard Can it Be?

by Mark Lieu, Chair of the Basic Skills Committee

At the 2003 Fall Plenary Session, the body passed a resolution calling for the Academic Senate to “develop definitions for commonly used terms for designating course level, such as ‘basic skills’...” On the surface, defining the term “basic skills” seems to be quite straightforward. Most people would agree that “basic skills” is the designation we give to math and English courses that prepare our students for college-level work. However, the usefulness of this definition depends on our agreement of the definition of “college-level work,” and we soon find that such agreement is elusive. We define this term variously. One possible definition of “college-level work” hinges on its degree applicability. The rigor for a course that is degree applicable is spelled out in Title 5 Regulation, and curriculum committees are expected to consider these criteria when designating a course as degree applicable. However, the assignment of degree applicability varies across the state, and a course that is applicable towards the AA/AS degree in one college may not be in another, even if the course content of the two courses is essentially the same.

Another definition of “college-level work” might be based on whether a course is accepted for transfer to a UC or CSU campus. Unfortunately (at least as far as a universal definition is concerned), transferability is an inconsistent thing. Articulation of courses operates on a campus-by-campus basis. Therefore, there are variations between community colleges as to what is transferable and what is not. In addition, there are differences between what the CSUs accept for transfer from what UCs or independent colleges and universities do.

To add another wrinkle to the discussion, throw in English as a Second Language (ESL) courses. First, there is the confusion as to whether or not ESL is included under the basic skills umbrella. Most would argue that ESL differs from basic skills in that it is developmental, i.e., ESL students are developing language skills that they have never been exposed to before. Basic skills courses are, in contrast, remedial,

i.e. they offer students a chance to relearn skills that they have been exposed to before. But because both prepare students for “college-level” work, ESL and basic skills are usually uttered in the same breath, further muddying any possible distinction.

At some institutions, ESL courses are in a sequence leading to basic skills English courses. As a result, basic skills courses are filled with ESL learners, so are these developmental or remedial courses? Usually, these courses are non-degree applicable. However, at some institutions, using the Title 5 criteria for rigor, curriculum committees have granted degree applicability to some ESL courses. Furthermore, some colleges have even articulated their ESL courses with a four-year institution. Therefore, in some colleges, ESL courses are by several definitions “college-level work” even though similar courses precede basic skills courses at other colleges.

The conclusion we come to, then, is that defining “basic skills” is not very easy after all. In addition, related terms such as “college-level,” “remedial,” and “developmental” are similarly difficult to define precisely. Yet, a common understanding of such terms is essential for discussion of basic skills across the state. The Basic Skills Committee invites you to attend its breakout session at the 2004 Spring Plenary Session to further the discussion for developing a common definition for such terms.

Honoring Excellence

by Julie Adams, Executive Director



Julie Adams

March and April each year is the time when the Academic Senate honors excellence in teaching and in diversity. In March, four faculty members are selected for the Hayward Award. Established in 1989, the Hayward Award, named in honor of the former Community College Chancellor Gerald Hayward, recognizes college faculty who demonstrate the highest level of commitment to their students, college and profession. Nominated by their peers and selected by representatives of the Senate, these faculty must demonstrate excellence to teaching and have a record of active participation on their campus. Four winners, one for each Senate area, are honored before the Board of Governors and receive a plaque and \$1,250 cash award. This year the Hayward Award Winners are: Area A, Rosalie Cuneo Amer, Professor of Library Sciences, Cosumnes River College; Area B, Gerald J. Perez, Napa Valley College, EOPS Coordinator; Area C, Kathleen Bimber, Professor of Child Development; Area D, James W. Baugh, Coastline College, Professor of Counseling. You can read more about them on our website.

In April, four faculty are selected for the Regina Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award. Established in 1998, the Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award recognizes four community college faculty members who have demonstrated a commitment to serving students of all ethnicities. This award was named for the past president of the Academic Senate, Regina Stanback-Stroud. In her many roles, Regina originated, advanced, and implemented many programs and policies that significantly increased the ability of the California community colleges to serve a diverse population of the state, especially through student equity and affirmative action in faculty hiring. The winning candidates must display a combination of seven criteria, including making a significant contribution to the creation of a campus environment friendly to students of diverse backgrounds and interest; implementing teaching strategies that have proven successful in serving historically underachieving students; demonstrating success in addressing diverse learning styles; and assisting students from underrepresented groups to encourage retention and success in classes as they move toward their goals. Four winners, one from each Senate area, are hon-

ored at the Spring Plenary Session in April and receive recognition and a cash award of \$500. This year the Regina Stanback-Stroud Diversity Award winners are: Area A, Janet Koenen, Lake Tahoe, Professor of English; Area B, Pablo Gonzales, Los Medanos College, Professor of English; Area C, Henry Ealy, Los Angeles City College, Professor of American Cultures; and Area D, Gayle Noble, Coastline College, Professor of Education. You can read more about these winners as well on the Senate website.

Please join us in congratulating our colleagues for winning these prestigious awards!

In September, the Senate will again send local senate presidents an announcement for these awards with the application for nomination. This information is also currently posted on the Senate website. Next year, we encourage all local senates to nominate faculty for these distinguished awards.

In the fall we will also seek nominations for our Exemplary Program award. Established by the Board of Governors in 1991, this award recognizes outstanding community college programs. Two California Community College programs are recognized before the Board of Governors in January; each receives a plaque and check for \$1,250; four other programs receive honorable mention at that time. This year's winners from Santa Ana College (Center for Teacher Education) and Santa Barbara City College (Gateway to Success Program), as well as representatives of programs in the Honorable Mention Category (Los Angeles City College Pi Shop, Reedley College's Student Athlete Retention Program and Sierra College Writing Center), will share information about the successes of their programs in break-outs at our Spring 2004 Plenary Session.

We urge you to learn from them—and to give serious consideration to individuals and programs on your campus worthy of such state-wide recognition.



Hayward award winners are being honored at the Board of Governor's meeting in Sacramento



Greg Gilbert

Less is Not Always More

by Greg Gilbert, Chair, Research Committee

“Teaching is not a lost art, but the regard for it is a lost tradition.”

Jacques Barzun

There is a general and intuitive dislike for compressed courses among many instructors—the more compressed, the more in the wrong. Compress my course, and you eliminate content that is important to my students. Compress my course, and you rob students of important time for reflection and incubation. Compress my course, and you demean the ideal, in the words of A. Bartlett Giamatti, that “teaching is an instinctual art, mindful of potential, craving of realization, a pausing, seamless process.” But the world is in a rush, we are told, and besides, our colleges need the revenue.

At the Academic Senate’s 2002 Spring Plenary, two resolutions were passed that state succinctly the apprehension expressed within the field concerning abbreviated time frames.

9.05R | 2002 Spring Resolution Opposing Abbreviated Time Frames For Speech Communication Classes

Urge community colleges to refrain from offering speech communication classes of three or more semester units in time segments of fewer than six weeks, except with the consent of the local speech communication faculty and academic senate.

9.06R | 2002 Spring Quality of Instruction

Urge community colleges to refrain from offering any courses of three or more semester units in any alternative delivery time frames other than full-term except with the consent of the tenured discipline faculty and the curriculum committee.

Throughout California, community colleges are offering an increasing array of courses in abbreviated time frames, and the question must be asked, to what end? Are there significant tradeoffs of content, rigor, and service to students between traditional and compressed course offerings? While there exists no single answer that encompasses all such courses, there are

core questions and principles that pertain to their design and delivery. There exists also a concern as to how well research on abbreviated time frames addresses legitimate concerns expressed by educators.

A review of hundreds of ERIC files and a range of studies obtained through a query on the RP Group’s listserv suggests that abbreviated courses result in student satisfaction, low attrition, and good grades. However, a closer examination reveals that a preponderance of the research does not adequately control for differences in subject areas, student preparation, or rigor (content and standards). In addition, while many studies refer to “abbreviated” 16-week courses in their research, our concern here is with courses that are substantially abbreviated, six-to-eight weeks, or less. Overall, when examining the research, one sees very little in the way of study objectives, methodology, research design, and pre- or post-test methodology. Completion rates and grade distributions are mentioned in some instances, but terms are not always defined well. The overriding issue, then, is until adequate research has been obtained, various questions and principles should be preparatory to the implementation of abbreviated time frames.

Certainly, examples of best practices exist within the milieu of abbreviated courses, but if local senates are to make informed decisions, they must have the necessary research available to them, generated locally and from within the field. To be useful, research on abbreviated time frames and traditional formats must be held to the same standards of excellence. A review of several years of attrition rates, grade distributions, and course syllabi content can assist local faculty as they determine the practicability of offering a course in an abbreviated form. To the extent that programs and departments can agree upon common course objectives and assessments and are prepared to collect data over time, the greater the

opportunity they will have of designing and tracking well conceived classes.

The Community College system in California provides education on demand to a diverse population. When a course is offered in an abbreviated time frame, it is reasonable to consider who this decision privileges and who it excludes. The further we get from a “standardized” Stepford student, the greater the need to apply specific local research to decisions concerning course design and delivery; a homogeneous population of highly motivated and privileged students will not respond in the same manner as a diverse lower division population such as we serve. Open access translates to less selectivity, which confers upon local senates a demand that they be highly selective in considering the application of abbreviated time frames.

Local faculty, senates, curriculum committees, and administration should weigh these four questions regarding the use of abbreviated time frames:

1. Will the course content and/or assessments, as designated on the course approval form, likely be reduced by an alternative delivery format?
2. Is student attrition likely to be significantly higher than for the same course taught in a traditional format?
3. For students who complete a course, is performance, as measured by passing grades, likely to be lower than in a traditional format?
4. If the answer to question (1), (2), or (3) is yes, what specific prerequisite and/or course modifications and faculty standards of learning and assessment will we implement and track in an effort to maintain course rigor, avoid increases in course and institutional attrition rates and/or declines in student grade distributions? Finally, how might these changes affect articulation agreements?

While issues of “revenue” and “expediency” may be used by some as the impetus for offering compressed courses, neither of these terms supersede the requirement for quality and accountability that is central to

current standards of accreditation within our profession. Funding based on FTES encourages an emphasis on access and affordability (compressed and online courses, and seminars for credit), and in the end, this can have the effect of precluding semester length and traditional approaches that may offer better components of rigor and instruction. Considered in the extreme, an MBA could be obtained in about three weeks given an adequate supply of catheters and caffeine, but you would not want a graduate of that program to keep your books.

In the final analysis, the core principles of consistent, high quality and accessible education remain, as they always have, a matter of primary importance for our local senates—the subject matter authorities. The design and implementation of abbreviated time frames must do much more than accede to a demand for expedience and revenue; such courses must rise to the level of our traditional offerings. The “instinctual art” of teaching does still matter, if mostly in retrospect, to those whose educations were not compressed or set at a distance by hastily conceived course designs.



A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to Session

by Yula Flournoy, Executive Committee Member

Every time I visit the hallowed halls of the San Francisco Westin, I take a minute or two to sit in “my” chair. It is not a completely comfortable chair, nor is it especially beautiful, but I think of it as “my” chair because that is where I spent a lot of time during the first plenary session I attended. I sat there to get myself oriented – I hate reading maps on street corners or in corridors, so I would refer to the session schedule while ensconced in “my” chair. I sat there to catch my breath between breakouts. I sat there to read material that I had had no idea even existed. I sat there to people watch. I sat there to drink coffee between meetings instead of standing around, with no one to talk to.

My first time at session was very frightening for me. Most people who know me do not realize just how shy I am in new situations. I am always on the margins at parties and gatherings where I don’t know anyone. If I only know one person, I will heel just like a well-trained puppy. If I don’t know anyone, I’d rather just not go. My metamorphosis into a political animal (all right, maybe just a political kitten) has been long and tortuous. I have forced myself all of my life into many strange and scary situations in order to grow. I have lived on three continents and did the Eurail trip at 21 all by myself. Many times I was uneasy and lonely, but in the end I had a wonderful time. So what happened at my very first session? I sat around the edges, tried to keep my mouth shut, was a little lonely, sat in my chair, and had a wonderful time!

I attended session all by myself because somehow I had ended up as the Academic Senate President of Mt. San Jacinto College. I had only just received approval of tenure (not yet by the board, though), but I had been on the senate for three years and thought I knew what was involved. The trip to session was almost a by-the-way sort of decision; I had heard of it in passing but did not really know what it was. The past president recommended that someone go, and since I was a newly minted local academic senate president, I figured it was my duty and responsibility

to do so. I was to learn that it was both a duty and a responsibility—and a whole universe more.

The first person to approach me in my chair at that first session was Mark Snowwhite. He teaches at Crafton Hills, which abuts my district. I had heard of him from our past president, but of course did not plan to approach him myself. He was so warm and welcoming. I can’t begin to tell you what that meant to me. After that, I started meeting more people, sitting next to them during the breakouts, but most importantly during the meals. Since I was alone, I had to find someplace to sit. I couldn’t tag along with Mark because he was on the Executive Committee, so I somehow found places at each meal. I met so many wonderful people who were so interesting! Sometimes I think the meals are the best part of session. Well, my hips do, at least!

The breakout sessions, however, are what I consider the most awesome aspect of session. I was truly amazed by the number of well-informed and motivated faculty we have here in California. Sometimes the most informative breakouts are the ones where the audience knows more than the presenter. We need to realize we are all resources, whether we know it or not, and going to session helps spread those resources around. Before going to session, I had not a clue about how much we all have in common. I didn’t know there were other people out there just like me with the same issues and questions, the same problems with administrators and students, even the same problems with some of our colleagues. Sharing our experiences, solutions, and maybe just our commiseration was so motivating. I cannot conceive of how I would have acted as president without having had the experience. I learned so much just from attending one session.

The most empowering part of session was still to come, though. On Saturday, we voted on resolutions. How cool!! I had my own delegate’s badge and a sense of emancipation. I didn’t have the nerve to approach the pro or con mikes, but I listened and thought and listened and thought as much as I possi-

bly could. What stood out the most for me was that we all care about our students with such passion and very little selfishness. Here was a group of people who have a calling, not a job. Above all, we come together. We may not always agree, but we support each other to the end. I was and am very proud to be a part of this.

Since my first session, I have attended both on my own and with a group of colleagues from my college. I don't know which I prefer. On my own, I was forced to interact with people from all over the state and from different disciplines. With colleagues, I usually spent most of my time with them, which is good to strengthen local bonds, but also a bit isolating. Perhaps attending with a group but forcing ourselves to go out and mingle is a good compromise.

I haven't missed a session since, am still learning, and discovering that I have so much yet to learn. There truly is strength in numbers, and attending session is, in my opinion, the one thing a new local academic senate officer cannot afford to neglect. After returning home, I felt so much more a part of a group of smart, caring people and not just a lone, struggling drudge. Since that first session, I have served on the Resolutions Committee, the Curriculum Committee, the Basic Skills Committee, and now on the Executive Committee as one of the South Representatives. I can't believe how far I've come. The next time I faced down an administrator, I wasn't alone: I had all of you behind me, cheering me on. It all happened because I wasn't afraid to try something new.

A funny thing happened to me on the way to session. Instead of attending yet another meaningless set of meetings, I grew as a faculty member, as a local senate officer, and as a person. I met so many new and interesting people that I cannot even begin to name them. I learned how important a faculty role in governance is and how to go about ensuring its health. I also learned what a great resource we have in the State Academic Senate. From the Executive Committee to the Committees to the Executive Director to the support staff to the local senate members, we have so much to be thankful for. If you have never attended session, you are missing out on a wealth of knowledge and camaraderie. Come with friends or come alone, just be sure to attend! (But don't sit in my chair!)

President's Message

Continued from page 2

federal vocational training funds all pose threats to our students' educational aspirations.

Thus, I'm back with still more exhortations. For those of you seeking action as an antidote to your frustrations or fears, we urge your continued engagement—first by reading the articles we provide herein. Many of these essays provide suggestions—to individuals and to local senates—on how to act upon such espoused principles as classroom integrity, student equity and diversity, and accessibility of services to all students. Included are also reminders of how we enact our delegated authority—by considering (and reconsidering) graduation requirements and disciplines lists. Of course, don't miss the article urging your participation at our Spring Plenary session in San Francisco, April 15-17. Finally, we hope that the article on leadership (the first in a series) will inspire you to consider statewide service to further principles you believe worth of defense.

For those of you still recovering from the tasks you've undertaken as a result of my earlier exhortations, take heart in the list of actions your Academic Senate has assumed on your behalf and in response to your resolutions and requests. As you also see in this *Rostrum*, we continue to provide you essential information, whether it is contained in an article on full-time faculty obligation numbers; or in forthcoming papers on faculty chairs and accreditation; or in plenary sessions breakouts on counseling for athletes and vocational students, and student fees; or through our public recognition of exemplary programs and unrivalled teaching. Read, listen, and be assured that we continue to work, even when you are unable to be at our side.

75/25—the Faculty Obligation

continued from page 3

So the full-time faculty obligation was introduced by the Chancellor's Office and approved by the Board of Governors as a mechanism to partially comply with the 75% goal. Although it did not generally succeed in ensuring attainment of the 75% goal, it did establish an annual minimum number of full-time faculty that each district was required to hire. Unfortunately many districts immediately interpreted this number as a maximum—a ceiling rather than a floor – although the original Education Code language clearly stated “at least.” The mechanism also provided for a reduction in apportionment dollars for each required position that a district failed to hire. The current level of this apportionment reduction is approximately \$55,000 for each position left vacant beneath the obligation number; that number is based on the statewide average faculty salary and benefits less the statewide average part-time faculty replacement cost.

Over the years since the original calculation in 1989, as districts received additional apportionment revenue, this faculty obligation number was raised whenever the Board of Governors certified that certain growth and cost of living funds had been provided. Unfortunately though, it turned out that it was possible for districts to comply with this increasing numerical requirement for full-time faculty without ever attaining the 75% goal. Some districts did exactly this, resulting in percentages as low as, for example, Mt. San Jacinto's 43.8% in the Chancellor's Office final report for Fall 2000 (43.5% in Fall 2001) or Copper Mountain's 44.7% in 2000 (47.7% in 2001). Other districts honored the intent of the legislation by reaching 2000 percentages such as 76.3% at Rio Hondo and 75.5% at Los Angeles, the largest district in the state, or Yosemite's 2001 percentage of 77.3%.

It is interesting to note that there is a one year delay factor whereby a district receives the money in one fiscal year and is required to hire the faculty by the following fall term, in the next fiscal year. A legitimate question for districts with persistent low percentages might be where are they choosing to spend the apportionment dollars that they have already received.

More Recent Activity

Specific numbers are sent to each district in the form of a budget memo from the Chancellor's Office, with preliminary figures supplied a year in advance (in October/November) and final figures provided the following summer or early fall.

Memos for the Fall 2003 requirement (and previous years) are available on the Chancellor's Office website at:

http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/cffp/fiscal/standards/full_time_faculty_obligation.htm¹

Annual final reports can also be found there.

In Summer 2002 the Board of Governors originally certified an increase in the faculty obligation number to take effect in Fall 2003. Subsequently in November 2002, when Governor Davis was about to enact mid-year cuts, the Board of Governors took two unprecedented actions regarding the existing compliance mechanism:

1. fifty percent of the planned increase in the faculty obligation number was waived permanently for all districts.
2. a mechanism was put in place that allowed districts to request a deferral of the remaining 50% of the originally planned increase. The local board of trustees had to notice and approve this request, as attested to by a sign-off from representatives of bargaining units, academic senates, and students. The request then had to be approved by the Board of Governors.

The Board of Governors approved deferral requests from four separate groups of districts. Those approved in May, July and September 2003 included an action item with text that read “defer for one year.” But for the group of districts approved in January 2004, the language of the agenda action item asked the Board only to “defer the incremental increase”. This language is particularly curious since, at this point, four months after the obligation should have been met, such districts no longer had the option to hire and were really only requesting that the non-compliance penalty not be applied to them. This observation was made at the Board of Governors meeting by faculty Board Member Carolyn Russell.

There remains currently disagreement among members of Consultation Council, the Chancellor's Office, and members of the Board of Governors regarding the duration of this deferral. Faculty groups interpret the language to provide for a one-year deferral, meaning that the Fall 2003 faculty obligation number would increase in Fall 2004 by the number of positions deferred (resulting in reinstatement of the original Fall 2003 requirement prior to deferral). Some administrative groups interpret the language to mean that the original Fall 2003 requirement would not be reinstated until growth and COLA funds were provided. These funds have not been provided in 2003-04. So under the administrators' interpretation, the Fall 2004 requirement would remain the same as the

¹ Specific details of how the faculty obligation numbers were calculated for your district are probably best obtained from the appropriate Chancellor's Office staff person, Patricia Laurent at (916) 327-6225 or plarent@ccco.edu.

Fall 2003 requirement. This issue is still to be resolved, but is scheduled for additional discussion this spring.

In a recent survey I undertook of the local senate presidents at colleges included in deferral requests, every respondent stated that the local senate believed, at the time their faculty participated in the request process, that the deferral was only for one year. Many responses included vigorous language of the nature that “the one year limitation was the only reason that we agreed.”

Another Approach

In September 2003 the Board took a different but related action regarding the full-time faculty percentage. Earlier, in Fall 2002, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted this resolution:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate work with the Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Governors to revise the implementation guidelines for attainment of the 75/25 full-time/part-time faculty ratio such that progress toward the attainment of 75/25 is required in good economic times, and a minimum maintenance of the current ratio is expected in difficult economic times. (5.02 F02)

The Board had already expressed concern over historical lack of progress towards the 75% goal, and the annual public disagreements over increases in the faculty obligation number.

A Consultation Council Task Force was formed and the Board approved its recommendations for a change in the Title 5 Regulations to add a third compliance mechanism (the first two mechanisms were to achieve 75% or to comply with the full-time faculty obligation number).

Title 5, Section 51025 was revised to insert an option that actually examines the effect of change on the full-time faculty percentage, rather than simply relying on the full-time faculty obligation number.

If the Board of Governors determines pursuant to subsection (a) that adequate funds have not been provided to implement paragraph (1), the district’s base full-time faculty obligation shall be unchanged. However, for the fall term of the succeeding fiscal year the district may choose, in lieu of maintaining its base obligation, to maintain, at a minimum, the full-time faculty percentage attained in the prior fall term.

This modification was intended to be the long-term solution to the problem by preventing backsliding in difficult economic times, and is in place for the Fall 2004 requirement. If a district selects this option it is not permitted to let its full-time

faculty percentage decrease (in practice this means that if full-time faculty numbers are reduced then part-time faculty numbers must also be reduced). Interestingly, in terms of the above discussion about the length of deferrals, if a district selects this option, then the deferral does indeed continue until growth and COLA funds are restored. However, at the point that those funds are restored, the district’s original faculty obligation number is reinstated (unless they satisfy the first compliance mechanism by achieving 75%).

The Section 51025 language also introduced a new mechanism for providing separate funds (other than the ill-fated program improvement funds) that would be specifically targeted to increase the full-time faculty percentage:

If the Board of Governors determines pursuant to subsection (a) that additional funds have been provided for the purpose of increasing the full-time faculty percentage, the district’s base full-time faculty obligation shall be further increased for the fall term of the succeeding fiscal year by the quotient of the applicable funds divided by the statewide average replacement costs for the current fiscal year.

This would allow a specific budget change proposal with a line item intended to deliberately increase the full-time faculty percentage. It was hoped that the possibility of these funds, and the third compliance option, would avoid the unfortunate tendency to ignore the need for progress towards the 75% goal in good times and to plead that it’s not possible in bad times. Whether this improvement actually occurs remains to be seen.

In a somewhat related 2004-05 budget conversation, the Academic Senate currently advocates that the discussion surrounding the use of equalization funds based on a head-count or FTES measure must include a quality component involving progress on several system standards. One of the most obvious existing quality standards is the full-time faculty percentage.

There are other forces that would like to see quality standards such as the 75% goal (and even the 50% law) disappear completely. Perhaps the equalization debate, combined with the new Title 5 language will finally enable the system to attain its twenty-five year old goal of a 75% full-time faculty percentage. We’re certainly not there yet, and I’m not holding my breath.



Gary Morgan

Conversations about Leadership

By Gary Morgan, Educational Policies Committee Member

Let's face it: when we talk about faculty leadership, we are usually speaking about a fairly limited group of people. Though there are dozens around the state, leaders of every local academic senate and leaders of faculty in various statewide organizations, the number is really very small.

Those individuals make an appreciable difference in the way the faculty roles in governance look. However, many of those leaders are now moving on to other phases of their lives or careers; large numbers of faculty have retired or plan retirement imminently.

That means a new generation of faculty leaders is needed, and needed now. If the faculty voice in institutional governance is to remain strong and vital, new leaders must come forward to lend their expertise and their commitment to that ideal.

The Academic Senate's Leadership Institute is one venue for aspiring individuals to hone their skills. Another is, unquestionably, the "hard knocks" method, wherein the faculty member rolls up his or her sleeves and plunges ahead, learning by experience. But at the end of the day, leadership is something individuals themselves bring to the table, and the Academic Senate needs that leadership. Without that new generation of faculty leaders stepping forward, much of what the previous generation of leadership worked so hard to achieve will be lost.

In a series of *Rostrum* articles, then, we will converse with faculty leaders about their leadership experiences—what brought them to the table and what feast they have found before them. This first interview of the series introduces us Carolyn Russell, Professor of English at Rio Hondo College and a faculty representative to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

Carolyn, what piqued your interest in leadership? In my own case, it was a local issue about equivalency, but for other people, it's other things...what provided that catalyst for you?

I started teaching English at Rio Hondo in 1975 when we were trying to unionize and meeting great resistance from our board and administration. Our days at table were no better than our organizing days, so we finally called a "Day of Dignity," which was a euphemism for a strike. Later, as a negotiator, I soon realized how important it was for me to be involved in having a say in how the college impacted my students and me. So during the next 10 years, I served as senate president and 5 years as department chair. I have been on my local senate for about 20 of my 29 years as a faculty member and the executive committee for about 12 of those. I am currently 2nd vice-president. From 1998 to 2001, I also served as president of the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC).

What rewards do you associate with your leadership roles?

As a faculty member, bringing the Puente Project to Rio Hondo and setting up the first computer lab on campus (1985) come to mind. As senate president, I advocated for including our president on the district cabinet. Although I couldn't make it happen my term, the next president was brought in. Often, results take time. During my term as FACCC president, I was proud to be a part of the STRS taskforce that changed retirement benefits from 2% to a potential 2.4%. Other changes for part-timers, office hours, health benefits, and the original \$57 million dollar salary enhancement were also long overdue.

Finally, I was also extremely proud to have the Academic Senate forward my name to the Governor as a candidate for the Board of Governors. As a faculty member of the Board of Governors, I have worked hard not to be marginalized, but to be seen as someone who accurately reflects the needs of the

students, the system, and the faculty. In these budget constraints, all constituents need to work together to present a unified front. We must work out compromises on issues that can potentially divide and, thus, permanently damage us, like funding, growth, non-credit and the 75/25 ratio. We will also have as many as nine new board members.

We so often hear our colleagues say, “I just don’t have time.” How do you balance your time?

I currently teach 70%, but because my Board, President, and Dean have been very supportive in helping me with a schedule that accommodates the meetings and conferences I attend as a board member, I am able to combine my interests.

What pitfalls often await leaders?

It’s not always possible to avoid pitfalls, but it is possible to have the right equipment to get out of them: history of the problems, knowledge about the situation and the players, a range of solutions, and a willingness to take risks and accept responsibility. Leading is always a learning experience.

What advice would you offer to new leaders?

My advice—not in order of priority:

1. Try on lots of hats. No leadership job is too small, so find the right fit.
2. Never be afraid to ask questions. Ask questions of those with whom you disagree; know their perspective.
3. Continually assess and reassess, asking yourself, “What do we need—presence, product, or process?” “Presence” means making certain the body you represent has the credibility and the commitment necessary to follow through; “product,” means a tangible outcome like a raise or a change in grading policies; “process” means making certain structures are in place that provide opportunities for academic discourse that will drive the institution through shared governance.
4. When conflict (which can be healthy) arises, keep focused on what you need, then fight the good fight. Win and lose well; don’t gloat or brood. Get on to the next challenge.

Section 508

Continued from page 5

course publisher, and/or the IT managers and technicians all had to work together to ensure accessibility and 508 compliance.

Conclusion

As colleges integrate the web and other electronic resources more into their curriculum, it will be difficult to anticipate all of the accessibility issues that arise. However, as faculty we can’t view these issues as interruptions or inconveniences to our teaching. Disabled students greatly benefit when we become better aware of their needs and become more proactive when deciding on accessible web and electronic media for our courses. We can also influence key campus decision makers in choosing 508 compliant and usable course management software and student information systems.

Our disabled students also benefit when colleges adopt accessibility standards and policies. It is always better to work from top-down rather than bottom-up one when implementing such standards. The president, budget administrators, deans, division chairs, curriculum committees, and instructors should have an understanding of web and other electronic accessibility in college wide planning and purchasing. They must collaborate with the college Webmaster, assistive technologies specialist, faculty and DSPS office to produce policies with timelines to ensure successful compliance. New faculty should be given the college’s web and digital access policies. These policies must be revised periodically to address emerging technologies. Practical workshops on how to comply with Section 508 should be provided to faculty on a routine basis as well.

We invite you to join our breakout, “The Human Side of Section 508,” at our April Plenary Session to further discuss Section 508 compliance and accessibility issues. Following are some online resources that you may find helpful as you work collaboratively to accommodate students with disabilities.



Mark Snowwhite

Disciplines List Review Preparation

by Mark Snowwhite, Standards and Practices Committee Chair

Maintaining a high degree of professionalism is critical to the health of the California Community College system. By insisting on high standards for new faculty hires, we assure that our students will have educators well prepared to teach and render other students services necessary for our students' academic success. Fundamental to the various processes that we use to select highly qualified faculty is the Disciplines List for minimum qualifications that defines the academic and experiential preparation for faculty in all of the recognized disciplines. Responsibility for reviewing and recommending revisions to the Disciplines List falls to the Academic Senate; these revisions reflect current understanding of the discipline training and/or related experience one needs to teach classes in each of the disciplines. Since 1992 the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has reviewed and revised the state's disciplines list of minimum qualifications once every three years as stipulated in the Education Code.

The Spring 2004 Plenary Session will mark the beginning of the fifth regular review process with two breakout sessions, one providing an overview of the process and a second explaining in greater detail the criteria used to determine which proposals for changes will go forward to session to be voted on by the plenary body.

The first will include a brief history of the current minimum qualifications requirements, which, in 1990, replaced the old credential system. This change, authorized by AB 1725, the Community College Reform Bill, was intended to end a credential system similar to the one for K-12 and replace it with a system more appropriate for a post-secondary system. Attendees at this breakout session will learn how the authors of this landmark legislation believed that the faculty themselves, working through the state Academic Senate, were best suited to make recommendations to the California Community Colleges Board of Governors, that determine qualifi-

cations for new faculty members. Attendees will also learn how this legislation set forth the authority of faculty through their local academic senates; how to place all credit courses offered by their respective institutions under the disciplines delineated by the Disciplines List; and how to assess the qualifications of faculty who teach those courses. Understanding of this authority and how it is exercised is essential for faculty to properly fulfill their obligations in this area of maintaining a strong profession.

The second breakout session on the Disciplines List review will include the details of the review that participants in the process need to know. Presenters will provide such information as the timeline for the review, criteria used to determine which proposals succeed, levels of scrutiny a proposal undergoes, examples of successful and unsuccessful proposals, and an explanation of how proposals that are not recommended by the Executive Committee may still be introduced for consideration by the body.

Because the responsibilities for reviewing the Disciplines List on the state level and using it on the local level are so important, we expect a large turnout for these two breakout sessions.

Status Report: The Discussions about AA/AS Degree Requirements



Jane Patton

by Jane Patton, Curriculum Committee Chair

This year the Senate's Curriculum Committee is charged with writing a paper to inform faculty about the issues raised during discussions about AA/AS degree requirements in math and English. For years, the Academic Senate has discussed whether the current levels should be changed. The essential issue is this: are the current allowable levels of math and English appropriate, or should the Academic Senate recommend a change, and if so, what change? Title 5 requirements currently read:

§55805.5. Types of Courses Appropriate to the Associate Degree.

(c) English courses not more than one level below the first transfer level composition course, typically known as English 1A. Each student may count only one such course as credit toward the associate degree.

(d) All mathematics courses above and including Elementary Algebra.

As with all Senate committees, the Curriculum Committee's work is driven by resolutions adopted at bi-annual plenary sessions. Eight different resolutions since 2001 have been brought to the Senate's plenary body, asking us to deliberate about the math or English requirements—some in favor of a change, some not. The Committee hopes its paper will clarify the issues and present enough information to prepare the plenary body to make a decision at the 2004 Fall Plenary Session.

The Curriculum Committee is comprised of: Carole Bennett, Santa Rosa; Jane de Leon, American River; Richard Mahon, Riverside; Zwi Reznik, Fresno, and Sandy Warmington, Sacramento City. In the fall, the Committee decided that we needed wider discussion and participation from across the state, so we planned the following: breakouts for the 2003 Fall and 2004 Spring Plenary Sessions, for the 2004 Vocational Leadership Seminar and the next Curriculum Institute, and two special Curriculum

Colloquia which were held in February. In addition, I was invited to share information at a breakout of the bi-annual meeting of CIOs, held in San Francisco.

What We Have Learned So Far

Below is a partial list of what we're learning:

1. Faculty's views are as mixed as ever. Individual faculty within specific disciplines (including math and English) and across disciplines ring in on both sides, although regional and state English and math organizations have taken positions in favor of changing the regulations.
2. Passionate and strong arguments—both pro and con—have been voiced.
3. The literature review suggests that employers want graduates with a higher level of skills.
4. If a change is recommended, there are several options—both for English and math. Other options could include new courses, tailored to specific audiences, at the same level as English 1A and Intermediate algebra.
5. The issues can be divided into an array of complex categories, including a) what's best for students; b) what's best for society; and c) what's best for colleges.
6. Faculty in math and English may need to re-evaluate *how* they teach as well as *what* they teach. Faculty across disciplines may need to re-evaluate what math and English skills they expect from students. Are we collectively clear about what students need and how we should meet their needs?
7. If a change is recommended, we collectively need to consider implementation methods and options.

Pros and Cons

Many and varied pro and con arguments have been voiced from faculty. Here is a brief list of some of the over-arching ones.

Continued on page 28



Wanda Morris

“Separate but Equal”?:

The *Brown v. Board of Education* Decision, Then and Now

by Wanda Morris, Chair, Equity, Diversity Action Committee

On the eve of the 50th anniversary of this landmark decision, educators, legal experts, and authors prepare to celebrate the historical civil rights decision known as *Brown v. Board of Education*. To this day, efforts continue across the country to realize the dream of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the efforts of the families named in the original Supreme Court case. This article reminds us of that critical decision and suggests why it requires us to continue to enact its principles.

Then...

During Fall 1950, several African American parents, with the support of the Topeka, Kansas Chapter of the NAACP, filed suit against the Topeka Board of Education. The court case challenged the “separate but equal” doctrine governing public education at that time. Ideally, the court case sought equitable integration of public schools in Topeka, Kansas.

At that time, African American children in Topeka were required to travel past nearby schools to attend the four schools designated for them. The Topeka school district operated eighteen schools for white children and four for African American children. In other cases outside of Kansas, African American children attended poor facilities without basic school equipment. Third-grader Linda Brown was one of those African American children who walked through a railroad switchyard to catch a bus that would take her one mile to her all- black elementary school, even though a white elementary school was only seven blocks away.

For a period of two years prior to legal action, McKinley L. Burnett, President of the Topeka branch of the NAACP attempted to persuade Topeka school officials to integrate their schools. After numerous unsuccessful attempts to ensure equal opportunities for all children, African American community leaders, including Burnett and other local attorneys, stepped up efforts to change the

educational system; the lawsuit was their final attempt (*Washburn Alumni Review*, Dec. 1989).

The U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas heard *Brown’s* case from June 25-26, 1951. At the trial, the NAACP argued that segregated schools sent the message to black children that they were inferior to whites; therefore, the schools were inherently unequal. The Board of Education’s defense was that, because segregation in Topeka and elsewhere pervaded many other aspects of life, segregated schools simply prepared black children for the segregation they would face during adulthood. Based on a similar court case, *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), that had been overturned in the courts, the judge felt compelled to rule in favor of the Board of Education.

On behalf of Linda Brown, the NAACP then appealed to the Supreme Court on October 1, 1951 and their case was combined with other cases that challenged school segregation in South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware. Arguments were heard in the Supreme Court in 1952, but failed to reach a decision; it was heard again in 1953 when the Supreme Court requested that both sides discuss “the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868.”

On May 17, 1954, at 12:52 p.m. the historical civil right decision was uttered. It was decided that “that in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal...therefore plaintiffs and others...are deprived of the equal protection of the law guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution.” This decision unleashed a concentrated burst of energy altering public education across America.

And now...

Today, public education across America continues its struggle to ensure equal opportunity for children and future generations. Even though the Brown legacy is one of vast educational progress over two generations, communities continue to challenge the “separate but equal” doctrine and to erode principles of equity. Often cited as racially divisive acts, for example, were California’s Propositions 209 and 226. Yet in 1991, legislation enshrined into law required all public education institutions—including California Community Colleges—to provide educational equity regardless of ethnic origin, race, gender, age, disability, or economic circumstances, including a reasonable opportunity for any student to develop fully his or her potential (Education code 66010.2 and 66030).

The Board of Governors reinforced this law in 1992 and again in 2003. To ensure equal opportunity for all students, the Board of Governors identified this element as a minimum condition for receipt of state funding (Title 5, Sections 51026 and 54220). Specifically, each college is charged with creating or revising its current Student Equity Plan. Newly revised plans from each community college are due July 2004.

We hope that each local senate will join educators and legal scholars around this country, using this opportune moment to familiarize faculty, students and staff with this important landmark in the delivery of education to diverse groups. Former Chancellor Tom Nussbaum, in collaboration with George Nicholson, Associate Justice for the Court of Appeal, Third District and a host of Californians are now promoting observation of this court decision throughout the state.

Among the ways you can contribute locally to the national effort underway this year are these specific actions:

- ▶ attend our plenary session breakout on this topic;
- ▶ visit our Academic Senate website (<http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us>) in May to find links to other resources for use in your classrooms;
- ▶ study materials such as those sponsored by the American Bar Association and those noted below;
- ▶ encourage dialogues on your campus about the nature of equity and our need to preserve it (for suggestions, see <http://www.aba.org/brown>);
- ▶ sponsor local resolutions commemorating this court decision and the civil rights movement that followed it, including resolutions adopted by student, faculty and trustee groups;
- ▶ affirm your commitment to equity and diversity by participating in the revision of your college’s student equity plan between now and July.

- ▶ American Bar Association (2003). “Dialogue on Brown v. Board of Education.” (Chicago: Author). An 8-page educational brochure available at <http://www.abanet.org/publiced>
 - ▶ Berkin, C. *et al.* (2001). *Making America: A History of the United States*. (New York: Houghton Mifflin), pp. 629-30.
 - ▶ <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/> American Association of Community Colleges has posted a link on this home page to its resolution in support of commemorative efforts.
 - ▶ <http://brownvboard.org/summary/backgrnd.htm> Washington Law School offers additional historical information about this event.
 - ▶ <http://www.jsonline.com/news/metro/jan04/204053.asp> Retrieved March 22, 2004.
- Several first-person accounts of the impact of *Brown v. Board of Education* published in the Milwaukee Sentinel Journal.

RESOURCES



Leon Marzillier

Principle and Integrity in the Academy

by Leon Marzillier, Relations with Local Senates Committee Chair

The approach of April 15 seems to be an appropriate time to address questions of integrity. Most of us attempt to file tax returns as favorable to us as possible... within the rules. It is when we stretch or break the rules for personal gain that we must question our own integrity. On the campus and in the classroom, our personal integrity is the foundation of the integrity of our profession. And it is the faculty, through modeling and encouragement, who ought to foster integrity in our students.

The ethics of our profession has been a topic taken very seriously since the foundation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. In 1988, the Senate adopted the American Association of University Professors' Ethics Statement, and in 1994, the paper: *Faculty Ethics: Expanding the AAUP Ethics Statement*. In 2002, an even more expanded paper was adopted: *Faculty as Professionals: Responsibilities, Standards and Ethics*, in Response to a 1998 Resolution: "Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to develop a model for an ethics and professional standards process and committee structure to recommend to local academic senates to help them implement the Academic Senates paper *Faculty Ethics: Expanding the AAUP Ethics Statement*." All three of these documents are available on the Academic Senate's website (www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us/Publications/Papers/ethics.html), and include useful information about college academic senates' adopting ethics statements, dealing with faculty-to-faculty conflict, and making sure integrity is upheld in our classrooms.

Faculty Integrity

The AAUP Statement affirms five areas of faculty responsibility—our disciplines, students, col-

leagues, institutions, and communities. Briefly, we should keep current in our fields, involve ourselves with our students to ensure their getting the counsel and assistance that they need, while ensuring academic honesty in the classroom, be involved in hiring, evaluation, and college committees, be involved with our institutions in creating a safe, trusting, nonhostile and open learning environment, and act as responsible representatives of our institutions to the community.

Faculty members with grievances against administration are able to use the channels available to them through their collective bargaining agent (CBA). But, if two or more faculty members find themselves in conflict, the CBA cannot be involved since bargaining agents legally represent both parties. In preparation for such eventualities, it would behoove each local academic senate to have adopted (a) an ethics statement, and (b) a process by which such colleague-to-colleague *contretemps* can be resolved. The Academic Senate's 2002 paper suggests three approaches to such a process: the establishment of a committee, either a Professional Relations Committee (in which each of the faculty members of such a committee is expected to have expertise in the areas of counseling and/or mediation and conflict-resolution as a result of professional training and appointed to serve on this committee by the local academic senate), or a Professional Ethics and Standards Committee set up through the local academic senate, under which the senate appoints college faculty (from a variety of disciplines), who are tenured and well respected on campus to serve as members of this committee; or the local academic senate could confront unethical or unprofessional faculty behavior using procedural mechanisms outlined in local board policy, the local academic senate constitution, or in the local bargaining agreement.

We encourage all academic senates to read the above cited papers for more details.

Student Integrity

In October, 1999, the Center for Academic Integrity (a consortium of approximately 200 colleges and universities and 500 individual members from those institutions) published a paper, *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity*. The paper can be read at <http://www.academicintegrity.org/pdf/FVProject.pdf>.

In the introduction to this paper, it states: “It can be difficult to translate values, even widely shared values, into action—but action is badly needed now to promote academic integrity on our campuses. Researchers agree that rates of cheating among American high school and college students are high and increasing. Donald McCabe of Rutgers University, founder of the Center for Academic Integrity, has found that more than 75% of college students cheat at least once during their academic careers. Particularly alarming is research gathered by *Who’s Who Among High School Students*, indicating that 80% of high-achieving, college-bound students have cheated, that they think cheating is commonplace, and [that] more than half do not consider cheating as a serious transgression.”

In their paper, academic integrity is defined as “a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility.” Whereas, most if not all colleges have written policies extolling the virtues of honesty and not cheating, it is incumbent on all faculty and administration to cultivate an atmosphere and culture of honesty on the campus and in the classroom. This is difficult to achieve when trust is lacking. For example, if students see their peers getting away with dishonest behavior, and faculty and administration are ineffective at policing such behavior, trust in the institution is undermined, and some formerly honest students will see no reason why they shouldn’t resort to

such behavior themselves, the result being an escalation of dishonesty. For that reason, a college should not only have a written policy on academic integrity, but also create the conditions on the campus whereby such a policy is enforced in a fair and consistent manner.

Lack of respect can also lead to dishonesty. If students find a faculty member relying on the work and ideas of another academician without attribution, they might be led to believe that plagiarism is OK when it comes to their own work. To quote from the above paper, “Students and faculty must respect themselves and each other as individuals...All must show respect for the work of others by acknowledging their intellectual debts through proper identification of sources.”

Finally, everyone, students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators must take responsibility for upholding academic integrity on the campus. This means exposing dishonest behavior, not ignoring or condoning it. Peer pressure might make a student reluctant to turn in another student, or likewise faculty members one of their peers. But abdication of such responsibilities can also foster a climate of dishonesty on the campus. As the authors of the above paper note, “Blaming, blaming, blaming!! Many faculty blame lack of integrity on student apathy. Many students blame faculty for not upholding policy. Both don’t uphold their own responsibilities out of fear or lack of trust in the other group. Each group needs to uphold its own responsibility and do it well, without making excuses, for academic integrity to truly flourish.”

We encourage you to attend the Senate’s upcoming Spring Session at which we will be exploring these ideas in more depth at one of the breakouts.



Dan Crump

Counselors and Librarians— What's Up!

by Dan Crump, Counseling and Library Faculty Issues Committee Chair

Well, it is never a dull time for library and counseling faculty. But of course, all we do is read books and tell students what classes to take in college. Right!! At present, the Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP), possible changes in matriculation, legislative proposals in support of textbook rentals, and the budget are all the issues that keep us busy at the moment—in addition to reading books and counseling our students.

Our Committee is planning two obviously relevant breakouts—one on online advising and another on advising our student athletes—to be offered at the Academic Senate's Spring Plenary Session in San Francisco April 15-17, 2004.

A number of colleges are using the Internet to providing counseling and/or advising services to students. An adopted Academic Senate resolution directed our Committee to develop guidelines and definitions on web advising for counseling faculty. To those ends, we have sent out surveys to colleges (thank you, counselors, for your responses) asking about web practices. We are in the process of compiling the results of the surveys and anticipate that they will help us in providing procedures and best practices so that our services can be the most effective possible for students while preserving our professionalism.

The other breakout will focus on student athletes. Other Academic Senate resolutions directed our Committee to conduct research on programs that are beneficial to student athletes. The Senate supports local and statewide programs that address the needs of student athletes and provide specific instructional and counseling interventions to increase student access in retention, degree completion, transfer, basic skills development, and career advancement. We are proud to highlight one such program—the Student Athlete Retention Program (SARP) at Reedley College. SARP provides a com-

prehensive approach to assisting student athletes in achieving their educational goals by providing the supportive services to ensure that they comply with the academic standards set by the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Commission on Athletics. SARP was recognized with an honorable mention at the Board of Governors Exemplary Program Awards ceremony in 2003.

The state budget raises special concerns for library and counseling faculty. The Governor's Budget Plan proposes to move most categorical programs into the General Apportionment Fund for community colleges. This comes to the attention of the librarians and counselors because of two categorical programs—TTIP and matriculation. One component of TTIP is funding for library electronic resources, especially the magazine and newspaper databases that are provided to ALL our students, whether they are on- or off-campus. The Budget plan also proposes to allocate TTIP funds on an FTES basis. While this allocation mechanism is good for many budget areas, it doesn't work for TTIP and would result in inequitable use of technology funds and decrease the negotiating power for libraries and other technology users.

Matriculation provides counseling and advisement, orientation and academic follow-up services to our students. Proposed placement of matriculation funding into the General Fund raises concerns on whether these valuable services will continue to be funded at the current level.

The new accreditation standards and student learning outcomes are also of concern for the counseling and library communities. The Academic Senate still has concerns with the new accreditation standards in general, but we also discuss how to work with them at the local level in support of students and programs. Certain sections of the new standards are of particular interest to counselors

and librarians—"the institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services" (section II.B). Elsewhere, the standards call for libraries and other learning support services at a level "sufficient to support the institution's instructional programs" as well as requiring an assessment of "the student learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures" (section II.C). The Senate's Research Committee will share at the Spring Plenary a draft of a paper on the new accreditation standards, and our Committee will use it to inform library and counseling faculty of the important contributions they must make as part of the self-study using these new standards.

As you might have heard, the Chancellor's Office has gone through a large reduction in staffing. This has especially hit the library and learning resources community, as one of the positions eliminated was that of Coordinator for Library and Learning Resources. The Senate has a resolution recognizing the value of this position and will work with other library groups to restore this position in the future. In the meantime, the Senate and our professional library organizations, including the Chancellor's Office Advisory Committee on Library and Learning Resources Programs, the Council of Chief Librarians, and the Learning Resources Association of California Community Colleges, will work with the Chancellor's Office to determine ways to continue some of the services provided by the Coordinator.

Mea culpa...One of the things that I mentioned in the last issue of the *Rostrum* was the concern that administrators and our faculty colleagues might not understand that our programs directly affect students as much as what happens in the classrooms. I received an email from a faculty member who had read my article (wow, so people actually do read my stuff!) thanking me for my article. But the writer also wanted to remind me of the valuable direct impact on students provided by other faculty also. So let me end this article by acknowledging the wonderful services provided by our college nurses, EOPS, DSP&S and Learning Disabilities (LD) faculty. Thanks to all for a great job!

SENATE INSTITUTES

Faculty Leadership Institute

The Faculty Leadership Institute provides assistance and training to faculty members to empower them to run stronger, more effective local senates. Through a variety of Institute activities, participants learn to identify the role and function of local senates as well as their relationship to the statewide Academic Senate, the Chancellor's Office, other consultation groups, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Legislature.

This year the Institute will be held June 23-26, 2004 at the Hayes Mansion Conference Center, San Jose.

Curriculum Institute

The Curriculum Institute provides faculty curriculum chairs, chief instructional officers, and faculty members involved in new program development, program revision, or technology curriculum development with training on curriculum development. Participants in attendance learn good curriculum committee practices including how to write integrated course outlines. Additionally, participants learn about separate course approval for online, distance technology, technology-mediated courses, and effective instructor-student contact and about course transfer and articulation. The Curriculum Institute provides curriculum specialist for special assistance to all in attendance. This Institute offers a unique opportunity for campuses to send teams to participate in the very important process of curriculum development.

This year the Institute will be held July 15-17, 2004 at Claremont Resort & Spa.



**The Academic Senate
for California Community
Colleges**

President

Kate Clark



Executive Director

Julie Adams



Design and Layout

Rita Sabler,

Publications Specialist



The Rostrum is a publication of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 428 J Street, Suite 430, Sacramento, CA, 95814.



The Rostrum is distributed to all faculty through college academic senate presidents and by individual mailing.



Letters and unsolicited articles by faculty members are invited. For deadline information call (916) 445-4753 or email us at asccc@ix.netcom.com



You can find this and the previous issues of this publication online at: <http://www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us>



AA/AS Degree Requirements

Continued from page 21

Pro Arguments

1. The current high school graduation requirements in math are the same as those for an AA/AS degree.
2. Expectations from society and the workplace have changed; we have to change accordingly.
3. We do students a disservice to send them out with such minimal skills; they cannot compete in job placement and advancement or in life with their current skills.
4. Students need more than current elementary algebra, but intermediate algebra may not be the best choice. Other courses with elementary algebra as a pre-requisite have been suggested.
5. Students will rise to the level we set for them.

Con Arguments

1. Students will either take longer to graduate or will drop out if more requirements are added. Fewer students will earn AA/AS degrees.
2. Presently, colleges can decide locally if students need a higher level; a change in the law sets the bar the same (higher) for all colleges.
3. FTEF and resources will have to be moved from other departments to math and English to accommodate the increased demand.
4. Colleges don't have the budgets to provide additional services to students struggling in math and English.
5. The current English 1A course is not written nor taught with vocational students in mind. Their needs are often not met by that course as offered now.

Next steps

Between now and Fall 2004, the Curriculum Committee has a series of tasks.

1. The Committee will share its preliminary findings at the 2004 Spring Plenary session and ask for more input from faculty.
2. The Committee will conduct further research and will continue to gather input from faculty informally and at conferences.
3. The completed paper will be disseminated in the fall.
4. One or more resolutions will be presented at the 2004 Fall Plenary Session. Delegates will vote, as always. The plenary body, not a committee, will decide.
5. If a resolution asking for a change is passed, it will then go to the Board of Governors as a recommendation from the Academic Senate.

How to get involved

If you'd like to participate in these discussions, there are several ways to do so.

1. Attend the plenary sessions in spring and the Curriculum Institute in July. Ensure your college is represented at each to listen and to carry forth your faculty's recommendations or questions.
2. Go to the Academic Senate website (<http://www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us/ExecCom/Committees/CurriculumCmte.htm>) and read the prior resolutions, relevant Title 5 Code sections, and background materials distributed at the Colloquia.
3. Hold local discussions in your department and the local senate.
4. Send comments to me, jane_patton@wvmccd.cc.ca.us

It is not surprising that these discussions have lasted for several years. The issues are important and faculty feelings are passionate. While some resolution will be made in the fall, it is the nature of our profession that the debates about students' needs persist.