MAY 2015

SenateRostrum

THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

Take a Look in the Mirror

BJ Snowden

also in this issue

Working Together, Better for All p1

CTE Course Re-enrollment p4

The ASCCC Appointment Process p6

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COLLEGE 11

AN UPDATE ON THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS 13

"AND THE WINNER IS...." 16

BEYOND COMPLIANCE 18

Working Together, Better for All:
ASCCC and CCLC Collaboration

by David Morse, ASCCC President

and Thuy Thi Nguyen, Interim President and CEO, Community College League of California

For many years, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has urged local senate presidents to see themselves as working on the same level as their college presidents or chancellors. The logic behind this philosophy is not an attempt to assert power or contest authority, but rather to encourage the senate presidents to see their relationships with administrative leaders as partnerships. The ASCCC hopes to foster the perspective that when academic senate presidents work with their college presidents or chancellors, they see the interaction not as an employee answering to a supervisor but as two colleagues collaborating to find the best way to achieve mutual goals.

If one follows this same logic, then at the state level the administrative organization with which the ASCCC should most see itself as a partner is the Community College League of California, most specifically the League's CEO Board that represents chancellors and presidents throughout the state. Certainly the Academic Senate works well and appreciates its relationships with the Chief Instructional Officers, the Chief Student Services Officers, and many other system constituencies. Likewise, the League collaborates with other organizations through various statewide activities including Consultation Council and legislative advocacy. Yet effective, collegial collaboration between the Senate, being the organization that represents all faculty statewide, and the highest level of administrative leadership in the state can only benefit both organizations and the system as a whole.

Since the beginning of 2015, the leadership of the ASCCC and the League have emphasized and strengthened our partnership in various ways, and we continue to look for additional cooperative efforts that we can pursue. Among our current collaborations are a revision of the longstanding Technical Assistance Program for colleges, a proposed revision of the published ASCCC/League governance scenarios, and multiple opportunities for crossover presentations and appearances at our organizations' events.

THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

While both the ASCCC and the League offer separate services to our constituencies, the jointly presented Technical Assistance Visits on participatory governance are among the trainings most frequently requested by academic senates and college presidents, evincing the need at our colleges to ensure close collaboration between academic senates and CEOs. The ASCCC website describes the purpose of this program as "to help districts and colleges successfully implement state law and regulations that call for effective participation by faculty, staff and students in district and college governance" *www.asccc.org/services/technical-assistance*. To model that collaboration, requests for such visits must be made jointly by the local academic senate president and the college or district CEO.

The Technical Assistance Program has existed since 1998 and has offered effective training at many colleges. At present, however, the ASCCC and the League are revising the structure and

content of the visits in various ways to make them more engaging for the participants and more comprehensive based on collective knowledge of how college governance works and does not work effectively. The most common form of Technical Assistance Visit has traditionally involved a pre-developed presentation by the League's President/CEO and the ASCCC President. Changes to the program that are under consideration or have already been implemented include the following:

- Since December of 2014, the ASCCC President's co-presenter has been a college president or CEO from a district other than that in which the visit takes place. Recently the League's Interim President has also joined the presentations and lent her experience in leading the restructuring of the participatory governance structure that has now been in operation for five years at Peralta Community College District. As presidents of our respective organizations, we believe that the addition of a college CEO who can bring examples from his or her own experience as a decision-maker to the discussion can add a significant benefit to the visit. Thus, the exact composition of the presenting team will be determined according to the unique circumstances and issues to be addressed at each visit, with the possibility of expanding the team to include more voices, such as trustees, as may be needed.

- We have developed a brief pre-visit survey that can be distributed to the college community in advance of the visit. This survey attempts to identify specific issues and concerns that should be addressed, thus providing the presenters a way to better prepare for and serve the needs of the specific college community they are visiting.

- We have revised the powerpoint that has long been used for the presentations, changing structure, content, and most importantly length in order to ensure more time for interaction. A significant portion of general historical background has been eliminated in order to focus more immediately and directly on governance roles. In order to make the visit more interactive and less lecture-like, a number of questions and scenarios for discussion that invite audience participation and consideration have been added. We hope that this approach will engage the audience sooner and will encourage a focus on discussion of broader governance training and appropriate roles and processes and help to avoid a contentious debate of specific local issues.

- We are planning a change to the name of the program, as we hope to make the visits more inviting and to remove any implication that a college that requests a visit is experiencing severe difficulties. The ASCCC website for the program notes, "The services offered will be most effective if used before major conflicts arise and prior to a heightened level of local unilateral action by any the parties involved in the local decision-making process." Certainly any local board, administration, and faculty might benefit from a refresher or reminder on appropriate roles periodically, and interest in such a visit might indicate positive relationships and a desire to maintain good policies rather than severe disagreement or division at the college. Nevertheless, for many people the term "technical assistance" raises images of a college in crisis and may imply a stigma that could discourage colleges from requesting the service.

- For this reason, we plan to rename the program from "Technical Assistance" to "Collegiality in Action," with different subheadings for each tier of visit.

- The first tier and most common type of visit, currently titled "Information Presentation" on the ASCCC website, will be called "Collegiality in Action: Effective Participation Fundamentals."

- The second tier, which includes the information presentation and separate faculty and administration focus group discussions

> The Technical Assistance Program has existed since 1998 and has offered effective training at many colleges.

and is currently titled "Advisory Assistance," will be called "Collegiality in Action: Effective Participation Focused Study."

- The third tier, which also involves interviews with individuals on campus and is currently titled "Issue Resolution," has not yet been renamed, as we are considering connecting visits at this level to the Chancellor's Office Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative.

All of these changes have the potential to make an already successful collaboration between the ASCCC and the League more effective. We will continue to pursue these and other developments in order to make the visits as beneficial for all participants as possible, and we are open to hearing any suggestions for further improvement.

GOVERNANCE TRAINING SCENARIOS

In 1998 the League and the ASCCC jointly published a set of 26 "Scenarios to Illustrate Effective Participation in District and College Governance." These scenarios have been used in a variety of training activities, including the ASCCC's annual Faculty Leadership Institute, as ongoing training during local academic senate meetings in some districts, and most recently as additions to the Technical Assistance Visit powerpoint. They cover a wide range of issues, from curriculum development to budgeting processes to accreditation to senate-union relations, and their greatest benefit is that they provide guidance that has been agreed upon by the ASCCC and the League, thus minimizing any contentious division between faculty and administrative perspectives.

Although they were first published almost twenty years ago, nearly all of the scenarios address issues that are still current in the community college system. However, in some cases the scenarios are phrased in terms or call up situations that may no longer be the most relevant to the present moment. In addition, new issues and challenges have arisen since the publication of the scenarios and are therefore not addressed. For these reasons, the ASCCC and the League leadership have committed to a revision of the scenarios in order to ensure their currency and utility for both faculty and administration throughout the system.

CROSSOVER PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES

Another aspect of the partnership between our organizations is our interaction and presence at each other's various statewide gatherings. This year several ASCCC leaders have attended the League's events that include the Annual Convention in November and the New Trustee Meeting and Legislative Conference in January, with the ASCCC President making presentations to CEOs and trustees at the Annual Convention and Trustee Meeting. The League has also invited the Academic Senate to present two breakouts at the League's Equity Summit in May to solidify our partnership, and the ASCCC President and Vice-President both sit on the League's Advisory Committee on Legislation. In return, the League's staff members have attended several ASCCC plenary sessions and other events in the past. The League's current Interim President/CEO was present as a recent attendee and participant at the Academic Senate Academic Academy in March and has accepted the invitation to be a regular presence at future ASCCC events, including the offer of her participation in any presentation in which she can be helpful.

The ASCCC and the League will continue to search for opportunities to strengthen our connections and our relationship, including finding ways to address some of the most challenging, sensitive policy issues that affect our system, and we welcome any suggestions for collaborations that might benefit our organizations. Most importantly, we hope that our collegial and productive partnership can serve as a model for college CEOs and academic senate presidents around the state. We can accomplish more when we assume a common goal and work together to realize it. We may of course at times have reason to differ in our viewpoints or approaches, but if we assume good intentions and work to find common ground, we will find that we agree more often than we disagree and that through cooperation and positive consultation our colleges and our students will all be better served.

CTE Course Re-enrollment: Practices from the Field

by Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College

Kit O'Doherty, Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC) Regional Consortium Chair

Kim Schenk, Senior Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, Diablo Valley College

and Mollie Smith, Palomar College

During the 2014 ASCCC Fall Plenary, delegates passed Resolution 07.06, *Re-enrollment Information for Admissions and Records Staff*. This resolution was a response to concerns raised by career technical education (CTE) faculty that colleges are struggling to secure permission for students to re-enroll in a course due to a significant change in industry standards or licensure or due to a legally mandated requirement (Title 5 §55040 (b) (8 and 9)). This resolution directed the ASCCC to recommend to the Chancellor's Office that Admissions and Records staff be encouraged to permit students' re-enrollment into necessary courses and to research effective practices used by local districts to re-enroll students that meet the criteria under Title 5 §55040 (b)(8 and 9) and present its findings by 2016 Spring Plenary Session.

More recently, at the first-ever CTE Curriculum Academy, faculty and administrators had an opportunity to explore local and statewide curriculum practices. Some colleges noted that they were experiencing extreme difficulty in allowing CTE students to re-enroll as permitted by Title 5. The voicing of these difficulties emphasized the need for the effective practices guidance requested in Resolution 7.06 F14 in order to help students re-enroll in compliance with the regulations.

CREDIT COURSE REPETITION REGULATIONS

Since 2011, significant changes have been made to Title 5 to clarify exactly when a student may repeat a course. As a general rule, a district may not permit a student to re-enroll in a credit course if the student received a satisfactory grade on the previous enrollment.

CTE courses do not fall under the types of courses that a district may designate as repeatable under the revised Title 5 §55041. Previous regulation §55041 (c) (2) (b), which permitted repeatability of activity courses, was extended by many colleges and districts to apply to career technical education courses. The recommendation of the Statewide Academic Senate Repeatability Taskforce in 2011 was for faculty to establish courses designed so that students can achieve an acceptable level of proficiency within a related number of hours of study. More advanced proficiency would be addressed by more advanced courses.

Since promulgation of the revised regulations regarding course repetition, some colleges have indicated an undue negative impact on their CTE programs. However, two sections of current regulations specifically address CTE students who may need to repeat coursework in pursuit of a career, career advancement, or career maintenance. These specific sections are as follows:

§55040. District Policy for Course Repetition.

(a) The governing board of each community college district shall adopt and publish policies and procedures pertaining to the repetition of credit courses. Such policies and procedures shall not conflict with section 55025 or Education Code section 76224, pertaining to the finality of grades assigned by instructors, or with subchapter 2.5 (commencing with section 59020) of chapter 10 of this division, pertaining to the retention and destruction of student records.

(b) The policies and procedures adopted pursuant to subdivision (a) may,

(8) permit a student to repeat a course determined to be legally mandated as defined in section 55000, regardless of whether substandard academic work has been recorded. Such courses may be repeated for credit any number of times. The governing board of a district may establish policies and procedures requiring students to certify or document that course repetition is legally mandated.

(9) permit a student to petition the district to repeat a course as a result of a significant change in industry or licensure standards such that repetition of the course is necessary for employment or licensure. Such courses may be repeated for credit any number of times. The governing board of the district may establish policies and procedures requiring students to certify or document that there has been a significant change in industry or licensure standards necessitating course repetition.

Title 5 §55040 (b) (8) was included in previous regulation, while §55040 (b) (9) was added to ensure that students would have access to courses needed to improve their competitiveness or to improve or maintain their skills in their field. The regulations state, "The governing board of the district may establish policies and procedures requiring students to certify or document that there has been a significant change in industry or licensure standards necessitating course repetition." Colleges and districts must ensure that their communities are effectively served by providing current, relevant, and timely training while also, as stewards of the public trust, abiding within the spirit of limitations on course enrollments. In order to balance between these interests, college policy and procedure must be transparent and consistent.

The following recommendations may help to ensure effective practice in the implementation of §55040 (b) (8) and (9):

- Include in the course outline of record a course note indicating that the course is eligible for "Petition to Repeat" if legally mandated or when a significant change to industry or licensure standards occur. The note should appear in the course catalog as well as the schedule of classes. This practice ensures that the Curriculum Committee has evaluated the course as one for which students may apply for repetition and provides students with information.
- Provide students with clear instructions regarding how to petition to repeat a course based on the local policies and procedures. Publish these instructions online and in students' advisement documents.
- Meet with Admissions and Records personnel to determine the documentation required to ensure that a petition is approvable and sufficient to establish an audit record. Remove as many barriers for students as possible through practices such as the following:
- Collect all statutes that relate to mandated training related to any program offered at the college. This task should not be the responsibility of the student.
- File significant changes to industry or licensure changes with Admissions and Records prior to the registration period so that they are aware petitions may be submitted. Provide documentation about such changes for the audit record.
- Establish a central point of contact for Admissions and Records for questions on petitions.
- Develop a template employer letter to help students gather the appropriate information that will facilitate their petition. Ask students to document what employment they are seeking, such as a clerical specialist.
- Provide access to petition forms in multiple locations and formats. Web-enable the petition process if possible.

In addition to establishing permitted practice to enable CTE students to repeat a course per §§55040 (b) (8) and (9), faculty may consider developing noncredit or fee-based options for students for whom hours of continuing education, as opposed to course credit, is of value. Both noncredit instruction and fee-based classes may be co-offered with credit classes, providing additional flexibility to meet community needs for training.

The ASCCC Appointment Process:
Clarifications and Possible Improvements

by Julie Adams, ASCCC Executive Director

and David Morse, ASCCC President

On Saturday, April 11, at the 2015 ASCCC Spring Plenary Session, the delegates considered Resolution 1.06 S15, *In Pursuit of a more Inclusive and Transparent ASCCC*. The stated intent of this resolution was to create a process for the ASCCC that provided greater transparency and promoted more diversity regarding the manner in which appointments are made to Academic Senate standing committees, task forces, ad hoc groups, and Chancellor's Office groups. The arguments made in favor of the resolution suggested that the current appointment process bypasses the Executive Committee by relying on the president and executive director to make most appointments, which the resolution asserts does not promote inclusivity or equity in all forms. While the discussion during the plenary session raised a number of valid questions, some of the information shared was incomplete or inaccurate. A more complete explanation of the ASCCC committee appointment process may help faculty leaders around the state to understand the demands and necessities of that process and the ways in which the ASCCC might more successfully promote transparency and diversity in this area.

While the discussion during the plenary session raised a number of valid questions, some of the information shared was incomplete or inaccurate.

THE CURRENT PROCESS

As noted in the ASCCC bylaws, the Executive Committee approves all appointments to the ASCCC standing committees (Article V.1). Committee chairs are selected in April by the president in consultation with the executive director. The standing committee chairs then begin to recruit members for their committees using a variety of resources, beginning with a list of volunteers who have submitted the Application for Statewide Service that is available on the ASCCC website. At every Senate event during the year, through breakouts and other activities, faculty are encouraged to submit this form and nominate themselves for service. Other resources used by committee chairs to identify potential committee members include the Senate's online directory, past committee members,

attendee lists from Senate events, and personal contact. Once a list of potential committee members is identified, the chairs send their recommendations to the president and executive director, who review the lists to ensure diversity in all of its forms, ensure that those recommended have the necessary skills to perform the work of the specific committee, reduce duplicate nominations among the various committees, and address any known concerns regarding the nominees' prior participation. Working with the chairs, the president and executive director suggest a final list to the Executive Committee for approval at the first Executive Committee Meeting of the academic year. This process has been in place with little variance for over fifteen years.

Appointments to task forces, ad hoc committees, and other bodies take place not only at the beginning of the year but on an ongoing basis. The Chancellor's Office regularly makes requests of the ASCCC for faculty appointments, while immediate but temporary needs and demands that arise throughout the year may be met through short term groups created by the ASCCC or in collaboration with other bodies. When appointments to such bodies are needed, the ASCCC typically sends an email to the local senate president listserv requesting nominees for these groups in addition to again considering appropriate volunteers who have submitted the Application for Statewide Service. The president then determines the appointments to these groups in consultation with the executive director and the vice-president as noted in the bylaws (Article V.2). In addition, the president often seeks additional input from other members of the Executive Committee regarding potential appointees. However, the ASCCC bylaws do not require formal Executive Committee approval for these appointments, as the number and frequency of requests for faculty representation, often under substantial time pressure, would make such approval impractical and would inhibit the ASCCC's ability to respond in a timely manner.

Appointments to task forces, ad hoc committees, and other bodies take place not only at the beginning of the year but on an ongoing basis.

The ASCCC varies from this process only in the rarest of instances. On occasion an unusual situation may arise in which very specific expertise is needed to represent the faculty voice to other constituencies. A recent example of such an instance is the Board of Governors' Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and the Economy. The faculty appointees to this task force needed to have not only a very specific area of professional expertise but also the willingness and experience to represent the faculty viewpoint and ASCCC positions to a highly select group of policy makers and other individuals from inside and outside the system. For this reason, the Academic Senate did not send its usual call for nominations on the senate president's listerv but instead sought specific individuals known to have the necessary qualifications and skills for these sensitive appointments. However, a situation such as this in which the ASCCC deviates from its usual process is very uncommon, and under all usual circumstances the Academic Senate attempts to solicit interest as broadly as possible before making appointments.

In addition, faculty appointments to Chancellor's Office committees and task forces and to other non-ASCCC bodies are subject to confirmation by the local senate president from the appointee's college, who is contacted to verify that the person being appointed has the qualifications needed to serve on the specific group. The ASCCC believes that this local senate approval is necessary, as the local faculty leadership has direct experience with the potential appointee and should be able to provide valuable insight into his or her strengths.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

While the resolution presented at the Spring Plenary Session failed, the conversation caused the ASCCC leadership to realize that many of the delegates and local senate presidents present were unclear regarding the current process for making appointments. For example, the resolution suggested the creation of a form that would solicit information about nominees' background and

experience; however, the ASCCC already has a form that collects this information in the Application for Statewide Service. Likewise, the resolution called for appointments to be advertised via the local senate president's listerv; the ASCCC regularly sends such requests for nominations to the listserv, but some local senate presidents seemed to either be unaware of the listserv or to have overlooked many of these requests for nominations.

The ASCCC hopes that the information provided in this article can help to clarify the details of appointment process for local senate leaders. Nevertheless, the current process can certainly be improved without putting unreasonable additional demands on local senate presidents, the Executive Committee, or the appointment process itself. Several positive and potentially productive suggestions were raised at the plenary session and at area meetings, including the following:

- Publishing an ongoing list of appointments as a regular feature of the Executive Committee agenda as an information item in order to inform all interested parties regarding recent appointments;
- Sending out an announcement to ASCCC listservs requesting nominations for service on standing committees and other expected bodies in May. This announcement would contain the most complete information possible regarding all of the committees, including their charges and a link to their pages on the ASCCC website;
- Exploring further avenues for recruiting diverse faculty to participate in leadership activities, as such service might then lead to an increase in the diversity on the Executive Committee. Such recruitment is already a conscious effort for the ASCCC, but this effort can become a greater focus in the coming year and moving forward;
- Increasing the frequency with which we send notices of opportunities for service to the senate presidents' listerv;
- Expanding the call for nominees sent to the senate presidents' listserv to include other ASCCC listservs more regularly, thus reaching a greater number of potential volunteers or recruiters;
- Through the efforts of the Relations with Local Senates Committee and in other ways, work to expand the reach of the senate presidents listserv and other listservs by encouraging not only all local senate presidents but other local faculty leaders to subscribe.

We actively and regularly recruit faculty of all backgrounds, disciplines, and other perspectives, and we consciously attempt to make our committee and task force appointments balanced and fair.

The ASCCC is dedicated to increasing the opportunity for all faculty to serve at the state level. We actively and regularly recruit faculty of all backgrounds, disciplines, and other perspectives, and we consciously attempt to make our committee and task force appointments balanced and fair. However, we welcome further suggestions to help us improve our processes. Both transparency and diversity are of great importance to our organization, and we would willingly consider any potentially productive means of improving our performance in these areas.

However, we cannot accomplish our goal of diversifying our appointments and ultimately our Executive Committee alone. Failed Resolution 1.06 S15 and the discussion that it engendered was a call to action for local senate leaders as well. In order to diversify in all ways the ASCCCs committees and task forces, we need a more diverse faculty statewide. For this reason, we need all local senate presidents to address these same issues on their campuses by involving diverse faculty on their local senates and developing leadership opportunities for them and by recruiting and nominating diverse faculty for state-level service. Only if we are all dedicated to diversifying our faculty senates, both local and statewide, will we achieve the levels of diversity that we want and need among faculty leadership in our system.

Take a Look in the Mirror:

Should the Diversity of Our Faculty Reflect the Diversity of Our Students?

by BJ Snowden, Cosumnes River College, Equity and Diversity Action Committee

This *Rostrum* article is not intended to be exhaustive review of literature and research but rather to serve as a working document that can help guide the efforts of academic senate leaders. The purpose is to discuss the importance of a diverse faculty and its positive impact on our student body. It should serve as a beginning to this discussion and as a call to action for local senates as they question their status quo in regard to hiring practices and the current makeup of their local senate leadership.

The student body in California community colleges is more diverse than it has ever been. We have a wider breath of students taking courses, earning degrees or certificates, receiving job training, and filling our classrooms. As a system, we are making extraordinary strides in attempting to meet their increasing demands. Between innovative approaches to teaching and learning and much needed financial support from the state, we have attacked many of the challenges associated with serving our students head-on and with great vigor. Yet, while we are attempting to meet these needs, we must also be proactive in shaping the overall college experience of our students. We should always work to create the best environment to produce well-rounded citizens that will leave our institutions and be able to truly contribute to society and not to shield them with like-minded and outdated perspectives and experiences.

> The greater the diversity among faculty, the greater our diversity in class assignments, mentoring, course content, and, even more importantly, scholarly ideas.

According to the CCC Chancellor's Office Faculty and Staff Demographics Report, 17,059 tenured or tenure track faculty were working in the system during the fall of 2014. Of that number, 10,726 self-identified as White Non-Hispanic, which translates to 62.88% of our faculty. During that same semester, our student headcount was reported as 1,571,534. Only 440,974, or 28.06% of those students self-identified as White Non-Hispanic, which clearly is a stark contrast to our faculty ratio. The students' statistics are not an anomaly and will only continue to increase in the future. If presenting a diverse collective of thought and

reflecting the social diversity of our state is of importance to us as leaders, we must take action now.

The greater the diversity among faculty, the greater our diversity in class assignments, mentoring, course content, and, even more importantly, scholarly ideas. A diverse faculty brings to campus a way of thinking that may have been unexplored; it brings a voice to decision-making that has historically been absent. It brings authenticity to the experience of the underrepresented students who have navigated the educational system and now stand on the other side ready to serve. A diverse faculty will not only directly impact students but also add value and perspective to shared governance practices, to planning efforts, and to the campus community. Institutions as a whole will benefit when a wide range of ideas and outlooks are included and valued. When we limit ourselves to what we know and whom we know, we are in danger or doing a much greater injustice that permeates beyond our campuses and into our communities.

A diverse faculty will not only directly impact students but also add value and perspective to shared governance practices, to planning efforts, and to the campus community.

One of the most critical decisions a campus can make is whom it hires as a tenure track faculty member. Unlike administrators, faculty members rarely move from campus to campus. We commit to our college and our department often spending whole careers at one institution. We must therefore take steps to diversify our faculty for the benefit of our colleges and our students.

RECRUITMENT

The recruitment of a diverse faculty pool for an open position requires districts and institutions to publish and distribute vacancies as widely as possible. The expansion of recruiting efforts allows for the position to reach all possible potential candidates. Connections to local universities are also critical to recruitment. Faculty chairs should be in regular contact with graduate programs in their field encouraging promising students to apply for fulltime or adjunct positions after graduation.

HIRING COMMITTEES

Colleges should examine their hiring practices and specifically their hiring committees. They should consider who they place on committees and what strengths and perspectives those individuals bring. And they will need to show courage in the face of opposition, understanding that many may not see the value of looking for input outside of the discipline or from newer faculty. In essence, in order to cast a wider net, we must diversify our vision of hiring. This vision is important not only in regard to ethnicity but also in a broader context including seniority, discipline, age, and background. As leaders, we must motivate those who might not normally serve and communicate to those who are limited in their perspective.

MENTORING

Perhaps one of the most important elements in diversifying our faculty is to mentor prospective full-time applicants in our adjunct pools. An adjunct position is often the gateway to a fulltime job in community colleges. Because of this natural pipeline, faculty leaders have a responsibility to encourage and guide adjuncts into contributing roles on campus and in the discipline. When we make our adjuncts solid candidates, we have a better opportunity of hiring the best colleague.

Diversifying our faculty ranks can have a multitude of benefits, but none more important than the impact it can have on our students. Having a faculty more reflective of our student demographics can reduce anxiety for many students as they are the first in their families to attend college, and it can also generate a sense of connectedness to the institution that is impossible to fabricate. Academic senates should foster an ongoing dialogue concerning these difficult conversations while addressing the benefits to diversifying our faculty ranks, as well as continuing to acknowledge how important it is for those in leadership to act now.

The ASCCC Professional Development College: A New Path for Faculty

by Dolores Davison, Professional Development College Chair

In the past few years, many faculty members in the California community colleges have seen their professional development programs cannibalized. While administrators and boards recognize that professional development is an essential part of faculty responsibilities, it is often one of the first things that is cut or eliminated whenever budget concerns arise. For evidence of this unfortunate tendency, one only needs to consider the lack of funding that accompanied the most recent attempt to bring Professional Development to the fore, AB 2558 (Williams, 2014), which was signed into law in September 2014 but received no specific funding in the governor's January budget. This lack of funding is not new, however, and in fall 2012, recognizing the need for faculty professional development in areas relating to the 10 + 1, the ASCCC approved resolution 19.01 that called for the creation of a Professional Development College. Throughout the 2013-14 year, the ASCCC Professional Development College (PDC) Task Force met to create a program for faculty seeking professional development that was not available through their local structures. The task force worked to develop applications, specific criteria, and modules for faculty that would be useful and reasonably priced and that could potentially provide opportunities for continuing education units or other advancement possibilities. At the Executive Committee meeting prior to the 2014 Spring Plenary Session, the PDC Task Force presented its plans to the Executive Committee and received approval for the first module.

The Professional Development College launched its inaugural module at the 2014 Faculty Leadership Institute, with 12 faculty members registering to be part of the "Leadership" cohort.

The Professional Development College launched its inaugural module at the 2014 Faculty Leadership Institute, with 12 faculty members registering to be part of the "Leadership" cohort. This module is designed for faculty who will be stepping into faculty leadership roles, specifically as a senate president or officer, in the next two years. In order to be considered for the cohort, faculty applicants must have the recommendation of their local senate president as well as their college president or vice president. Those applicants chosen to participate in 2014-15 represent the diversity of our faculty, both in terms of colleges—almost evenly split between north and south—and disciplines, including faculty whose primary assignments are in basic skills, transfer, and workforce. Several of the PDC Task Force members, as well as ASCCC Executive Committee members including the Executive Director, met with the participants prior

to beginning of the institute to discuss expectations and to introduce the members of the cohort to each other.

In addition, during the Faculty Leadership Institute, participants were assigned to and met their personal mentors from the Executive Committee, who assisted in guiding them through the activities and events in which the participants were involved. The mentors had all served as a local college or district senate president and so were able to provide guidance to the participants. After meeting with their mentors, participants filled out a contract detailing their plans for the year and goals that they hoped to achieve through participation in the leadership module. The chair of the Professional Development College and the executive director were also available to provide guidance and assistance to the mentors and the participants throughout the year.

In June 2015, the first cohort will graduate at the Faculty Leadership Institute in San Jose and will be recognized by their peers at that institute.

The leadership module is set up chronologically. All participants are expected to attend the major ASCCC events for faculty leaders: the pre-plenary Area meetings in October and March, the two plenary sessions in November and April, and the Faculty Leadership Institutes in June of the year of enrollment and the following year. In addition, participants are expected to attend at least one other ASCCC Institute, depending on interest (Accreditation, Vocational Faculty Leadership, the Academic Academy, or Curriculum) or another leadership conference that can assist in developing leadership skills, such as the RP Group's Student Success Conference or the League for Innovation in the Community Colleges' Innovation Conference. After each event, participants are expected to reflect on lessons learned, information gathered, or suggestions or ideas to bring back to their own campuses; reflections can take a variety of forms, including online. Participants have an opportunity to engage in discussions as well as meetings at the plenary sessions and the Leadership Institute, including being introduced at both plenary sessions to the attendees. Participants are also expected to report out at their local campuses, either at their academic senate meetings or at a Board of Trustees meeting, about the module and their participation in it.

In June 2015, the first cohort will graduate at the Faculty Leadership Institute in San Jose and will be recognized by their peers at that institute. One of the assignments that the graduates will be asked to complete is an evaluation of how the PDC format worked for them and areas that should be modified or added. Those suggestions will be incorporated into both the leadership module and others modules going forward. A second leadership cohort will begin at the 2015 Leadership Institute, again targeting incoming Senate leaders who would benefit from mentoring in leadership areas; applications are available on the Academic Senate Foundation Website under the PDC tab. A second module, this time based on Career Technical Education (CTE) curriculum, is being developed based on input gathered at the CTE Curriculum Regional meetings in January 2015, which demonstrated the clear need for support for CTE faculty. Additional modules, including programs that focus on part-time faculty and general curriculum, are also in progress and may be implemented during the next year.

The ASCCC Executive Committee and the Professional Development Committee will continue to seek new areas in which the Professional Development College can offer new learning and growth opportunities for all faculty in the system. The first module of the PDC has been a success but also a learning experience, and the Academic Senate will take into consideration both the positive experiences of participants and their suggestions for improvement in working to improve all PDC programs. In an environment in which professional development is both so badly needed and so grossly underfunded, the Professional Development College offers a venue through which the ASCCC can provide resources and training to faculty throughout the state.

An Update on the Board of Governors Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy

by Julie Bruno, ASCCC Vice President, Workforce Task Force Representative

and Wheeler North, Chair, Futures Committee

With two meetings completed, the Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy continues to move at a rapid pace to meet its July deadline. The Board of Governors convened the task force to make recommendations that will increase completion of industry valued credentials, keep community colleges responsive to business and industry, and connect funds from multiple sources to support this effort. What follows is an update on the progress of the task force including the January 22 and April 2 meetings as well as the Academic Senate's efforts to support the faculty representatives.

WORKFORCE TASK FORCE: JANUARY 22 MEETING

One of the primary goals of the January meeting was to provide the task force members with background and context for the discussions to come in the subsequent meetings. As a result, the bulk of the meeting time was devoted to presentations on the status of California's workforce, job skill requirements, and the challenges that employers face in hiring qualified individuals. Useful information was provided by organizations outside of the California Community College System, including the Aspen Institute, which presented "The National Imperative to Close the Skills Gap," and Burning Glass, with "Help Wanted: California's Middle Skill Jobs," which together helped create a framework for the discussion that followed. In addition, task force members provided information, opinions, and perspectives from the constituent groups and organizations they each represented. By the end of the meeting, task force members were able to reach agreement on certain issues that California faces in developing a skilled workforce to build a stronger economy.

WORKFORCE TASK FORCE: APRIL 2 MEETING

The progress of the task force continued during the meeting in April with a primary focus on workforce data and outcomes. To build upon the work from the prior meeting and refine the information that emerged through the 11 Regional College Conversations, 3 career technical education (CTE) Faculty Regional meetings, and 5 Town Hall events from November through March, which included the ASCCC CTE Regional Meeting Report summarizing the findings from

the three Faculty Regional Meetings in March and April held at Solano College, Palomar College, and Clovis College, the chair and co-chairs created an "Issues Statement" document. Task force members spent the first half of the meeting reviewing the Issues Statement in small groups to determine the appropriateness of each issue and identify any missing components. The task force then reviewed the work of the small groups and refined the Issues Statement document.

The second half of the meeting began with a presentation by Kathy Booth of West Ed as a follow up to the background paper supplied to the Task Force titled "Moving the Needle: Data, Success, and Accountability for Workforce Programs." Booth reviewed the information presented in the paper and answered questions from task force members. This activity prepared the task force for working in small groups on the issues directly related to data and outcomes. The groups reviewed the workforce data and outcome ideas that arose in the regional meetings and town halls to again determine the issues' significance, identify any missing components, and draft possible recommendations for consideration by the larger group. Once the small groups reported out, the task force determined which recommendations were to remain under consideration. Finally, a small writing group was formed to refine the draft recommendations on workforce data and outcomes for review and possible adoption at a future meeting.

> By the end of the meeting, task force members were able to reach agreement on certain issues that California faces in developing a skilled workforce to build a stronger economy.

SUPPORT FOR THE FACULTY VOICE ON THE TASK FORCE

As the task force's work has proceeded, the ASCCC Futures Committee has supported the faculty representatives by researching resolutions to determine ASCCC positions on the issues raised at the CTE regional meetings and in the task force's Issues Statement as well as any other related concerns. Further, in attempting to anticipate the evolution of the task force's work, members of the Futures Committee and the CTE Leadership Committee authored resolutions for consideration at the ASCCC Spring Plenary Session. After deliberation, the body passed two resolutions that will inform the work of the faculty serving on the task force. The first, Resolution 5.01 S15 *Exploring the Funding Model*, states,

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work toward possible improvements that may change the California community college funding model as long as those changes do not detract from existing services and programs and do not diminish success, access, and equity; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the establishment of differential apportionment tied to higher cost instructional areas, primarily laboratory and activity courses, as long as these changes do not reduce or redirect current allocations in both general and categorical funding.

The second, Resolution 6.02 S15 *Support Funding of Career Pathways and Coordination of Long Range Planning*, states,

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support current and future public investments in California high school to community college career pathways; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with interested legislators to include long range goals and resources for coordinating and investing in career pathways at the state level.

These two resolutions will be guiding positions for the faculty representatives on the task force as the work progresses, particularly for discussions regarding funding and regional and statewide coordination. In addition, the Futures Committee has compiled past and recent ASCCC resolutions to inform task force discussions and provide direction for the participation of the faculty representatives.

LOOKING AHEAD: FUTURE WORK OF THE TASK FORCE

The third meeting of the task force is scheduled for May 13 and will address curriculum development, instructor recruitment and hiring, structured pathways, and student support. To assist in preparing task force members to consider recommendations in these areas, the Academic Senate authored two detailed background papers: "Essential Elements for Strong Programs: Curriculum Development and Instructors" and "Structured Pathways and Student Support." Additionally, ASCCC Curriculum Chair Michelle Grimes Hillman and Statewide Career Pathways Articulation Liaison Kris Costa will be presenting on curriculum processes and statewide career pathways during the May meeting to assist in framing and informing the conversation.

The task force will continue to meet through the summer, with the fourth and fifth meetings scheduled for June 11 and July 29. The Academic Senate has created an email address (*CTETaskForceComments@asccc.org*) for faculty to ask questions or provide comments and information to the faculty representatives as well as the Futures Committee. The ASCCC welcomes your feedback as the task force moves forward in completing its charge. Additionally, the task force documents referenced in this article may be found on the task force page of the Doing What Matters Website at *http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/StrongWorkforce.aspx.* This site includes a "Feedback" link for interestefd individuals to submit comments to individual task force representatives or to the group at large.

Local senates and faculty statewide should remain informed regarding the progress of the Workforce Task Force. However, the work does not end when the task force submits recommendations to the Board of Governors. Rather, the real work will begin as the system starts the process of implementation and looks to the leadership of the Academic Senate for assistance in fulfilling the recommendations that fall within faculty purview. At that moment, a strong and sustainable connection to CTE faculty statewide will be critical. In anticipation, the ASCCC passed Resolution 17.02 S15 *Establishing Local CTE Liaison Positions*, urging "local academic senates to identify a CTE faculty member to act as a liaison to facilitate communication among local CTE faculty, the local academic senate, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges." In addition, to facilitate communication with our CTE colleagues the Academic Senate has created a CTE Faculty Listserv with subscription open to all interested individuals. The Academic Senate urges all local senates to establish a CTE liaison position and have that individual subscribe to the ASCCC CTE Faculty Listserv to stay in contact with ASCCC. As always, please do not hesitate to contact us by emailing info@asccc.org if you have questions or concerns.

Local senates and faculty statewide should remain informed regarding the progress of the Workforce Task Force.

The ASCCC thanks the faculty who attended the CTE Faculty Regional Meetings as well as those who have provided comments and input into the task force effort thus far. Faculty participation in the process has been invaluable, and the Academic Senate will continue to rely on the expertise of faculty throughout the state as the task force's work continues into the summer and beyond.

"And The Winner Is...":
The ASCCC Spring 2015 Elections

by Dan Crump, Elections Chair

Each year on the Saturday of the Spring Plenary Session, elections are held for positions on the ASCCC Executive Committee. The four officer positions—president, vice-president, secretary and treasurer—are open for election each year. Elections for the other ten positions occur on a two-year cycle—Areas A and D along with one each of the North, South, and At-Large Representatives in one year, and Areas B and C along with the other North, South and At-Large Representatives in the next year.

The ASCCC elections have all the trimmings of a national election—nominations, speeches, and voting. But the Academic Senate also has something that those ordinary national elections cannot compete with: the "trickle down" system. Elections are held consecutively rather than all at the same time, and candidates running for a position on the Executive Committee have the option of running for another position should they lose the first election. Running for more than one position is referred to as trickling down. In order to trickle down, a candidate indicates lower positions that she or he is eligible for and interested in at the time of nomination. For example, if a candidate for president fails to win that office but has indicated a desire to run for treasurer and area representative, that candidate's name would be placed on the ballot for treasurer when the election for that office occurs. If that candidate is unsuccessful in the election for treasurer, then his or her name would be placed on the ballot for area representative for the election of that position. The candidate's name would trickle down through all the positions so indicated until that candidate is either elected to a position or loses the election for the last position indicated. With this system, one cannot be certain at the beginning of the day who will really be the candidates for most of the elections. What one sees on the nominations board on Thursday is not necessarily what one will see on the ballots on Saturday.

Every spring is a busy time for candidates. The first step is the nomination process: a person can nominate oneself for election in the weeks prior to the plenary session or be nominated on the floor on Thursday by someone else, with all the nomination papers to fill out. In the Thursday nominating session, the elections chair makes the nomination request three times for each position.

Next come the speeches on Friday morning. Presidential candidates can speak for up to ten minutes, while all the other candidates have up to five minutes to present us with their thoughts and ideas of why they should be elected to the Executive Committee. Throughout the years, the ASCCC has had some memorable speeches: Allen Boyer singing part of his speech, Mark Wade Lieu giving us the ABCs of his qualifications, and Debbie Klein literally standing on her head last year. This year saw a wonderful innovation: David Morse and Julie Bruno, uncontested candidates for president and vice-president respectively, gave their speech in tandem—evidence of the close working relationship that has benefited the ASCCC this last year.

Finally, the actual elections take place on Saturday. The staff prepare the ballots to be handed out and do a great job of coordinating the entire process.

Another essential element of the election process is the volunteer tellers, plenary session attendees who are not delegates and therefore are not voting in the elections or on the resolutions. They wear red sashes to identify themselves and hand out and retrieve the ballots, open the ballots, verify the signatures, and count the votes. Eight volunteer tellers helped with the ballots this year: Roseann Berg (Foothill), Shawn Carney (Solano), Achala Chatterjee (San Bernardino Valley), Lee Gordon (Orange Coast), Diana Hurlbut (Irvine Valley), Katherine Schaefers (Foothill), Catherine Shafer (San Diego City) and Monica Thurston (East Los Angeles). The ASCCC thanks all of these volunteers, as the elections could not be finished in one day without them.

The winners of the elections this year were as follows: David Morse and Julie Bruno were reelected by acclamation to the offices of president and vice-president. The offices of secretary and treasurer were contested, but the incumbents, John Stanskas and Wheeler North, were each reelected to serve another year in their offices. James Todd was reelected by acclamation to the position of Area A Representative. Craig Rutan was elected to the position of Area D Representative, with Cynthia Rico trickling down to the election for the south representative and being elected to that position. Four candidates were on the ballot for the position of north representative, with Ginni May winning a runoff ballot for the position. Elections were held for both at-large positions, one for a two-year term and one for a one-year term because the at-large representative elected last year chose not to serve the second year of her term. Thus, the elections culminated with Randy Beach winning the two-year position and Cheryl Aschenbach the one-year position. Congratulations to all the members of the 2015-16 Executive Committee.

In conclusion, I take "senior status" privilege to end this article with a personal note. I chose not to run for re-election to the Executive Committee and, therefore, am ending a wonderful 13-year tenure on the Committee. It has been an honor and privilege to work with the members of the Executive Committee throughout the years and I look forward to continuing my work with the ASCCC.

PRESIDENT
David Morse, Long Beach College
Term Ends: 2016

VICE PRESIDENT
Julie Bruno, Sierra College
Term Ends: 2016

SECRETARY
John Stanskas, San Bernardino Valley College
Term Ends: 2016

TREASURER
Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College
Term Ends: 2016

AREA A REPRESENTATIVE
James Todd, Modesto College
Term Ends: 2017

AREA B REPRESENTATIVE
Dolores Davison, Foothill College
Term Ends: 2016

AREA C REPRESENTATIVE
John Freitas, Los Angeles City College
Term Ends: 2016

AREA D REPRESENTATIVE
Craig Rutan, Santiago Canyon College
Term Ends: 2017

NORTH REPRESENTATIVE
Kale Braden, Cosumnes River College
Term Ends: 2016

NORTH REPRESENTATIVE
Ginni May, Sacramento City College
Term Ends: 2017

SOUTH REPRESENTATIVE
Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt San Antonio College
Term Ends: 2016

SOUTH REPRESENTATIVE
Cynthia Rico, San Diego Mesa College
Term Ends: 2017

AT LARGE REPRESENTATIVE
Cheryl Aschenbach, Lassen College
Term Ends: 2016

AT LARGE REPRESENTATIVE
Randy Beach, Southwestern College
Term Ends: 2017

Beyond Compliance:
Effectively Engaging the Violence Against Women Act

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

It rang loudly: the passing by acclamation of Resolution 13.01, *System-wide Collaboration on Violence Prevention Programs*, on Saturday, April 11, 2015 at the ASCCC Spring Plenary Session. This resolution asked the ASCCC to "work with the Chancellor's Office and other system partners to develop and distribute guidelines to assist with developing and implementing effective anti-sexual assault and violence prevention programs at their colleges." With the passage of this strong statement, faculty must now consider how to hold crucial conversations in local academic senates and on college campuses about sexual violence and assault.

Sexual violence on college campuses is not new, nor are many of the college programs aimed at preventing it. The heightened attention to this issue over the last two years stems in part from President Obama's reauthorization of the federal Violence Against Women Act in 2013, effective July 1, 2015. The reauthorization included the "Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act," more commonly known as the "Campus SaVE Act." This legislation places greater responsibility on institutions of higher education by requiring increased transparency about sexual violence on campus, enhanced rights for victims, more stringent standards for conduct proceedings, and greater efforts in violence prevention programs. Compliance is mandatory for all post-secondary institutions to remain eligible for participation in federal financial aid programs. The U.S. Department of Education began enforcement of these provisions in March 2014 and colleges—including California Community Colleges—have had to respond quickly to plan and implement measures to come into compliance.

The second major factor currently spotlighting violence prevention programs is California's September 2014 passage of the "Affirmative Consent Law" (SB 967) in response to the federal Campus SaVE Act. Effective January 2015, the Affirmative Consent Law added §67386 to the California Education Code, and the law features several important provisions, including the requirement for college campuses to adopt a "Yes Means Yes" or "Affirmative Consent" standard.[1] Although the affirmative consent standard is perhaps the most conspicuous component, California's Affirmative Consent Law requires colleges to implement comprehensive violence prevention programming, both ongoing and as a part of every new student's orientation. California community college faculty will immediately recognize this requirement as a challenge, as institutions already struggle to ensure that every new, non-exempt student participates in

1 California was the first state to adopt such a standard, and the detailed ramifications are beyond the scope of this article, but several references are provided in the next few footnotes for those wishing to learn more.

orientation and colleges already have to include nine other orientation components explicitly required by Title 5 §55521.

At this point, faculty may feel overwhelmed, as most are neither lawyers nor experts in violence prevention. These compliance mandates also come at a time when colleges are faced with a litany of other issues ranging from increasing student success and mitigating disproportionate impact to meeting a new set of accreditation standards. However, the response to resolution 13.01 S15 demonstrates that as a body, faculty overwhelmingly support effective violence prevention efforts on our campuses. Truly, one could argue that working to ensure a safe environment must be central in our efforts to increase student success. As such, the external pressures currently driving the review and revision of our anti-violence policies and programs can be viewed not just as a challenge but also as a critical opportunity for campus-wide collaboration to build programs that are not just compliant but, more importantly, that are actually effective at preventing violence.

Local senate leaders can help guide effective campus efforts and conversations in several ways. Beyond familiarizing themselves with the requirements in California's Affirmative Consent Law, perhaps the most immediate work is to identify and contact key players already on campus. These individuals include the campus Title IX compliance officer, as well as the individuals or groups responsible for compiling their mandatory Annual Security Report (ASR), which includes statements of campus policies regarding sexual violence and annual campus crime statistics. Because counseling faculty are central to orientation programs, they too must be involved in planning and discussions. Colleges should note that SSSP money can be used effectively and legitimately to develop effective violence prevention programs.

Faculty, staff, and administrators should collaboratively explore prevention strategies already known to be effective and revise those known *not* to be effective.[2] Two great resources to begin with include the 2014 White House Task Force report "Not Alone"[3] and the CDC's "Preventing Sexual Violence on College Campuses: Lessons from Research and Practice."[4] The National Sexual Violence Resource Center also provides a number of resources.[5]

The passage by acclamation of Resolution 13.01 S15 demonstrates the importance to the ASCCC and to faculty in general of preventing sexual violence. The Academic Senate will follow the direction of the resolution and work to publish guidelines for colleges in developing anti-sexual assault and violence prevention programs. However, the most meaningful work regarding this issue must take place at our colleges themselves. If we are to make a difference, our review of campus policies and procedures should not just be developed for compliance but with a vision of implementing truly effective practices and building a culture of nonviolence and safety.

2 Two great websites to beginI your knowledge-building: *knowyourix.org/understanding-the-campus-save-act/*
oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/law_enforcement/info-bulletin-dle-2015-01.pdf

3 See: *www.notalone.gov/assets/report.pdf*

4 See: *www.notalone.gov/assets/evidence-based-strategies-for-the-prevention-of-sv-perpetration.pdf*

5 See: *www.nsvrc.org/resources*

THE ROSTRUM IS DISTRIBUTED TO ALL FACULTY THROUGH COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENTS AND BY INDIVIDUAL MAILING. FOR DEADLINE INFORMATION CALL (916) 445-4753 OR EMAIL JULIE@ASCCC.ORG

NOTE: THE ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN THE ROSTRUM DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT THE ADOPTED POSITIONS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE. FOR ADOPTED POSITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, PLEASE VISIT OUR WEBSITE.

YOU CAN FIND THIS AND THE PREVIOUS ISSUES OF THIS PUBLICATION ONLINE AT: WWW.ASCCC.ORG

PRESIDENT: DAVID MORSE · EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: JULIE ADAMS · CREATIVE DIRECTOR: RITA SABLER