Call to Order
Public Commentary
February 4, 2019 Minutes (Attachment to Follow)

**Information/Discussion Items**

1. Upcoming ASCCC Events (2 Minutes)
   a) AB705 Data Revision Project Recoding Regional, March 18, Santa Clarita
   b) Area A Meeting, March 22, Stockton
   c) 2019 Spring Plenary, April 11-13, Millbrae

2. Local Assignment of Courses to Disciplines: Update—Vicki Jacobi (5 Minutes) pg. 2

3. Distance Education—Adam Bledsoe (15 Minutes)
   a) Improving Online CTE Pathways Grant Program pg. 28
   b) CVC-OEI Progress
   c) Distance Education Course Review Process pg. 44

4. Faculty Diversity Hiring (5 Minutes) pg. 50

**Action Items**

5. Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process (10 Minutes) pg. 63
6. Administrative Retreat Rights (10 Minutes) pg. 107

**Committee Reports** (can be discussed if time allows)

7. Academic Senate Subcommittees
   a) Academic Development Committee pg. 111
   b) Career Technical Education Committee pg. 113
   c) Curriculum & General Education Committee pg. 117
   d) Distance Education Committee pg. 119
   e) Dual Enrollment Committee pg. 121
   f) Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Steering Committee pg. 125

8. Governance Council Subcommittees
   a) Budget Committee pg. 127
   b) Strategic Planning Committee pg. 130

**Open Forum for Announcements**

**Adjournment**

*The next meeting of the Academic Senate Council is Wednesday, March 20, at 12:00pm in the Cafeteria Conference Room. Next meeting of the Academic Senate-of-the-whole is Monday, April 4, at 12:00pm in the Cougar Room.*
ASSIGNING COURSES TO DISCIPLINES

Rebecca Eikey, ASCCC Area C Representative
Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Long Beach City College
Carrie Roberson, ASCCC North Representative

2018 Curriculum Institute
Riverside Convention Center
Today, we will discuss…

• Minimum Qualifications (MQs)
• The Disciplines List
• Assigning Courses to Disciplines
What is a Discipline?

• A “discipline” is defined as a grouping of courses that share common academic or vocational preparation, which are typically defined by a degree or degrees (MFA, MA, BA, MS, etc), or specific professional preparation.

• Discipline is from the perspective of faculty preparation.

• Faculty must meet the MQs for the discipline of the faculty member’s assignment.

• Not the same as local departments or subject areas.
  • Example:
    • Local Department or Subject Name: Child and Family Studies
    • Official Discipline: Early Childhood Education

• Not the same as your local designator, a TOP code, or a FSA!
The Disciplines List

• Specifies the *minimum* qualifications for each discipline

• Revisions to Discipline List is done annually
  • Through local senate or through professional organization
  • Must have two separate senate districts approve the proposal
  • Must provide evidence to support rationale for change
  • Minimum of two statewide hearings

• Board of Governors considers the recommendations of the Academic Senate and formally acts on them
Organization of the Disciplines List

• Disciplines requiring a Master’s Degree
• Disciplines where a Master’s degree is not normally expected but a Bachelor’s or Associate degree is expected
• Disciplines in which a Master’s, Bachelor’s or Associate Degree is not generally expected or available in that specific discipline
• Disciplines for non-credit instruction
• Other – to include Administrators, Learning Center Coordinators, Health Services Professionals, Apprenticeship Instructors, DSP&S Counselors, Work Experience Coordinators, Faculty Interns, EOPS
**DISCIPLINES INDEX**

This is a comprehensive list of all of the disciplines included in the handbook displayed in alphabetical discipline order. The list identifies the degree and professional experience requirement along with the associated statutory law in California Education Code (CEC) and/or regulation in California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 5 section for each discipline. Reference the Statutory Laws & Regulations section of this handbook for a definition of Occupational and Professional Experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline and Areas</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
<th>Specific Bachelor’s/Associate’s Degree and Professional Experience</th>
<th>Any Degree and Professional Experience</th>
<th>CEC / CCR Code</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCR 53410.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted Computer Technology: Disabled Students Programs and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCR 53414(d)(1)(2)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiction Paraprofessional Training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Justice (Police science, corrections, law enforcement)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautics (Airframe and power plant, aircraft mechanics, aeronautical engineering technician, avionics)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minimum Qualifications

• Degrees and credits generally must be from accredited institutions (§53406).

• An occupational license or certificate is required in certain instances (§53417).

• A district may hire a person who possesses qualifications different from, but equivalent to, those listed on the disciplines list, according to criteria and procedures agreed upon by the governing board and the academic senate (§53430).
Why Do We Care About Faculty Qualifications?

• Minimum Qualifications are one mechanism that:
  ✓ Ensures faculty preparation in the content area
  ✓ Addresses Accreditation Standards
  ✓ Is a 10+1 issue
    • Equivalency - Ed. Code §87359(b),
    • Minimum Qualifications - Ed. Code §87360(b)
Local Minimum Qualifications

• A district may establish additional qualifications which are more rigorous than the state-established MQs.
• However, local MQs cannot be less rigorous than the state-established MQs.
Discipline
Defines required academic preparation and professional experience for faculty

Assignment of Course to Discipline
Defines the MQs needed to teach the course.

Courses
What the faculty teach…curriculum!
Assigning Courses to Disciplines

- Determine the minimum qualifications necessary to teach a course.
- Local senates maintain responsibility for placing courses in disciplines (§53200(c)(1)).
- All credit & noncredit courses **must** be placed within a discipline or disciplines.
- Not required for community service courses
Options for Assigning Courses

1. Course assigned to a single discipline.
   • Example: ENGL 101 assigned to English. The minimum qualifications for English provides adequate preparation to teach the course content.

2. Course assigned to more than one discipline with an “or”
   • Example: ARTS 101 assigned to Art or Graphic Design. The minimum qualifications for either discipline provide adequate preparation to teach the course content.

3. Course assigned to more than one discipline with an “and”
   • HUMA 120 assigned to Humanities and Ethnic Studies. The minimum qualifications for both disciplines together provide adequate preparation to teach the course content.
Multiple Disciplines

- *Do not* need to have more than one course outline of record (COR) or be listed in the catalog under multiple subject codes. For example:
  - ARTS 101 is assigned to Art OR Graphic Design on the COR. The college only maintains one COR for ARTS 101. The course is listed in the catalog ONLY as ARTS 101. However faculty who meet MQ for Art or Graphic Design can teach course.

- *May be “double-coded”,* i.e. recorded on two or more CORs and listed in the catalog under each subject code. For example:
  - Social Psychology is recorded on two separate CORs, one as PSYC 120, one as SOCI 120. It is listed in the catalog under both subject codes. Double-coded courses should have identical CORs.
Impact on Teaching

Single Discipline:
Faculty who meet minimum qualifications or the locally-determined equivalent for that discipline are eligible to teach the courses within that particular discipline.

More than one discipline with an “or”:
Faculty who meet minimum qualifications or the locally-determined equivalent in any of the listed disciplines are eligible to teach the course.

More than one discipline with an “and”:
Faculty who meet minimum qualifications or the locally-determined equivalent for ALL of the listed disciplines are eligible to teach the course.
Interdisciplinary Studies

• The Disciplines List includes the discipline of Interdisciplinary Studies.
• The minimum qualifications for Interdisciplinary Studies are:
  • Master’s in the interdisciplinary area OR master’s in one of the disciplines included in the interdisciplinary area and upper division or graduate coursework in at least one other constituent discipline.
• Any time interdisciplinary studies is used, the disciplines for a particular course MUST be specified.
Local Disciplines Assignment

• A district may locally assign any discipline on the state list for local use, but they do not have to use any particular discipline.
• For instance, if a district has not locally adopted the discipline of Art History, it could assign all of its Art History courses to the discipline of Art.
• In this case, the MQs for Art History classes in that district would be those defined for the Art discipline, not the Art History discipline (unless/until the district chose to change this).
Single Course Equivalency

- Ed Code and Title 5 refer to qualifications in terms of Disciplines not courses or subject areas within a Discipline (Ed Code §87357; Title 5 §53410 and §53430)
- Legal Opinion L 03-28, Chancellor’s Office Legal Division
  - Faculty are hired to teach within disciplines, not a course
  - Therefore faculty are qualified to teach *all courses* assigned to that discipline
- Resolution 19.03 (S18): [Oppose Efforts to Permit Single-Course Equivalency](#)
Disciplines vs. Departments

• Departments are locally defined organizational structures.
• Instructional faculty teach courses *assigned to disciplines, not departments*.
  • Faculty must meet the MQs of the disciplines to which courses are assigned.
  • Example: The LACC Chemistry and Earth Sciences Department offers courses in Chemistry, Geology, Oceanography, and Geography. Who teaches which course?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td>EARTH 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEOL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEOL 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCEANO 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>CHEM 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEM 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEM 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEM 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEM 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEM 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>GEOG 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEOG 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conflicts When Assigning Courses

• Imagine that the faculty in your physics department want to create a new course on the Philosophy of Science and would like this to be a physics course.
• The philosophy faculty object to the placement of the course in physics and believe that the course should be part of philosophy.
• How does your local process deal with conflicts like this?
Which Discipline(s) Would You Assign?

Multimedia Applications for the Web

Introduction to the use of multimedia components, images, typography, motion and audio, for designing websites. Software may include Photoshop, Dreamweaver, SoundEdit 16 and Flash. Projects include conceptualizing, storyboarding, and designing Web page layout. Application of design elements to Web page creation.
Which Discipline(s) Would You Assign?

Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies

Historical, social and economic development of the world order along with a wide range approach integral to the examination of global studies, peace and conflict resolution. The study of peace and conflict areas to include the war system, war prevention, nonviolence, human rights, social justice, environmental sustainability and the role of the United Nations and other international governing bodies.
Which Discipline(s) Would You Assign?

Introduction to Geographic Information System
This course introduces basic scientific principles of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) as they relate to working with data that have important spatial orientation and organization. Geometric and geographic concepts and theories are used to develop scientific methods for proper communication of the data and the solution of problems that have spatial relationships. Course covers basic concepts in mapping and orientation, the development of map scales and comparison of different coordinate systems and data error analysis.
Multi-College Districts

• While some multi-college districts have common courses, others do not.
• Since your district has one set of minimum qualifications, similar courses should be placed in the same discipline, even if they are called different things.
• Your local process may be different than those in single college districts
Summary

• All Courses **must** be assigned to a discipline listed in the Discipline’s List and the assignment of courses is under the **academic senate’s/curriculum committee’s** authority.

• The process for assigning courses is locally determined and may differ from college to college

• Different colleges may choose to use different disciplines for similar courses!

• Create a clear local process that outlines who is involved and who makes the ultimate decision.
Questions?

• Thank you for joining us
  Rebecca Eikey (Rebecca.eikey@canyons.edu)
  Michelle Grimes-Hillman (mhillman@lbcc.edu)
  Carrie Roberson (robersonca@butte.edu)
Request for Applications

Improving Online CTE Pathways
Grant Program

February 14, 2019
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INTRODUCTION

The California Virtual Campus-Online Education Initiative’s (CVC-OEI) Improving Online CTE Pathways grant program is designed to support online education interventions that California Community Colleges (CCC) and/or districts expect to produce meaningful improvements in online student education outcomes.

Using one-time funding of $35 million in the 2018-2019 budget, the CVC-OEI will award competitive grants to community college districts to develop online programs and courses that support either of the following:

- Lead to short-term, industry-valued certificates or credentials, or programs; or
- Enable a student in a pathway developed by the California Online Community College to continue his or her education in a career pathway offered by an existing community college.

Grants may range in size from tens of thousands of dollars to several hundred thousand dollars, however, they may not exceed $500,000 per college/district. Projects are to be implemented within the one-year funding timeframe. Additionally, grants may be awarded to individual colleges or districts, or multiple colleges and/or districts working together as partners. Grants will be administered by the Foothill-De Anza Community College District, serving as the fiscal agent for the CVC-OEI.

Depending on total funds awarded, CVC-OEI may issue additional calls for participation.

Program Goal

The Improving Online CTE Pathways program was designed to leverage existing capabilities within the CCC system, while also integrating together with the CVC-OEI’s objectives.

Grant applications must fall within one of the three approved tracks:

- **TRACK 1: Improve access to and quality of existing online programs:** We can achieve maximum impact not just by creating new online courses or programs, but more importantly by expanding access to existing but locally or regionally-siloed online CTE-oriented programs or certifications — e.g., increase capacity or frequency of sections not available anytime / anywhere; and supporting colleges to improve the quality, accessibility, and equity of existing offerings.
  - Increase access to existing online certificates, credentials or programs.
  - Increase visibility of existing online certificates, credentials or programs.
  - Improve quality of existing online certificates, credentials or programs.
- Expand availability of C-ID designators for CTE courses.

**TRACK 2: Increase the number of online programs that meet workforce needs** by filling in gaps within programs – missing content, missing courses; leveraging industry partnerships to create or expand access to online programs; and encourage collaboration between colleges to offer joint programs.

- Fill gaps in existing on-ground certificates, credentials or programs.
- Build an online certificate, credential or program that addresses regional workforce needs.
- Develop a replicable model for advancing credit for prior learning pathways and solutions.
- Create online programs using industry content, Zero Textbook Cost Materials, and/or Open Educational Resources.
- Review industry-approved curriculum.

**TRACK 3: Support students, faculty, staff and campus leaders** by supporting the student groups that could most benefit from expansion of online; offering targeted support structures; and providing coordinated support for faculty and staff at the colleges as they participate in activities funded by these grants.

- Create a jointly offered program with another college or district in the CCC system.
- Pilot tools for students to chart and track progress on academic pathways.
- Support students staying on their existing academic pathways.

As this augmentation initiative, *Improving Online CTE Pathways*, involves one-time funding over a brief period, these college- and district-level grants are intended to help a CCC campus, district, or partnership to complete short-term projects that:

- can be implemented within one year (July 2019 through June 2020), and
- lead to lasting institutional innovation beyond the one-year grant timeframe.

These college- and district-level grants are not intended to support the purchase of computer hardware or software.
Process Summary

Phase One: Grant Planning & Preparation – February 2019 to June 2019

- **Letters of Intent**: All applicants must submit a Letter of Intent by March 15, 2019, at 5:00 PM PST; and according to the Letter of Intent Format & Instructions (see below).

- **Letter of Intent Notifications**: The CVC-OEI team will send notification messages to all applicants shortly after submission, indicating approval to move forward with application planning and development.

- **Applications**: All applicants must submit an Application by May 01, 2019, at 5:00 PM PST; and according to the Application Format & Instructions (see below).
  
  - **NOTE**: The grant process will be competitive, but equitable. Recognizing that colleges and districts throughout the CCC system vary in distance education expertise and staffing, the CVC-OEI will support all institutions applying for grants. Planning and Development Reimbursements (up to $15,000 per college/district) will be provided to fund one or more faculty and/or staff members to engage in a planning process to prepare an Application. Reimbursements will be issued upon receipt of the Application and an invoice, whether or not the grant is awarded.

- **Award Notifications**: The CVC-OEI will send notification messages to all applicants and announce the *Improving Online CTE Pathways* grant awards (up to $500,000) no later than May 31, 2019.

- **Preparation**: After receiving an award notification, awardees will assemble their project teams and prepare to begin their projects by July 01, 2019.

Phase Two: Grant Implementation – July 2019 to June 2020

- **Project Implementation Begins**: Awardees will begin project work on July 01, 2019.

- **Quarterly Reporting**: Awardees will submit quarterly progress reports and invoices on October 15, 2019, January 15, 2020, April 15, 2020, and July 15, 2020.

- **Project Implementation Ends**: Awardees will complete project work on June 30, 2020.

  - **The CVC-OEI intends that** *Improving Online CTE Pathways* **projects disseminate their results to the practitioner community, the academic community, and the general public. To this end, applicants are required to discuss the dissemination of their findings in their applications, including oral briefings and release of publicly available written brief(s) at the end of the grant.**
The CVC-OEI will consider only applications that are responsive and compliant to the requirements described in this Request for Applications (RFA) and submitted electronically via the CVC-OEI website (www.cvc.edu/pathwaysgrant).

**APPLICANT REQUIREMENTS**

Applications under the *Improving Online CTE Pathways* grant program must meet the requirements set out under (1) Eligibility, (2) Principal Investigator(s), and (3) Authorized Organization Representative in order to be responsive and sent forward for review.

**Eligibility**

Qualified Applicants/Fiscal Agents include a California Community College, a California Community College District, or an entity operating under a Joint Powers Authority. Applicants may propose but are not limited to one of the following partnership models:

- Single college/district develops RFA response and submits as a single college or district responsible for *Improving Online CTE Pathways* project.

- Two or more colleges/districts develop the RFA response and clearly define the roles and responsibilities required to satisfy the *Improving Online CTE Pathways* project objectives.
  - To help demonstrate a working partnership, the CVC-OEI strongly encourages institution(s) forming the partnership to submit a joint Letter of Agreement, rather than separate letters, documenting their participation and cooperation in the partnership and clearly setting out their expected roles and responsibilities in the partnership.

The CCCCO reserves the right to make the final selection of the projects. This RFA may be reissued until all funds are allocated.

**Principal Investigator(s)**

Applications must include at least one Principal Investigator (PI) from each institution submitting the application. When discussing the PIs in the application, it is helpful to the reviewers to identify which institution they represent.

- CCC Partnerships must choose one PI to have overall responsibility for the administration of the award and interactions with the CVC-OEI. The PI is the individual who has the authority and responsibility for the project, including the appropriate use of grant funds and the submission of...
required progress reports. This person should be identified on the application as the Project Director/Principal Investigator. All other PIs should be listed as Co-Principal Investigators (Co-PIs).

The CVC-OEI recommends that the person chosen as PI has the qualifications and experience to manage the grant and that the PI’s organization has the capacity to fulfill the administrative, financial, and reporting requirements of the grant.

The CVC-OEI team may convene one or more in-person or virtual meetings with other grantees and CVC-OEI staff. Should the PI (or Co-PI) not be able to attend a meeting, he/she may designate another key person on the project team to attend.

**Authorized Organization Representative**

The Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) for the institution is the official who has the authority to legally commit the institution to (1) accept federal funding and (2) execute the proposed project. When your application is submitted, the AOR automatically signs the cover sheet of the application, and in doing so, assures compliance with any policies and/or regulations governing grant awards. In most cases, this individual would be the College President, District Chancellor, and/or Chief Business Officer.

**APPLICATION CLARIFICATION**

If any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in this RFA is discovered, immediately notify CVC-OEI of the error and request a written modification or clarification of the document. A clarifying addendum will be given to all parties who have obtained the RFA and will be posted on the CVC-OEI website [www.cvc.edu/pathwaysgrant](http://www.cvc.edu/pathwaysgrant). The CVC-OEI shall not be responsible for failure of an applicant not having the most current information.

Contact for this Application:

Justin Schultz, Director, Planning & Grants Administration, 650.949.7939, jschultz@cvc.edu

**LETTER OF INTENT FORMAT & INSTRUCTIONS**

The CVC-OEI asks potential applicants to submit a Letter of Intent prior to the Letter of Intent submission deadline of March 15, 2019. Letters of Intent are required. College/districts that submit a Letter of Intent may be contacted regarding the proposed project. NOTE: If college/district’s Letter of Intent is accepted and that college/district is invited to submit an Application, the CVC-OEI team understands that there may be a need or want to modify some details after further local discussion.
The Letter of Intent should be uploaded as a PDF to the CVC-OEI website (www.cvc.edu/pathwaysgrant).

No later than March 15, 2019, at 5:00 PM PST, applicants should submit the following information:

1. Community college or district name, address, and phone number
2. Community college or district Authorized Organization Representative (name, title, phone, email, signature)
3. Project Director/Principal Investigator information for this application (name, title, phone, and email, signature)
4. Proposed Project Title (max: 15 words)
5. Proposed Project Summary (max: 500 words)
6. Proposed Total Budget Request (select one)
   - $001-100K
   - $100-250K
   - $250-500K
7. Primary goal of proposed project (select one)
   - Improve existing online certificates, credentials or programs (Track 1)
   - Build new online certificates, credentials or programs (Track 2)
   - Support success for online students and/or faculty (Track 3)
8. Please describe the areas with which your proposed project best aligns (select no more than three)
   - to increase access to existing online certificates, credentials or programs
   - to increase visibility of existing online certificates, credentials or programs
   - to improve quality of existing online certificates, credentials or programs
   - to expand availability of C-ID designators for CTE courses
   - to fill gaps in existing on-ground certificates, credentials or programs
   - to build an online certificate, credential or program that addresses regional workforce needs
   - to develop a replicable model for advancing credit for prior learning pathways and solutions
   - to create online programs using industry content, Zero Textbook Cost Materials, and/or Open Educational Resources
• to review industry-approved curriculum
• to create a jointly offered program with another college or district in the CCC
• to pilot tools for students to chart and track progress on academic pathways
• to support students staying on their existing academic pathways

9. Describe your level of certainty — i.e., outline what might change between submitting this letter of intent and submitting your application.

APPLICATION FORMAT & INSTRUCTIONS

As this augmentation initiative, Improving Online CTE Pathways, involves one-time funding over a brief period, these college- and district-level grants are intended to help a CCC campus, district, or partnership to complete short-term projects that:

• can be implemented within one year (June 2019 through June 2020), and
• lead to lasting institutional innovation beyond the one-year grant timeframe.

These college- and district-level grants are not intended to support the purchase of computer hardware or software.

NOTE: Planning and Development Reimbursements (up to $15,000) are designed to fund one or more faculty and/or staff members to prepare this Application. Please submit with the Application an invoice that includes a) details of what is being reimbursed and b) the total reimbursement amount (up to $15,000). A reimbursement will be issued for each Application that includes this invoice, whether or not it is awarded.

The following instructions prescribe the format and sequence for the development and presentation of the Application. All questions must be answered and all requested data must be supplied. All narrative portions of the Application should be in 12-point, Arial font, single-spaced, and with minimum 1” margins. A single application cover page may be included. The Application should be uploaded as a PDF to the CVC-OEI website (www.cvc.edu/pathwaysgrant).

No later than May 01, 2019, at 5:00 PM PST, applicants should submit the following information:

1. Table of Contents

The Table of Contents should be on a separate page, with each component of the application’s narrative listed and page numbers indicated.
2. Project Summary

- Proposed Project Title (max: 15 words)
- Proposed Project Summary (max: 500 words)
- What is the primary goal of your proposed project?
  - Improve existing online certificates, credentials or programs (Track 1)
  - Build new online certificates, credentials or programs (Track 2)
  - Support success for online students and/or faculty (Track 3)
- What are the areas of emphasis for the project proposed in this application? (select no more than three)
  - to increase access to existing online certificates, credentials or programs
  - to increase visibility of existing online certificates, credentials or programs
  - to improve quality of existing online certificates, credentials or programs
  - to expand availability of C-ID designators for CTE courses
  - to fill gaps in existing on-ground certificates, credentials or programs
  - to build an online certificate, credential or program that addresses regional workforce needs
  - to develop a replicable model for advancing credit for prior learning pathways and solutions
  - to create online programs using industry content, Zero Textbook Cost Materials, and/or Open Educational Resources
  - to review industry-approved curriculum
  - to create a jointly offered program with another college or district in the CCC
  - to pilot tools for students to chart and track progress on academic pathways
  - to support students staying on their existing academic pathways

3. Project Preparation

Local Starting Point

- What is the starting point for the proposed project?
  - Track 1 or Track 2 proposals:
• What is the certificate, credential or program (please include discipline, number of courses, workforce area supported)?

• Is the entire certificate, credential or program already fully online?
  o If yes, have the individual courses been reviewed with the OEI Course Design Rubric?
  o If no, how many courses are fully online courses?

• Track 3 proposals:
  ▪ How do students currently chart their academic pathways and track their progress in completing certificates, credentials or programs?
    o What support do you already provide for online students?

• Describe Distance Education at your college or district (e.g., what percentage of total enrollments are in online courses?)

Local Preparation

• If you win an award, what is the first date you can give a presentation to the Board of Trustees for your district to get approval?

• Which executive stakeholders from your college or district should be included in this project?

• Who is the fiscal agent from your college or district who will receive the funds?

• What data must you collect before you start, so you can compare pre-award and post-award impact?

4. Project Implementation

Project Alignment

• Please describe how your proposed project aligns with one of the two CCCCO goals for this project:
  o CCCCO Goal 1: Lead to short-term, industry-valued certificates or credentials, or programs
  o CCCCO Goal 2: Enable a student in a pathway developed by the California Online Community College to continue his or her education in a career pathway offered by an existing community college.
    ▪ Information Technology
- Medical Coding
- Management

- If applicable, please describe how your proposed project aligns with one of the CCCCO system-wide initiatives, such as *CCC Vision for Success* or *Guided Pathways*.

**Project Need**

- What other specific needs will you meet with this proposed project?

**Project Description (includes timeline and budget)**

- Please describe the proposed project activities.
- Please provide a rough timeline for the grant period with expected deliverables at three-month intervals.
- Please provide a budget summary including the total funding requested and how you plan to use the requested funds.

**Project Success**

- Please describe the anticipated or desired results of the proposed project — meaningful and practical success metrics related to a) capacity growth and b) student success (e.g., how many students will be served in a 3-5 year timeframe?).

**Project Evaluation**

- Please describe how you will track progress during the grant.
  - Include how you will collect the data necessary to track progress.

**Project Feasibility**

- Please describe your college or district’s expertise and capacity.
  - How many faculty releases and/or support staff members does your college or district already provide for distance education activities?
  - How do these faculty and/or staff members’ skills and technical capabilities align with the overall demands of the proposed work?
  - How much staff time (total FTE) will your college or district be able to devote to this project over the grant period (12 to 18 months)?
5. Project Conclusion and Continuation

**Project Reporting**

- Please describe how you will document what the proposed project has achieved during the grant period (through June 2020).
  - Include how you will synthesize main achievements, remaining or revised work to complete, challenges, and replicable practices.

**Post-Grant Commitment**

- How will your college or district institutionalize the advancements funded by this CVC-OEI *Improving Online CTE Pathways* grant program (e.g., schedule/offer new certificates, credentials or programs for at least 3-5 years after they have been created; advertise existing certificates, credentials or programs)?
## APPENDIX A: GRANT TIMELINE

### Phase One: Grant Planning & Preparation

*February 2019 to June 2019*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 2019</td>
<td>Call for Letters of Intent &amp; Release of RFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 2019</td>
<td>Submission Deadline for Letters of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 01, 2019</td>
<td>Submission Deadline for Applications &amp; Planning Invoices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31, 2019</td>
<td>Notification of Grant Awardees <em>(by CVC-OEI)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase Two: Grant Implementation

*July 2019 to June 2020*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 01, 2019</td>
<td>Start of Grant Implementation Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15, 2019</td>
<td>Submission Deadline for Quarter 1 Report &amp; Invoicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15, 2020</td>
<td>Submission Deadline for Quarter 2 Report &amp; Invoicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>January 15, 2020</em></td>
<td>Start of Progress Payment Dispersal Period <em>(by CVC-OEI)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2020</td>
<td>Submission Deadline for Quarter 3 Report &amp; Invoicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 2020</td>
<td>Submission Deadline for Quarter 4 Report &amp; Invoicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>July 15, 2020</em></td>
<td>Submission Deadline for Legislative Report <em>(by CVC-OEI)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31, 2020</td>
<td>End of Grant Implementation Period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post-Implementation

*July 2020 to June 2021*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 30, 2020</td>
<td>Submission Deadline for Final Report &amp; Invoicing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B: RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING GRANT APPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Does Not Meet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEFORE – PROJECT PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Starting Point</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Proposal clearly defines the applicant's starting point for the project and outlines how proposed activities will build on current status.</td>
<td>Proposal clearly defines the applicant's starting point for the project.</td>
<td>Proposal does not clearly define the applicant's starting point for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Preparation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proposal identifies all preparatory activities the applicant must complete before it can begin implementation.</td>
<td>Proposal identifies the key preparatory activities the applicant must complete before it can begin implementation.</td>
<td>Proposal does not identify any activities the applicant must complete before it can begin implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DURING – PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Alignment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Proposal shows clear alignment with a) a CCCCO goal for this grant funding and b) a CCCCO initiative (<em>CCC Vision for Success or Guided Pathways</em>).</td>
<td>Proposal shows clear alignment with a CCCCO goal for this grant funding.</td>
<td>Proposal does not show alignment with CCCCO goals for this grant funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Need</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proposal defines more than one clear need that the applicant intends to meet through project activities.</td>
<td>Proposal defines at least one clear need that the applicant intends to meet through project activities.</td>
<td>Proposal does not define specific needs that the applicant intends to meet through project activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Proposal describes project activities that match augmentation priorities; and includes a detailed timeline and budget summary.</td>
<td>Proposal describes project activities clearly and includes a timeline and budget summary.</td>
<td>Proposal does not describe project activities clearly, and/or does not include a timeline or budget summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Success</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proposal describes in detail how the applicant will measure success—meaningful and practical success metrics related to a) capacity growth and b) student success.</td>
<td>Proposal describes how the applicant will measure success.</td>
<td>Proposal does not describe clearly how the applicant will measure success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Evaluation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proposal describes in detail workable methods for collecting the data necessary to track progress toward reaching success metrics.</td>
<td>Proposal describes how the applicant will track progress.</td>
<td>Proposal does not describe clearly how the applicant will track progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Feasibility</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Proposal demonstrates that applicant has exceptional expertise and capacity to complete the project; and a strong understanding of what the project will take to complete.</td>
<td>Proposal demonstrates that applicant has sufficient expertise and capacity to complete the project; and a reasonable understanding of what the project will take to complete.</td>
<td>Proposal does not demonstrate that applicant has sufficient expertise and capacity to complete the project; nor a reasonable understanding of what the project will take to complete.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFTER – PROJECT CONCLUSION & CONTINUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Reporting</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Proposal describes in detail how applicant will evaluate and report overall success and impact.</th>
<th>Proposal describes how applicant will evaluate and report overall success and impact.</th>
<th>Proposal does not describe how applicant will evaluate and report overall success and impact.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Grant Commitment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proposal outlines clearly how the applicant will institutionalize the advancements funded by this initiative for over 3 years.</td>
<td>Proposal outlines how the applicant will institutionalize the advancements funded by this initiative for at least 3 years.</td>
<td>Proposal does not outline how the applicant will institutionalize the advancements funded by this initiative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points** | 100 | | | |
Taft College Distance Learning Approval Form
For Online and Offline Formats Only

Course:
Submitted by:
Date:
(Please submit this form electronically as a Word file to the DE Coordinator Director)

This course is to be taught: Online _____ Hybrid _____ Offline _____

Answer the following questions for each modality requested:

1. What is the justification for this course to be taught in a distance learning format?
   - Some of the potential responses here could be based on trying to increase enrollment, or trying to meet student demand for the course without impacting scheduling issues.

2. In what ways might this course present What are the unique challenges for this course in specific to the distance education environment, and how will they be overcome met?
   - As an example, if your course requires student presentations, how will that be accomplished in the distance education environment?
   - Examples of potential challenges:
     o Presentations
     o Requirements to present in front of live audience
     o Labs
     o Models
     o Educational materials
     o Accessibility

3. How will this course be developed to promote regular effective instructor/student contact?
   - Be specific. Simply stating “Email and/or LMS Message Posts” is not specific. Detail how the methods that will be used to maintain effective contact will be put into place. (REC Procedure as part of AP 4105) (For example: weekly announcements; reminder emails; Instructor-led Cranium Café study sessions and office hours; participating in class discussion forums; replying to student emails, phone calls, mail, as specified in the syllabus)
3. Describe ways the content of the course will be delivered or presented.
   - For example, instructor-created videos, PDFs, web links, Canvas Content Pages, student collaboration projects, and the course textbook could be used to deliver content.

4. How will you ensure the students can successfully navigate your course?
   - For example, ways to help guide your students through your course might include creating a video with you recording your desktop (screen-casting) as you demonstrate stepping through your class and the modules in your class; or, it might include a Content Page within Canvas that explains how the students will proceed through the class.

5. How will you assess student learning within Canvas?
   - For example, tests and quizzes within Canvas, essays/papers, discussion forum responses, and projects could be different ways to assess student learning.

6. Will this course use a textbook other than what is currently approved for the face-to-face class?
   - If this class is not taught face-to-face, or a different textbook will be used, has the textbook gone through the appropriate approval process?

7. List all types of materials, supplemental online platforms and how accessibility issues will be addressed?
   - Consider AP 5145 in your response. Will PDFs, instructional videos, MyMathLab, Word files, audio files, PowerPoint presentations be used? If so, each resource needs to be accessible.

8. Does this course contain a lab requirement? If so, how will the lab requirement be met?

9. If this course is approved to be offered in a Distance Learning format, will this action push the percentage of Distance Learning courses offered in the program over 50%? If so, this will trigger the need for a Substantive Change to be submitted to ACCJC. If you are not sure about how to respond to this question, you can leave this response blank and have the division chair and/or the DE Coordinator determine whether this change of delivery methods will push the percentage over 50%.
DE Committee Comments:

Date forwarded to the Curriculum Committee:

Curriculum Committee Comments:

Course Approved or Disapproved
ATTACHMENT 1

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
PROPOSED REVISIONS TO TITLE 5 REGULATIONS:
of
DISTANCE EDUCATION

1. Section 55200 of article 1 of subchapter 3 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55200. Definition and Application.

Distance education means instruction in which the instructor and student are separated by time and/or distance and interact through the assistance of communication technology. All distance education is subject to the general requirements of this chapter as well as the specific requirements of this article. In addition, instruction provided as distance education is subject to the requirements that may be imposed by the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12100 et seq.) and section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. § 794d).


2. Section 55202 of article 1 of subchapter 3 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55202. Course Quality Standards.

The same standards of course quality shall be applied to any portion of a class course conducted through distance education as are applied to traditional classroom courses, in regard to the course quality judgment made pursuant to the requirements of section 55002, and in regard to any local course quality determination or review process. Determinations and judgments about the quality of distance education under the course quality standards shall be made with the full involvement of faculty in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 2 (commencing with section 53200) of chapter 2.


3. Section 55204 of article 1 of subchapter 3 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:
§ 55204. Instructor Contact.

In addition to the requirements of section 55002 and any locally established requirements applicable to all courses, district governing boards shall ensure that:

(a) Any portion of a course conducted through distance education includes regular effective contact between instructor and students, and among students, either synchronously or asynchronously, through group or individual meetings, orientation and review sessions, supplemental seminar or study sessions, field trips, library workshops, telephone contact, correspondence, voice mail, e-mail, or other activities. Regular effective contact is an academic and professional matter pursuant to sections 53200 et seq.

(b) Any portion of a course provided through distance education is conducted consistent with guidelines issued by the Chancellor pursuant to section 409 of the Procedures and Standing Orders of the Board of Governors.


4. Section 55206 of article 1 of subchapter 3 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55206. Separate Course Approval.

If any portion of the instruction in a new proposed or existing course or course section is designed to be provided through distance education in lieu of face-to-face interaction between instructor and student, an addendum to the official course outline of record shall be required. In addition to addressing how course outcomes will be achieved in a distance education mode, the addendum shall at a minimum specify how the portion of instruction delivered via distance education meets:

(a) Regular and effective contact between instructors and students and among students as referenced in title 5, section 55204(a), and


The addendum the course shall be separately reviewed and approved according to the district's adopted course curriculum approval procedures.

Section 55208 of article 1 of subchapter 3 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55208. Faculty Selection and Workload.

(a) Instructors of course sections delivered via distance education technology shall be selected by the same procedures used to determine all instructional assignments. Instructors shall possess the minimum qualifications for the discipline into which the course’s subject matter most appropriately falls, in accordance with article 2 (commencing with section 53410) of subchapter 4 of chapter 4, and with the list of discipline definitions and requirements adopted by the Board of Governors to implement that article, as such list may be amended from time to time.

(b) Instructors of distance education shall be prepared to teach in a distance education delivery method consistent with local district policies and negotiated agreements.

(bc) The number of students assigned to any one course section offered by distance education shall be determined by and be consistent with other district procedures related to faculty assignment. Procedures for determining the number of students assigned to a course section offered in whole or in part by distance education may include a review by the curriculum committee established pursuant to section 55002(a)(1).

(ed) Nothing in this section shall be construed to impinge upon or detract from any negotiations or negotiated agreements between exclusive representatives and district governing boards.

Achieving Common Ground: Creating Common Understanding and Expectations

ASCCC FACULTY DIVERSITY REGIONALS:
FEBRUARY 21ST BAKERSFIELD
FEBRUARY 25TH YUBA COLLEGE
FEBRUARY 28TH NORCO COLLEGE
The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is pleased to empower faculty at the local level with equitable practices to increase the diversity hiring of underrepresented minorities. This session will discuss achieving workplace diversity through relating job performance to skills and abilities of qualified candidates through intentional organizational practices. Join us for a session of deliberate dialogue of achieving common ground between faculty and administrators to align goals for diversification practical strategies with three practitioners dedicated to address potential institutional barriers to equal employment opportunities.

Presenters:
LaTonya Parker, South Representative ASCCC
Sandy Somo, Glendale College
TODAY’S AGENDA:
- Welcome and Introductions
- Workforce Diversity Defined
- Faculty Diversity (FD) Discussion
- FD Moving From an Organization Value to Practice Through Institutional Strategies

Equitable (Ethnic and Racial Diversity) Approaches to Increase Student Success
“Workforce diversity means a workforce made up of people with different human qualities or who belong.”


http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/44956061
Why is it Important for Faculty and Administrators to Dialogue and Align Goals to Hire for Diversity?

Pair & Share Activity
According to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office 2016 Equal Opportunity Employment & Diversity Best Practices Handbook there has been an increase in underrepresented students in California community colleges in recent years.

Data shows that the student population in the community colleges has become increasingly more diverse, whereas all ranks of the workforce have not reflected this increase in diversity. According to data submitted by the districts, for the past 10 years, approximately 20 percent of full-time faculty members are from underrepresented communities.

See chart in next slide:
Under-Represented Minority Percentages by Student and Employee Type
Additional Benefits of Faculty Diversity

- Improving Faculty Diversity Improves the Quality of Instruction

Diversity in the workplace adds to the diversity of ideas and attitudes within an organization.

- Improving Faculty Diversity will Protect Districts Against Liability

Both the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act prohibit employers from discriminating against employees based on a number of protected characteristics, including race, gender, religion, sexual orientation and national origin.
What are Best Collaborative Practices for Faculty and Administrators to Hire for Diversity?
Achieving Common Ground Through Developing and Maintaining Institutional Commitment to Faculty Diversity

- Data Informed Decisions
  - Has your organization reviewed the current hiring processes?
  - Does your organization make available underrepresented students and employees data?

- Bring Awareness
  - Identify Potential Barriers
  - Communicate Challenges
  - Data Driven Decisions

- Create an Achieving Common Ground Plan
  - Develop a Metric
  - Include the Faculty, Staff and Administrators in the Communication Plan
  - Sustain Momentum
Collaborative strategies to increase diversity hiring to increase students’ success in California community colleges
THANK YOU....

LaTonya Parker:
latonya.parker@mvc.edu

Sandy Somo:
ssomo@Glendale.edu

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges: submit inquiries to info@asccc.org
Resources:

https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/FacultyHiring_0.pdf


https://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/Legal/EEO/2018-Longitudinal-Data-Guide.WEB.pdf
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Introduction

The hiring of faculty is at the heart of developing and maintaining programs, as well as the success and achievement of students, in all educational systems, and the California Community College System is no exception. While hiring practices may vary in terms of specifics in the 72 community college districts in California, basic principles and tenets of faculty hiring are consistent across the state. In recent years, a focus on diversifying the faculty that are hired at community colleges has increased in intensity, and both the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) have responded in a range of ways. This paper, in response to Academic Senate Resolution 3.01 (S17), is one of the various avenues through which the ASCCC has responded to the interest in diversifying community college faculty.

Academic Senate Resolution 3.01 S17 reads as follows:

Whereas, The most recent Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) paper on faculty hiring, A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures1, was adopted in Fall 2000, and it is good practice to regularly review and reevaluate professional standards regarding the hiring processes and procedures for all faculty;

Whereas, Awareness of the importance of developing faculty hiring processes to increase the diversity of candidates applying and being interviewed for full-time faculty positions has become more significant throughout the system, including the drafting and recent release by the Chancellor’s Office of the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Diversity Best Practices Handbook2, which provides an explanation of the recently-adopted, multiple methods allocation model for EEO funding and model practices for addressing the nine multiple methods described in the allocation model; and

Whereas, The report from the Board of Governors’ Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy included recommendations to expand the pool of potential career and technical education (CTE) faculty with industry experience, and subsequent efforts by the ASCCC and the Chancellor’s Office CTE Minimum Qualifications Task Force have been made to assist colleges to be more flexible when hiring CTE faculty while maintaining high academic and professional standards;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update the paper A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures and bring it to the Spring 2018 Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

In addition to serving as a revision of the Fall 2000 paper, this new paper also includes significantly more information about the statewide efforts of both the ASCCC and the CCCCO on hiring more diverse faculty, effective practices for expanding the diversity of hiring pools, and sample language from colleges used in hiring practices and procedures.

1 http://asccc.org/papers/re-examination-faculty-hiring-processes-and-procedures
As is clearly spelled out in the Fall 2000 paper,

The California Education Code is unequivocal in its assignment of authority to faculty in the realm of hiring. Section 87360 (b) reads: “hiring criteria, policies, and procedures for new faculty members shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board, and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board.” Two things are significant here: First, this mandate appears in Education Code, rather than in Title 5 Regulations, and whereas both Education Code and Title 5 Regulations have the force of law, this mandate is clearly the express intent of the Legislature. Second, there is no qualification of the mandate, no specification of circumstances wherein it would be permissible for boards to circumvent the requirement to reach joint agreement with the academic senates. These two points combine to make the authority of faculty in hiring even stronger than in the 10+1 academic and professional areas specified in Title 5 §53200. That faculty have the discipline expertise and the motivation to set the highest possible standards in selecting those who will be their colleagues for the next twenty to thirty years is simply inarguable.

Like the Fall 2000 paper, which was not intended as a substitute for previous ASCCC papers on hiring, this paper is intended as an update with more information about concerns that have become increasingly prevalent, including the role of faculty in the hiring of part-time faculty, interest in the diversification of faculty in the California Community College System, and the need for effective practices that can be used to expand the pools for both full – and part-time hiring in all disciplines across the state.

In addition, this paper should be used in conjunction with the CCCCO’s Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Best Practices Handbook (2016), a document created by the CCCCO’s EEO and Diversity Advisory Committee to assist colleges in understanding and implementing the conditions around diversification of the workforce required to receive EEO funding.

What Has Changed Since the Last Paper

As one might expect, dramatic changes around hiring have occurred in the 18 years since the adoption of the last ASCCC paper on hiring paper in 2000. Some of these changes are technological, such as the submission of applications through an online portal or the electronic transmission of transcripts rather than paper copies. Others are more philosophical, including the interest in diversifying departments, the expansion of hiring pools to include non-traditional candidates, and even the pedagogical expectations sometimes listed in preferred qualifications. For example, in 2000, colleges usually did not include a preferred qualification of teaching online; today, that attribute is far more likely to be listed.

Changes in campus demographics around diversity have also occurred, both in terms of college personnel and in terms of students. Student populations have seen increased diversity in terms of gender, ethnicity, race, veteran status, and other measures. While faculty hiring has not always matched these increases, evidence shows that the most recent efforts to diversify faculty have yielded more encouraging results. The examination of faculty diversity undertaken by the Chancellor’s Office EEO and Diversity Advisory Committee has dispelled

one long-time myth: that the ranks of the part-time faculty across the state are more diverse than those of the full-time faculty. Instead, faculty diversity remains fairly consistent regardless of employment status. For these reasons, effective practices in the diversification of hiring are important regarding both full – and part-time faculty.

The resolution calling for an update of the 2000 paper included a whereas regarding recommendations from the Board of Governors’ Taskforce on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy. These recommendations were directed toward the expansion of the pool of qualified applicants for career technical education (CTE) positions while maintaining high academic and professional standards. Many of the effective practices and strategies designed to diversify hiring pools are applicable across disciplines, including CTE hires. Among these strategies are ways in which colleges can be more flexible in terms of equivalencies; however, because the focus of this paper is around hiring, equivalency is only one of the elements discussed. Readers are encouraged to consult the 2016 ASCCC paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications* for further information on the topic of equivalency.

Change has not occurred solely at the colleges. Significant work has been accomplished over the last three years by the Chancellor’s Office EEO and Diversity Advisory Committee, which in 2016 created the *Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Best Practices Handbook*. While this handbook covers topics other than hiring, hiring practices are at the heart of the document, which spells out the requirements that colleges and districts need to meet in their processes and procedures in order to secure EEO funds.

This paper is divided into multiple sections that are designed to address each aspect of hiring, from the formation of the committee through the process itself, as well as a section on mentoring of new faculty. Appendices offer effective practices from different colleges and information from the Chancellor’s Office regarding efforts to diversify faculty in the recent past.

**Summary of Changes to the EEO Fund Allocation Model and Impact on Hiring Practices**

In 2015, the CCCCO, acting on the recommendation of the EEO and Diversity Advisory Committee, modified the Equal Employment Opportunity Fund Allocation Model. While historically EEO funds were allocated based on enrollment, these funds are now allocated to districts that meet “multiple methods of measuring success in promoting equal employment opportunity” as per Title 5 §53030(b)(2).

The *Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Best Practices Handbook* was created to assist colleges in meeting these multiple measures. Each local district’s chief human resources officer, chief executive officer, and board of trustees must annually certify compliance with the multiple measures in order for the district to receive EEO funds. The handbook spells out the current—as of 2017-18—nine possible measures and provide examples for each. These nine measures are as follows:
MANDATORY FOR ALL COLLEGES

1. The district must convene an Equal Employment Opportunity Committee and demonstrate that the committee met through minutes or other records. That committee, in accordance with local processes, must create and submit an Equal Employment Opportunity Plan to the Chancellor's Office as well as expenditure and performance reports for the prior year. This measure—the only one of the nine that is mandatory for all districts—has seen an increase in compliance from 79% of districts submitting these materials in 2015 to 100% of districts submitting them in 2017.

IN PRE-HIRING PROCESSES

2. The district must demonstrate that it has adopted board policies and resolutions that evidence a commitment to diversifying hiring processes and procedures. The Chancellor's Office has been clear that if a board does not use resolutions in its normal proceedings, adopted board policies will suffice.

3. The district must provide incentives for hard to hire disciplines or areas. These incentives are not limited to finances; for example, the district can demonstrate fulfilling this measure by allowing for Skype interviews if the college is difficult to reach or by limiting preferred qualifications to increase the overall size of the pool.

4. The district provides focused outreach and publications that demonstrate a commitment to diversifying hiring. This measure could include running advertisements and job announcements in a wide variety of publications to reach diverse populations, attending job fairs that are out of the college's area, or other demonstrable examples of diversifying outreach efforts.

IN HIRING PROCESSES

5. The district has established processes and procedures for addressing diversity throughout all steps and levels of the hiring processes. This measure includes such matters as the creation of the screening committee, the steps for job announcements, and interview processes, among others.

6. The district has provided consistent and ongoing training for all members of all hiring committees.

IN POST-HIRING PROCESSES

7. The district provides professional development focused on diversity.

8. The district ensures that diversity is incorporated into the employee evaluation and tenure processes.

9. The district actively pursues the creation of “grow your own” programs seeking to hire students who attended California Community Colleges.
Beginning in 2016-17, districts were expected to demonstrate that they met five of the above multiple measures, in addition to the mandatory measure, in order to receive EEO funding. In 2016, 77% of districts were able to demonstrate compliance by meeting at least five of the measures; in 2017, that number rose to 94%. The minimum standard for funding increased to meeting six of the eight measures in 2018-2019. Colleges may likely expect that the number of multiple measures expected to be met, as well as the measures themselves, will increase in coming years.

Hiring Processes and Prioritizations

The decision to hire faculty for contract positions, including tenure-track, should be determined cooperatively through a well-defined process that involves college administration including human resources, the local academic senate, and subject-area faculty. This process should include a thoughtful review of the capacity and needs of the college or district and an assessment of subject area strengths and weaknesses, as well as any need for special skills or foci within a discipline.

In all cases, the academic senate must be centrally involved in the determination of new faculty positions. According to California Education Code §87360 (b), “hiring criteria, policies, and procedures for new faculty members shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board, and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board.” In addition, Education Code §87360(a) states that districts are required to develop hiring criteria that include “a sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students.” Local hiring processes should result in jointly agreed-upon recommendations for hiring criteria, policies, and procedures for faculty; in addition, any changes to these criteria, policies, and procedures must also be jointly agreed upon.5

To this end, the academic senate should work with the governing board or its designees to develop clearly delineated procedures for analyzing requests and for ranking positions for which new faculty will be hired. Although colleges and districts may utilize a range of local processes for the determination and prioritization of faculty positions, colleges are best served by clear processes that connect requests for the hiring of faculty to local planning and budgeting policies and procedures in order to ensure that decisions are made on the basis of objective criteria, are applied fairly, and are focused on student needs.

While actual policies vary considerably around the state, the initial determination of the need to hire within a discipline should whenever possible rely on, and begin with, consultation with discipline faculty. Discipline faculty possess the expertise to evaluate the needs and requirements of the subject area. In collaboration with administration, such as the appropriate academic dean, a subject-area review by discipline faculty should include quantitative and qualitative data and, where possible, should make reference to the college’s program review process, program-level outcome assessments, and other data relevant to the program or department. For career technical education programs, additional information regarding employment data and other information from regional consortia, advisory committees, or other outside entities may also be relevant.

5 See the Irvine Valley College vs. South Orange Community College District decision, June 2005 http://caselaw.findlaw.com/ca-court-of-appeal/1068365.html
Quantitative factors are typically provided to faculty and administration by a college’s office of research and planning. Attention should be given to any identified data trends to include the current term and at least the two prior academic years where possible. Quantitative factors to consider may include the following:

- Current full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) within the discipline.
- The percentage of FTEF who are full-time faculty.
- The percentage of FTEF who are part-time faculty or full-time faculty teaching overload sections.
- The total number of sections offered in each discipline.
- The total number of full-time equivalent students.
- The percentage of instructional hours delivered by full-time faculty versus part-time faculty.
- The average percentage fill rate of course sections.
- Total weekly student contact hours.

Additional quantitative factors to consider include overall ratio of full-time to part-time faculty at the college. Although Education Code §87482.6 specifies a legislative goal of 75% of instructional hours to be taught by full-time faculty, many community colleges do not meet this goal. However, colleges should not be trending away from the 75% goal, nor should the percentage for a college in a multi-college district differ significantly from other colleges within that same district.

Colleges will also wish to consider their district-wide Faculty Obligation Number, or FON. The FON is set by the Chancellor’s Office per Title 5 §51025, which requires college districts to increase the number of full-time faculty over the prior year in proportion to the amount of growth in funded credit full-time equivalent students. Local academic senates should remain aware of the district FON, as districts can suffer significant financial penalties for failure to meet this requirement. The FON is set for the district, rather than for individual colleges, so in multi-college districts a disparity may exist between colleges despite the district still meeting its FON.

Qualitative factors should also be considered in establishing faculty hiring priorities. The identification of qualitative factors should involve consultation with discipline faculty and should be seen as a method to connect the hiring prioritization process to a college’s and district’s integrated planning processes, including program review. Qualitative factors to consider may include the following:

- The proposed job description.
- How the position would serve the needs of the discipline for which it is requested.
- Potential teaching load.
- The availability of qualified part-time faculty in the discipline.
representation of the staff with regard to gender, underrepresented group status, and other diversity metrics.

- Subjects and areas of the greatest strengths of the current staff and areas where additional expertise is required.

- Specific needs related to departments staffed by a single full-time faculty member or only part-time faculty members.

- Any legal mandates for a program, including state or federal mandates or requirements by external accreditation bodies (e.g. allied health programs).

- New programs that may require discipline faculty expertise.

In addition, colleges with a baccalaureate degree program will need to take into consideration the requirements for faculty in that area.

A college may also want to consider an analysis of projected needs within a specific discipline, where relevant. As such, the hiring prioritization process may allow for additional quantitative or qualitative factors that demonstrate these anticipated needs. Some possibilities to consider are an analysis of projected enrollment trends within the discipline based on employment trends or trends in transfer-level courses or developmental needs, additional requirements for student support, changing technology and the need to support the development of new skills, diversity needs for the department as well as the college or district, additional needs revealed by the district's strategic planning processes such as program review, forthcoming categorical funding requirements, and the district's educational master plan.

In developing or reviewing its hiring prioritization process, a local academic senate should consider creating a printed timeline for the process that includes submission deadlines, review by the academic senate, and submission to the president and board of trustees. Other possible aspects of such a timeline may involve the following:

- A request from the prioritizing body for hiring prioritization forms, soliciting the same information from all petitioning subject-areas and including clear connections to program review, outcomes assessment, and integrated planning and resource allocation procedures.

- Open discussion between the academic senate and administration regarding the merits of each petition.

- An agreed-upon procedure for forwarding recommendations to the college president or governing board.

- An agreed-upon procedure should the college choose to deviate from or alter the recommended priorities.

In this way, the hiring prioritization process is both predictable and transparent, while still maintaining flexibility on behalf of the district.
In addition, while the majority of current and future faculty staffing needs may be anticipated, some program needs may be unknown at the time of the hiring prioritization process and may therefore necessitate critical—sometimes also called emergency—hires. Unknown factors may include late or unanticipated retirements and resignations, vacancies of probationary faculty positions, unforeseen loss of adjunct faculty to other full-time positions, or unfilled positions needed to implement new or existing programs such as time-sensitive, grant-funded programs. Critical hires may also be a response to an immediate need for more course sections or expanded academic or student services due to program accreditation requirements, insufficient discipline adjunct pools, or other similar factors.

In all instances where critical hires are to be considered by a college, a corresponding procedure for the determination of eligible positions further contributes to the transparency of the overall hiring prioritization process. Therefore, colleges or districts are well-served to develop a separate and clear procedure for the determination and approval of critical hires, including a timeline, criteria for the request, validation of the necessity of such a hire, and similar matters. More on critical hiring processes can be found in the “Other Hiring” section of this paper.

At its core, any procedure for the determination of hiring priorities should involve the academic senate in consultation with subject-area or discipline faculty, college administration, and the board of trustees. The process should be as objective and data-informed as possible, allowing for the inclusion of quantitative and qualitative factors. The procedures should be timely and predictable, as clearly delineated, repeatable procedures are the best method to ensure the integrity and transparency of the hiring prioritization process for all involved parties.

The Formation of the Hiring Committee

District policies typically specify the composition of a hiring committee; however, academic senates should review these policies periodically to assure that they are providing the best opportunity to hire faculty experts that meet the needs of California’s diverse student population. In some districts, the collective bargaining unit also plays a role in the hiring process. In such cases, the collective bargaining unit must work with the academic senate to facilitate formation of an appropriate hiring committee.

Hiring committees should contain diverse membership to provide a variety of perspectives in selecting candidates, as per Title 5, §53024.

The composition and training of a hiring committee are very important, as the committee will make an impression on the interviewee that may be a factor in the decision of a candidate who receives multiple offers of employment. No committee should ever sacrifice discipline expertise for the sake of a more diverse committee makeup; however, if the discipline expertise does not supply significant diversity for the committee, then the college may wish to supplement the discipline faculty with additional faculty representatives who can provide greater diversity and differing perspectives.
The Role of Faculty on Faculty Hiring Committees

Faculty on hiring committees should be appointed or confirmed, according to local process, by the academic senate. Title 5 §53202 (f) states that “appointment of faculty members to serve on college or district committees, task forces, or other groups dealing with academic and professional matters, shall be made, after consultation with the chief executive officer or his or her designee, by the academic senate.” Local senates may choose to delegate the nominating process for these appointments to the disciplines involved or in some other manner; whatever the process, academic senate confirmations or appointments should be made in consultation with faculty from the discipline or subject areas, acknowledging the key role of department members in hiring into their own discipline and avoiding unnecessary tension between the roles of the department and the academic senate. The senate’s involvement provides assurance that procedures are being followed and thus affords a level of legitimacy that might otherwise be absent. In addition, the exercise of the academic senate’s role provides an opportunity for any concerns regarding the committee’s composition to surface and be resolved at the earliest stage of the hiring process.

As discipline experts, faculty play a key role in the hiring process. Depending on local practice, discipline faculty may be involved in writing the job description or in determining additional desirable or preferred qualifications and applicant screening criteria. Some districts may request faculty input regarding where to advertise a position or other matters involving recruitment efforts prior to the position closing. Faculty may also be involved in other aspects of the process prior to the actual interviews, including writing interview questions, determining possible scenarios for a teaching demonstration, suggesting additional measures within the interview process such as a hands-on demonstration for some programs, and other areas. Having a diverse committee composition ensures that many different perspectives are considered throughout these various aspects of the process so that the candidates that can best serve the diverse needs of students are more likely to be selected.

The Role of Administrators in Hiring Faculty

A number of administrators may play key roles in the hiring process, although the precise nature of administrative involvement will vary from district to district.

The area administrator, often a dean, may be the chair of the committee or may simply be a member. The position of the area administrator on the committee, including whether or not the administrator is a voting member, will be a matter of local policy, jointly agreed upon by the governing board and the academic senate and spelled out in district processes. In most district processes, the area administrator’s office will supply the committee with logistical support. Ideally, the area administrator, by virtue of service on a multiplicity of hiring committees, should have developed considerable expertise in all areas of the hiring process and should be a valuable resource to the committee. If the area administrator is not the chair, he or she should also work with the committee chair on various tasks, such as making reference checks on the finalists.

The chief human resources officer, or his or her designee, will review committee materials to ensure their conformity to state law and district policy and will serve as a resource to the committee on these matters. The chief human resources officer or his or her office may also be responsible for coordinating the advertisement of the position.
In some districts, a vice president or other senior administrator serves as the president’s designee in final interviews. The number of candidates selected for final interviews and the involvement of the committee with those interviews will be dependent on local processes. The selection of the applicant to be recommended to the board of trustees for hire is ultimately the responsibility of the college president or district chancellor.

**Training the Hiring Committee**

Once the hiring committee has been constructed, it must be trained in accordance with the district’s EEO plan (Title 5, §53003(c)(4)). This training should go far beyond the legal requirements of compliance with EEO standards to include anti-bias training on issues such as components of implicit bias. Meaningful training is essential if colleges are to make significant progress toward diversifying their faculty and is one of the multiple measures spelled out in the *Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Best Practices Handbook*. Furthermore, this training should take place before the job description is written in order to assure that a richly diverse applicant pool is obtained and that qualified applicants are not inadvertently screened out because of biases in the job description.

The role of the EEO representative on the committee is to monitor the process in order to ensure that process adheres to the principles in Education Code §87100(a)(3) “that all persons receive an equal opportunity to compete for employment and promotion within the community college districts and by eliminating barriers to equal employment opportunity.” All members of the committee must have EEO training; however, in an effort to increase diversity according to the district EEO plan, each committee should include one person whose primary function is to ensure that appropriate procedures are adhered to and that the EEO perspective is maintained throughout all of the committee’s deliberations. Thus, the EEO representative on the committee must receive specific anti-bias and compliance training according to the district’s EEO plan and must have access to the district’s EEO officer for advice and, if necessary, to report any perceived bias that cannot otherwise be resolved.

Because language often contains implicit bias, committee members must receive training on elimination of bias before construction of the job announcement. Furthermore, many potential candidates that meet or exceed minimum qualifications may have little familiarity with the California Community College System and cannot be presumed to be familiar with common terms and procedures used in the system. Therefore, the primary qualifications listed in the job description should be phrased clearly and plainly. The details of the application processes and the meaning of such terms as equivalency, as well as how it may be demonstrated, should be provided to potential applicants. District equivalency processes should be clearly spelled out and easily obtainable for interested applicants who might not meet the minimum qualifications as stated.

Confidentiality must also be a central part of hiring committee training. Committee members will generally be asked to agree that they understand that the work of the committee is done in strictest confidence and that the committee members should not communicate outside of committee discussions with each other or with others regarding any of the candidates, interviews, or committee conversations, both during the process and following its conclusion. While local processes may have slightly different procedures for training committee members on confidentiality, such information should be a part of every hiring committee training in the state.
Developing Objectives

Prior to engaging in the hiring process, the committee should begin by developing clear objectives. While colleges are generally very good about explaining the specific types of courses a new hire would be expected to teach and how the committee wants the candidate to appreciate the diversity of the students, clarity must also be provided regarding professional responsibilities, what it means to be part of the campus culture, and any other attributes, skills, or knowledge that would help to define an ideal candidate. This information will dictate the design of the entire hiring process, including job description, applicant screening criteria, interview questions, and applicant selection criteria.

The first things for a committee to discuss and determine are hiring objectives. Ideally, the discipline faculty or the department would meet and have a serious dialogue about who the new hire needs to be, both objectively and subjectively. Some issues to consider include what strengths the new hire needs to have, what particular challenges the new hire may face, and what perspectives might be needed in the department. The development of objectives should be the product of extensive dialogue, such that the entire committee, working from the recommendations of the discipline faculty, has a common understanding of what characteristics are desired in this new faculty member.

The Job Description

The next challenge for the committee is crafting the job announcement to capture the agreed-upon objectives. Aside from the college’s required information that is included in each faculty vacancy announcement, the discipline faculty, in consultation with other committee members, must determine what desired qualifications are expected from a candidate as well as the minimum qualifications the candidate would possess. To broaden the pool of applicants, the authors of the job description may wish to include as minimum requirements only the standard qualifications from the Board of Governors’ Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in the California Community Colleges, known colloquially as the Disciplines List.

The minimum qualifications as indicated in the Disciplines List simply allow an applicant to become part of a pool of candidates to be considered. A decision to raise the minimum qualifications should be made only after serious consideration, especially in disciplines that traditionally have a limited overall pool or a limited pool of diverse candidates. Depending on the position, however, more rigorous qualifications than stipulated by the Disciplines List may be desired. For example, if the new hire needs to have particular experience, have a license or certificate in a particular area, or be bilingual, these supplemental criteria could be included in the qualifications. Because raising the minimum qualifications often has the effect of limiting the applicant pool, doing so should only occur when the committee determines that additional qualifications are truly necessary to perform the duties in the job description. While constructing the job announcement, the authors should bear in mind that Title 5 §53022 requires that “[j]ob requirements shall include a sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, gender identity, sexual orientation, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students.”
After determining the minimum requirements, the committee can consider preferred or desirable qualifications. This second set of qualifications, as well as any minimum qualifications above those in the Disciplines List, should clearly connect to the agreed-upon hiring objectives. For example, committees commonly give preference to candidates with California community college teaching experience. Unless data indicates that candidates with California community college experience are significantly more successful in serving students than faculty with other backgrounds, such criteria should be avoided. Criteria such as these not only serve to limit the applicant pool but often have other unintended consequences, including limiting the diversity of candidates. For instance, many recent graduates with experience as graduate teaching assistants but no community college experience, including graduates of nearly all historically black colleges and universities and graduate degree-granting Hispanic serving institutions, would be disadvantaged if this type of preferred qualification were included. In addition, while the committee might be willing to consider candidates that do not possess all of the preferred qualifications, candidates may be dissuaded from applying if the preferred qualifications appear to be insurmountable. As an example, a potential candidate without a completed doctorate might not apply for a job in which one of the preferred qualifications was a PhD in the subject area.

Desirable or preferred qualifications can include but are not limited to the following:

- Academic qualifications beyond the minimum set by law and regulation if these qualifications would provide the basis for better teaching or other service.

- Measures of pedagogical skill such as evaluations of prior experience, education in pedagogy, or demonstrations of effectiveness as a teacher, counselor, librarian, or other faculty member.

- Specific preparation to offer instruction or other service narrower in scope than a discipline; for example, when hiring a faculty member to teach piano, a college would probably require not only the minimum qualifications to teach music but also specific qualifications to teach piano.

Committees should identify the desirable qualifications that, when teamed with the minimum qualifications, will result in an applicant that meets the characteristics of the ideal candidate. The previously determined objectives should emerge clearly from the job description developed. Committees should also seek the assistance of appropriate administrators to be certain that the job description conforms to relevant legal requirements, particularly those noted in Title 5 §53022.

Once the job description has been approved through local processes, other individuals or offices should not be allowed to subsequently add additional qualifications. In districts where this sort of intrusion is a problem, the academic senate should request of the governing board that hiring policies be revisited and should revise them to explicitly exclude such practice. Interference with established policies in an ongoing hiring process should be cause for immediate alarm and may be a basis for terminating the process. Academic senate presidents should be alerted to any such intrusion when it occurs.

Finally, the language of the job description should promote diversity and inclusivity. A job announcement should do more than state what the college is looking for in the position; it should also convince the applicant that the college is a desirable place to work. In order to attract a diverse body of candidates, the job announcement
should reflect the institution’s mission, priorities, and interest in inclusion and diversity. Colleges should look for every way possible to make all job announcement materials represent their institution’s commitment to all students and make them inviting to candidates of diverse backgrounds and perspectives. In addition, colleges should consider hiring as a means by which to foster a culture of diversity within the college community itself. By welcoming a greater diversity of applicants, candidates, and hires, a college has the potential to cultivate a more vibrant campus culture that may more accurately reflect the diversity that exists in the student population and within the community.

**Advertising and Recruiting**

At many colleges, the selection committee is involved in the development of advertising copy to ensure that the materials are clear in their intent, honest in their representations, and friendly to diverse populations. Because the job announcement is a recruitment tool, committee members may also include in the announcement and in other advertising copy information regarding the nature of their campus culture, the features of the campus and community that make it a vibrant and rewarding place to work, and the accomplishments or traditions of which they are particularly proud. Recruitment materials should communicate these positive images to potential applicants.

To develop a richly diverse pool of candidates, more will be required than posting the job opening in the California Community Colleges Registry or the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Ideally, the selection committee should work with the college or district human resources and EEO offices to identify additional avenues for reaching potential candidates. Some examples include the following:

- Targeting related-discipline departments at other colleges that have large populations of historically underrepresented groups.
- Working with national organizations that represent historically underrepresented groups to develop further postings.
- Working with local regional consortia, industry, and other organizations to promote teaching in the community college system to potential faculty in career technical fields.
- Advertising in a variety of locations that increase the likelihood of reaching the most diverse pool of potential candidates possible.
- Connecting with discipline specific organizations representing historically underrepresented groups.

Beyond electronic and print mechanisms, faculty should, if doing so is consistent with local practice, consider face-to-face opportunities at local or regional job fairs, educational placement fairs, or other such venues. While human resources officers often attend such efforts, the committee members themselves may make better salespeople, responding to particular questions about the discipline, the college expectations, and the joy of teaching at the local institution.
Initial Screening

At most campuses, the selection of candidates to be interviewed begins with a review of applications. Any questions regarding equivalency for candidates are to be resolved, according to Education Code §87359(b), using procedures “developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate.” Equivalency evaluations should be completed in a timely manner in order to ensure that all applicants are provided with equal opportunity to be interviewed or considered.

The screening process for minimum qualifications varies by district. In some districts, this screening is performed by the human resources office. However, a more effective practice involves discipline faculty determining whether a candidate meets minimum qualifications or might meet them through equivalency.

To have individuals other than discipline faculty complete the minimum qualifications evaluation could result in the loss of candidates whose qualifications would be evident to discipline faculty but perhaps not to those outside of the field.

The hiring committee should make every effort to ensure that review and selection procedures are free from bias and barriers in order to identify the best qualified candidates from diverse backgrounds. The following recommendations should be taken into consideration when evaluating applications:

- Assess ways that non-traditional or unconventional scholarship or research might contribute to the discipline, department, or college.

- Recognize that some individuals from underrepresented groups or other populations, such as those who were refugees, may have gaps in their education or might have taken longer to complete their coursework.

- Understand that many transferrable skills are acquired through alternative work or volunteer experiences and are no less valuable than more traditional pathways.

- Be sensitive to nonstandard ways in which applicants whose secondary language is English might utilize grammar, punctuation, word choice, and phrasing in the writing of cover letters and resumes.

The committee should have a screening instrument, or score sheet, which allows members to evaluate each applicant on the qualities listed in the job description. The responses on the screening instrument should be weighted to emphasize those qualities most relevant to the candidates’ performance of the work for which they will be hired. The scale for this evaluation should be agreed upon by the committee prior to the review of any applications in order to ensure that no bias enters into the process. Screening criteria should align with the minimum and preferred qualifications spelled out in the job description, although additional screening criteria, such as quality of application, can be included if the committee members agree and inclusion of such criteria reflects locally approved processes.

The committee should allot sufficient time for a full discussion of the members’ responses to candidates’ applications. This practice allows each individual member to process any thinking that might influence his or her perceptions of the applicants. Having an open and honest dialogue encourages members to ask questions...
about aspects of an applicant's background that they might not understand and creates an opportunity to reflect on any unconscious biases that might lead to the exclusion of qualified candidates from being interviewed.

Committee members should be encouraged to modify their scores in the light of insights gained through discussion, and at that point the scores might be given a major role in the selection of interviewees for the position. Because all of the documents used in the hiring process must be submitted as part of the legal record, committees may want to create a second rating sheet for this discussion phase on which they make notes and enter their sometimes revised scores. Both sets of scores, pre- and post-discussion, would then be submitted.

Once the decision as to who to interview has been made, the committee should establish a tentative interview schedule. At that time, both successful and unsuccessful applicants should be notified as soon as possible. The committee is unlikely to be responsible for notifying the candidates; however, this courtesy is extremely important, as any faculty member who remembers his or her own job applications will recall. The committee chair, if not responsible for this step of the process, should follow up with the responsible party to ensure that this courtesy has been rendered.

**Interview Process and Questions**

College and district policies regarding interview questions vary, with some colleges using a relatively standard set of questions for all interviews and other colleges allowing the discipline faculty or the hiring committees to determine their own questions. Some colleges may include a mixture of both: a set of pre-determined questions in addition to more specific, often discipline or pedagogically grounded, questions. The creation of the questions for the interviews should be done prior to the screening of applications in order to avoid any kind of bias in the questions themselves. If the committee is creating the questions, it may wish to seek out examples used in previous interviews for similar positions or from other sources, or the members may choose to create the questions collaboratively. The same questions should be asked of each candidate to ensure fairness, although some local processes allow for follow up questions or for clarification. The important aspect of the questioning process is that each candidate be treated in the same way and that no candidate be given either greater or lesser opportunities to make an impression than those extended to all other interviewees.

In the past, certain types of questions were standard in all interviews, most famously a so-called “diversity question” aimed at fulfilling Title 5 §53022; however, a more effective and useful practice is for committees to infuse qualifications such as diversity awareness or cultural competence into multiple questions rather than insulating those topics. Questions that require knowledge of a particular subject or terminology that is not a necessity for the position, such as familiarity with nomenclature commonly used in the California community colleges, may screen out otherwise qualified candidates and prevent them from being considered for a second or final interview, potentially impacting the overall diversity of the group being sent forward. Committees should consider carefully these types of questions before agreeing to include them; for example, in most cases a candidate for a faculty position would not need to know what Title 5 is or says. In order to ensure an equitable opportunity for all candidates, the committee should make every effort to ensure consistency and fairness in the development of all questions used in the interview.
Most faculty hiring processes require a teaching demonstration of some sort, and the committee should therefore also consider the question or questions for the teaching demonstration and the expectations of the candidates. Interviewees should be informed in advance of how much time they will have for their presentations so that they can prepare an appropriate demonstration within the allowed time constraints. Candidates also should be informed in advance if they will be allowed to use technology and what the expectations will be, such as if they will be required to bring their own computers, if internet access will be available for the candidates to use cloud-based documents, and whether they should bring sample syllabi or assessments.

In addition, committees should consider what kind of teaching demonstration they want to ask the candidates to provide. While in the past the standard demonstration often involved a lecture, pedagogical changes have led to many teaching styles involving flipped classes or having more interactive components, and therefore committees should be clear regarding what their expectations are in terms of the demonstration. For example, if the committee is instructed not to engage with the candidate and the candidate is not made aware of this instruction, the candidate might unknowingly prepare an interactive presentation and may not understand why the committee is not cooperating. Given the stressful nature of interviews, ensuring that the candidate is aware of what is expected ahead of time will be very helpful in allowing the candidate to make the best impression of which he or she is capable.

The committee may also want to consider whether or not to allow nontraditional interviews, such as online or video interviews, for the first round of the process. Because some colleges may not have the budget to reimburse candidates’ travel expenses to come to the campus for interviews, the cost associated with interviewing may preclude some potential candidates from participating in the process. Colleges in remote locations may be especially interested in considering the benefits of alternative interview options. Such allowances may enable colleges to reach a more diverse group of candidates. While some committee members may fall into the mindset of “if they want the job, they’ll get here,” colleges will benefit from making an effort to interview the candidates that they believe will be the best faculty hires, not simply the candidates who can afford transportation to the campus.

Selecting the Finalists

The selection of finalists for a position can be a stressful proposition for a committee, particularly if a divide exists among the members regarding whom the strongest candidates may be. Committees often fall into the trap of focusing on the way an applicant would fit in with the department, and while a potential hire should indeed be collegial and able to work with others, the needs and interests of students in the program for which the faculty member is being sought must also be considered. A committee should also be cognizant of the implicit bias that can exist when interviewing candidates whose experiences or educational paths may be different from those of the committee members. Relatively new graduates might be more interested in different forms of assessment than those traditionally used in a discipline; such a difference should not automatically preclude these candidates from consideration. The committee should consider a wide range of criteria when determining whom to recommend for final interviews, including the diversification of the department, growth and development of new curriculum, and the overall needs of the students and the college.
Different colleges and college presidents have a varied range of expectations and processes regarding the selection of finalists. At some colleges, the committee members are charged with sending forward only candidates that they are enthusiastic about, even if that means forwarding only one candidate or even no candidates. At other colleges, a minimum number of finalists is expected, and in some cases, a maximum number exists as well. A committee should recognize that in this former case, a failed search might be a more preferable outcome than sending forward unsuitable candidates simply to fulfill a requirement for an expected number of finalists. In addition, while limiting the number of finalists may make sense due to the constraints of a presidential schedule, such limits might also exclude a candidate that could be the best choice for the position.

**Finalist Interviews**

Colleges have a variety of processes for final interviews. In some cases, only the college president, the EEO representative, and the chair of the hiring committee are present in the interviews. At other colleges, the entire committee, or available members of the committee, may be part of the final interview, while in other cases only the president and other administrators are present. Some colleges require a teaching demonstration in the final interview, while others do not. Some presidents prefer a more casual approach to the final interview, almost in the form of a conversation, while others prefer a more traditional scripted interview format. Whichever process a college has chosen to follow, the president must be confident in the candidates that the committee has recommended, and the committee representatives must be able to articulate the reasons that the recommended candidates have been given the opportunity for a final interview. Committees must be able to be honest with a president or with his or her designee regarding the reasons that certain finalists were recommended and others were not, which is why the confidentiality of the processes is essential for all members.

Colleges may also want to consider scheduling alternatives for final interviews. For example, if a college requires that candidates physically travel to the campus for a first interview, the committee may want to schedule the final interviews as close to the first interview as possible so that candidates that are granted a second interview do not have to travel twice, especially if a college is not near an airport or is more remote. Alternatively, giving candidates several weeks to make travel arrangements might result in less expensive plane tickets depending on the destination. These kinds of considerations can assist in the diversification of pools and in bringing greater diversity to a college.

**What Happens If a Search Fails?**

Sometimes, despite the best efforts of a committee, a search fails. A failed search may occur due to a lack of diversity in the pool, an absence of qualified candidates, or other reasons beyond the control of the committee, such as budget cuts or all of the finalists accepting jobs elsewhere. If a search fails, local processes should be followed to determine whether the pool can be reexamined, new candidates can be considered, or other actions can be taken. For example, if a position is posted as “open until filled,” local processes might allow the committee to review all applications that have been submitted since the original closing date.
If a search is deemed to have failed, the committee may want to review the reasons for the failure and determine whether means can be explored by which to avoid these issues in future searches. For example, the search may have been conducted late in the year when the applicant pool was already limited, or similar searches may have been underway at nearby colleges, which might have impacted the overall quantity of applicants. For some colleges, external factors may play a role; for example, if a college is located in an area where costs of living are particularly high, candidates may be hesitant to take a job knowing that affordable housing would be difficult to find. While a committee may be able to do little to mitigate many external factors, the committee might consider ways to communicate these factors to the candidates prior to final interviews in order to ensure that candidates are aware of what to expect.

**Other Hiring Processes: Part-Time Hiring**

One of the myths about the California community college faculty ranks is that the part-time faculty in the system are more diverse than their full-time counterparts. Recent information from the CCC Chancellor’s Office has demonstrated that this belief is not accurate; however, part-time faculty play an essential role at community colleges and can be the first faculty members that students encounter when beginning at a college. For that reason, the hiring of part-time faculty must be done with rigor akin to that found in the hiring of full-time faculty.

Processes for hiring part-time faculty vary across districts, colleges, and even divisions and departments within an institution. Some colleges have set practices regarding the hiring of part-time faculty, including set interview questions, while others are more casual in their approach. Some colleges require a teaching demonstration, while others do not. While no single effective practice is universal regarding hiring of part-time faculty, consistent policies should be established and followed.

In a multi-college district, an equivalency granted at one college would also be valid at the other colleges in the district, so if a part-time faculty member were granted equivalency and then became full-time, that equivalency could potentially carry implications for the other district colleges in the case of a reduction in force or other action. Because of the variations in some disciplines, especially in areas such as art, physical education, and career technical fields, equivalency should be considered carefully when hiring an individual who does not meet the established minimum qualifications for the particular discipline. For more information on equivalencies, see the ASCCC paper *Equivalency to the Minimum Qualifications* (2016).

**Other Hiring Processes: Full-Time Temporary Replacement Faculty**

In some cases, a college may choose to hire a full-time temporary replacement faculty member, such as to substitute for someone on parental leave, to fill a critical function in place of someone who takes a leave of absence, or in other situations calling for a short-term, full-time faculty replacement. These positions often have no processes established for filling them, and therefore local academic senates should consider discussing processes prior to their colleges requesting temporary hires. The hiring of full-time temporary faculty can be viewed as another opportunity to diversify the workforce at the college.
Other Hiring Processes: Critical or Emergency Hiring of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty

Whenever possible, a college should use its regular procedures and timelines for the hiring of full-time and part-time faculty. However, in some instances the need to hire additional faculty falls outside of predictable norms and calendars needed for regular hiring practices to occur. For this reason, hiring procedures should take into account the need for emergency or critical hires for both full-time and part-time faculty members, including what conditions should trigger the process, as well as providing timelines and requirements feasible within shorter time periods.

Emergency hires typically occur when regular hiring procedures are impacted by restrictive timelines due to unanticipated vacancies close to the beginning of a term. Often, these vacancies can mean unstaffed but populated sections of courses. As such, emergency hires may be necessary to serve students, disciplines or departments, and colleges. Some criteria to consider prior to initiating an emergency hiring procedure might include the following:

- The number of viable or populated course sections without an instructor and any impact on student completion and success that would indicate a clear need for additional faculty.
- Whether the vacancy is deemed essential for the viability of the program.
- Whether the vacancy is essential for purposes of accreditation, including external accrediting bodies.
- The amount of time for staffing remaining prior to the term of the identified need.

Generally, for emergency situations, the hiring of part-time faculty is preferable in the absence of specific and compelling circumstances to justify an emergency full-time hire. If, after filling the immediate need with part-time replacements, a full-time faculty member is needed for the long term, the subject area faculty may participate in the next round of considerations for hiring prioritization. If the emergency hiring of a full-time faculty member is necessary, the position should be a full-time temporary position, with the term of service clearly identified, in order to allow this position to be reconsidered at the time of normal hiring prioritization considerations. In all cases, emergency part-time and full-time hires should be required to interview per the college’s regular hiring procedures within a reasonable timeframe after the date of the emergency hire. Emergency hiring procedures should not be used as a method to grow enrollment and college apportionment.

A college or district may choose to have different emergency hire procedures, depending on how much time is available between when the need is identified and when the term begins. For example, a college may choose to identify one streamlined process if fewer than twenty days but more than seven remain before the term and another more truncated process should the number of days be fewer than seven. In these cases, the local academic senate, in joint agreement with administration, should identify what works best for its college, as Education Code does not differentiate between regular hires and emergency hires when mandating consultation with the academic senate. Some items to consider when developing emergency hiring procedures might include the following:
• How a shorter timeline could impact the membership of the hiring committee, especially if hires are to occur during summer or winter breaks when most faculty are off-campus.

• How the membership of the committee is to be selected, including academic senate confirmation, given the potentially compressed timeline.

• How interview materials are to be reviewed, as well as the development of interview questions, teaching demonstrations, and other materials required for interviews.

• Changes to timelines and expectations for reference checks.

• The viability of additional interviews.

**Beyond Hiring: Mentoring and Retaining New Faculty**

The hiring of a new full-time faculty member is a lengthy and time-consuming process that can involve significant expense to the college, including the need for substitutes for faculty that are sitting on committees, clerical and other support from the administration, and similar costs. While a failed search is frustrating, perhaps even worse is hiring a faculty member and then having that new hire leave after a year or two at the college.

In some cases, the departure of a new hire is due to circumstances beyond the control of the college, such as a spousal deployment or other family matter that precludes the new hire from remaining. However, sometimes new hires leave because they do not feel that they have truly found a meaningful or comfortable place at their colleges. Mentoring new faculty is an essential part of the process of retaining new hires, and it is an element in which the faculty should be leaders. Mentoring is outside of the prescribed role of the tenure committee and therefore may be difficult at a college with a limited number of permanent full-time faculty. However, as such mentoring may be one of the most important means by which to retain new hires, colleges should do what they can to provide newly hired faculty with guidance and assistance in navigating a new college system in order to make them comfortable at the college and therefore more comfortable with their positions and their students.

Many colleges have established programs for first-year mentorship that bring together all of the new full-time hires for regular gatherings to discuss college culture, express concerns or frustrations, and receive information that might not be apparent outside of the tenure process. Creating a cohort for the new faculty benefits the new hires, as they see that their experiences are shared and that they are not alone, and it provides the opportunity for the new faculty to interact with senior faculty that they might not otherwise have the chance to meet.

A model mentoring program, from Sacramento City College, is provided in the appendices of this paper and includes a variety of ideas regarding mentoring new faculty. Other programs, such as the one at Foothill College, bring new full-time hires together weekly throughout their first year to allow them to hear from a wide range of guest speakers on a variety of topics from student services at the college to various forms of assessment. These types of programs provide the new faculty with a sense of community and may be the first line of defense against losing a new faculty member.
Beyond Hiring: Consideration of Administrative Retreat Rights

An additional factor that may impact a district’s hiring procedures, including hiring prioritization, as well as the district’s faculty obligation number is administrative retreat rights. Per Education Code §87454 and §87458, under two specific conditions a current administrator may invoke retreat rights to become a faculty member at his or her college, whether as previously tenured faculty or as a new faculty member who has not previously received tenure within the district.

The first condition applies if the administrator was previously a tenured faculty member within the same district and has been continuously employed by that same district. In this instance, the administrator may invoke retreat rights and, in so doing, retain status as a tenured faculty member at that institution. Faculty tend to be aware and supportive of this first condition, as it requires that the retreating administrator navigated successfully the college’s hiring and tenure processes prior to assuming an administrative role.

However, the second condition allows for retreat rights of an administrator who has not undergone the college’s hiring processes for faculty, thereby disallowing discipline faculty the opportunity to participate in the hiring of a tenure-track peer. Per Education Code §87458, “a person employed in an administrative position that is not part of classified service, whose first day of paid service as a faculty member or administrator is on or after July 1, 1990, who has not previously acquired tenured status as a faculty member in the same district, and who is not under contract in a program or project to perform services conducted under contract with public or private agencies, or in other categorically funded projects of indeterminate duration” does have the right to become a first-year probationary, or tenure-track, faculty member once the administrative assignment expires presuming all of the following criteria are met:

1. In mutual agreement with the academic senate, procedure is followed to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate to determine that the administrator possesses the minimum qualifications for employment as a faculty member in the appropriate discipline;

2. In mutual agreement with the academic senate, procedure is followed to provide the academic senate with an opportunity to present its views to the governing board before the board makes a determination, and the written record of the board’s decision, including the views of the academic senate, is made available for review pursuant to Education Code §87358;

3. The administrator has completed at least two years of satisfactory service in the district, including any time previously served as a faculty member;

4. The termination of the administrative assignment is for any reason other than dismissal for cause; and

5. A first-year, probationary faculty position is available to which the administrator may retreat.
If no currently identified first-year probationary faculty position exists to which the requesting administrator could be appointed at the time of termination, the college is not required to grant the retreat request of the administrator. While this second condition is less commonly exercised, should it occur, the situation may invoke feelings of disenfranchisement for discipline faculty who are appropriately accustomed to having an active voice in the hiring process.

The absence of local procedural language that captures the above requirements can allow a district to follow pre-existing procedures if such procedures exist, tacitly empowering the district with greater latitude for decision-making that may or may not include its academic senate. Therefore, academic senates should be aware of the conditions of each scenario, and colleges should develop corresponding procedural language by mutual agreement prior to any discussion of a previously untenured administrator seeking retreat rights. In this way, academic senates have the opportunity to participate in the development of appropriate procedures without the added weight of faculty discord or feelings of administrative overreach into the hiring and tenure processes.

For these reasons, local academic senates should work with their colleges to mutually agree upon procedures to accommodate each of these conditions and criteria. Development of a procedure should include a timeline for the district to communicate in writing the intent of the non-tenured administrator to invoke retreat rights. Where possible, the timeline should correspond to the ranking of faculty hiring priorities. Moreover, any timeline should be reasonable enough to allow for the senate to provide feedback, ideally prior to the issuance of March 15th notifications, to assure the senate that its feedback is to be considered.

As a part of the retreat request, the district should provide evidence that the administrator meets all of the conditions as required by Education Code §87458. The academic senate should be allowed to review the qualifications of the administrator to ensure they align with the most current edition of Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges. The procedure may also allow the review of the minimum qualifications to include a faculty member from the identified discipline. Best practice would also suggest that the academic senate be provided with the proposed job description to be assumed by the administrator. Where the identified position requires specific expertise, reasonable assurance that the administrator can fulfill assigned faculty duties should be provided by the district.

Based on the information provided, the academic senate should communicate its recommendations to the college president or the governing board. To best equip the academic senate, any procedure to accommodate an administrative retreat request might consider the development of an impact report, as such an appointment will likely have measurable impacts on the hiring prioritization process as well as impacts on subsequent quantitative and qualitative measurements of the affected subject area. In its assessment, the academic senate may also choose to consider additional impact on current full-time and adjunct faculty, the potential for other full-time hires in areas where the need is greater, the fiscal sustainability of the position, any impact on the diversity of teaching faculty, and any potential impact on student success.

When the governing board takes action either to approve or not approve the administrator’s retreat request, the board or its designee must provide to the academic senate in writing an explanation of action taken by the board, with reference to the written record of the decision including the views of the academic senate, pursuant to Education Code §87458.

---

**Recommendations for Hiring Processes and Procedures**

1. All campus personnel involved in hiring should be familiar with the CCCCO’s *Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Best Practices Handbook* (2016) and any subsequent updates from the Chancellor’s Office regarding the requirements for use of the EEO measures while hiring.

2. Processes and procedures within colleges and districts should be as consistent as possible and should involve the academic senate in the development and implementation of those processes and procedures, as required by Education Code.

3. Faculty should consider a variety of options in hiring both full-time and part-time faculty in an attempt to diversify the faculty ranks at their colleges. For specific suggestions, see the *Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Best Practices Handbook* (2016).

4. In accordance with local policies, hiring committees should be actively involved in as many aspects of faculty hiring as possible, from the creation of the job description to the forwarding of finalists. If committees are not involved in all areas of the hiring process, consideration should be brought to the local academic senate to discuss these processes and determine whether changes should be suggested.

5. Processes for hiring part-time faculty should, to the greatest extent possible, mirror the processes for hiring full-time faculty and should, ideally, be as consistent as possible.

6. Committees should be familiar with the role of equivalency and should exercise caution when recommending equivalency while also recognizing that the granting of equivalency in some cases may result in a more diverse pool of applicants. Equivalency information should be made clear to applicants through information included in the college’s application as well as in the job announcement.

7. Local academic senates and faculty should be involved in the district or college Equal Opportunity Committee and any other shared governance groups that are involved in hiring processes for faculty.

**Conclusion**

The hiring of faculty, both full-time and part-time, is at the heart of the success of the California Community College System and the ultimate success of its students. The involvement of faculty, through the academic senate and hiring committees, is essential to ensuring the strength of the faculty hired at colleges in all positions. As colleges move forward with hiring a new group of faculty, the needs of students should be at the forefront of each hiring decision, and the diversification of the faculty ranks can only serve to benefit students and the colleges that serve them. While hiring processes can be time consuming, they are among the most crucial roles that faculty take on beyond their responsibilities as teachers, counselors, librarians, and coaches. The conclusion of the Fall 2000 paper quoted the great philosopher Baruch Spinoza’s *Ethics*, and the quote rings as true for this paper as it did for the one adopted in 2000: “All things worthwhile are as difficult as they are rare.” The hiring of faculty may be difficult, but it is a worthwhile endeavor that will serve to benefit the students in the California Community College System.
APPENDICES

THE FOLLOWING APPENDICES INCLUDE TWO SETS OF INFORMATION. APPENDIX A IS THE DISTRICT CERTIFICATION FORM REGARDING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FUNDING REQUIREMENTS, CERTIFYING THAT MULTIPLE METHODS ARE BEING USED BY THE COLLEGE OR DISTRICT. APPENDIX B CONTAINS SPECIFIC DISTRICT AND COLLEGE EXAMPLES OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICES AND DOCUMENTS IN HIRING, INCLUDING EMERGENCY HIRES AND MENTORING PROGRAMS.
Appendix A: Equal Employment Opportunity Fund
Multiple Method Allocation Model Certification Form, Fiscal Year 2017-2018

District Name: ____________________________________________________________

DOES THE DISTRICT MEET METHOD #1 (DISTRICT HAS EEO ADVISORY COMMITTEE, EEO PLAN, AND SUBMITTED EXPENDITURE/PERFORMANCE REPORTS FOR PRIOR YEAR) (ALL MANDATORY FOR FUNDING).

☐ Yes

☐ No

The district met at least 6 of the remaining 8 Multiple Methods? (Please mark your answers.)

☐ Yes

☐ Method 2 (Board policies and adopted resolutions)

☐ Method 3 (Incentives for hard-to-hire areas/disciplines)

☐ Method 4 (Focused outreach and publications)

☐ Method 5 (Procedures for addressing diversity throughout hiring steps and levels)

☐ Method 6 (Consistent and ongoing training for hiring committees)

☐ Method 7 (Professional development focused on diversity)

☐ Method 8 (Diversity incorporated into criteria for employee evaluation and tenure review)

☐ Method 9 (Grow-Your-Own programs)

☐ No

I CERTIFY THAT THIS REPORT FORM IS COMPLETE AND ACCURATE. Please attach meeting agenda showing district EEO Advisory Committee’s certification of this report form.

Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee

Name: ____________________________________________________________

Title: ____________________________________________________________
This form requires districts to report the various activities that they are implementing to promote Equal Employment Opportunity for each of the 9 Multiple Methods.

When providing explanation(s) and evidence of your district's success in implementing the Multiple Methods, please keep narrative to no more than one page per Multiple Method. If you reference an attachment, please ensure it is attached to your submittal.

NINE (9) MULTIPLE METHODS

Mandatory for Funding

1. District's EEO Advisory Committee, EEO Plan, and submittal of Expenditure/Performance reports for prior year.

Pre-Hiring

2. Board policies & adopted resolutions

3. Incentives for hard-to-hire areas/disciplines
4. Focused outreach and publications

**Hiring**

5. Procedures for addressing diversity throughout hiring steps and levels

6. Consistent and ongoing training for hiring committees

**Post-Hiring**

7. Professional development focused on diversity

8. Diversity incorporated into criteria for employee evaluation and tenure review

9. Grow-Your-Own programs

**DOES DISTRICT MEET MULTIPLE METHOD #1 (DISTRICT HAS EEO ADVISORY COMMITTEE, EEO PLAN, AND SUBMITTED EXPENDITURE/PERFORMANCE REPORTS FOR PRIOR YEAR)?**

□ Yes

□ No

Under the Multiple Method allocation model, districts must minimally have an operational district EEO Advisory Committee, and an updated EEO Plan. Additionally, districts are required to annually report on the use of EEO funds.

- In order to qualify for receipt of the EEO Fund, districts are required to submit a board-adopted EEO plan every three years to the Chancellor's Office. (Title 5, section 53003).

- EEO Plans are considered active for three years from the date of when the district's Board of Trustees approved the plan.

- The districts are required to establish an EEO Advisory Committee to assist in the development and implementation of the EEO Plan. (Title 5, section 53005).

- The districts are required to annually submit a report on the use of Equal Employment Opportunity funds. (Title 5, section 53034).

Please provide an explanation and evidence of meeting this Multiple Method, #1.

To receive funding for this year’s allocation amount, districts are also required to meet 6 of the remaining 8 Multiple Methods.
DOES THE DISTRICT MEET METHOD #2 (BOARD POLICIES AND ADOPTED RESOLUTIONS)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Please provide an explanation and evidence of meeting this Multiple Method, #2.

DOES THE DISTRICT MEET METHOD #3 (INCENTIVES FOR HARD-TO-HIRE AREAS/DISCIPLINES)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Please provide an explanation and evidence of meeting this Multiple Method, #3.

DOES THE DISTRICT MEET METHOD #4 (FOCUSED OUTREACH AND PUBLICATIONS)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Please provide an explanation and evidence of meeting this Multiple Method, #4.

DOES THE DISTRICT MEET METHOD #5 (PROCEDURES FOR ADDRESSING DIVERSITY THROUGHOUT HIRING STEPS AND LEVELS)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Please provide an explanation and evidence of meeting this Multiple Method, #5.

DOES THE DISTRICT MEET METHOD #6 (CONSISTENT AND ONGOING TRAINING FOR HIRING COMMITTEES)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Please provide an explanation and evidence of meeting this Multiple Method, #6.

DOES THE DISTRICT MEET METHOD #7 (PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOCUSED ON DIVERSITY)?

☐ Yes

☐ No
Please provide an explanation and evidence of meeting this Multiple Method, #7.

DOES THE DISTRICT MEET METHOD #8 (DIVERSITY INCORPORATED INTO CRITERIA FOR EMPLOYEE EVALUATION AND TENURE REVIEW)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Please provide an explanation and evidence of meeting this Multiple Method, #8.

DOES THE DISTRICT MEET METHOD #9 (GROW-YOUR-OWN PROGRAMS)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Please provide an explanation and evidence of meeting this Multiple Method, #9.
Appendix B: Examples of Effective Practices Related to Hiring Processes

SAMPLE HIRING PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES

Faculty Hiring Manual – Lassen Community College

Equity Handbook for Hiring – Los Rios Community College District
http://www.losrios.edu/hr/Equity%20Hiring%20Handbook%20Final%20Version%202015(3.16.2015).pdf

Faculty Hiring Manual – Solano Community College (2017)
http://www.solano.edu/academic_senate/1617/SCC%20Hiring%20Guidelinesdraft41217_MW%2041217.pdf

Specific Highlights from the Above Documents:

Part-time Faculty Hiring Procedures – Lassen College

1. At least once each semester, anticipated new part-time teaching positions will be advertised. Applications for part-time teaching positions may be submitted at any time to the Office of Human Resources.

2. The applications will be forwarded to the Minimum Qualification/ Equivalency Committee chair for minimum qualification and/or equivalency review according to the approved policy and procedures. All applications meeting minimum qualifications will be placed in the Part-Time Faculty Applicant Pool.

3. The Division Chairs or Dean of Academic Services will recommend a part time faculty position to be hired from the Part-Time Faculty Applicant Pool. The Office of Human Resources will be notified when a position will be offered and will complete the employment processes prior to the part-time faculty applicant being placed in the schedule.

4. Coaching positions will undergo a screening/interview process similar to the procedures for hiring permanent positions. Coach committees will be comprised of a coach and a faculty member appointed by the Academic Senate, the Athletic Director, and an educational administrator or representative from Academic Services. By consensus, the Committee will agree upon candidates to invite to an interview. The Committee will present up to three candidates for selection by the President or Dean of Academic Services.

5. Full-time temporary positions will undergo a screening/interview process similar to the procedures for hiring permanent positions. Committees for full-time temporary positions will be comprised of a division chair and a faculty member from the discipline appointed by the Academic Senate, and an educational administrator from the Academic Services. By consensus, the Committee will agree upon candidates to invite to an interview. The Committee will present up to three candidates for selection by the President or Dean of Academic Services.
CCR, Title 5, Section 53021 “Recruitment for part-time faculty positions may be conducted separately for each new opening or by annually establishing a pool of eligible candidates, but in either case full and open recruitment is required consistent with this section.”

Hiring Practices — Los Rios Community College District

About Adjunct Pools: Los Rios Community College District recruits adjunct professors year-round. Applicants may apply to adjunct pools at any time. Applications are sent to campus when adjunct positions become available and are requested by the campus. Since, adjunct pools are on-going, emails reminding applicants to update their information are sent once a year.

About Temporary Pools: This pool of applicants is used by various departments throughout our district to search for applicants interested in working temporarily. Assignments may vary in length and hours of the day, up to 110 days per fiscal year per California Education Code. Temporary pools are generally open for six months. To keep pools up-to-date after six months the Human Resources Department will close the pool and send emails to applicants. Applicants that wish to still be considered will be instructed to re-apply to a NEW posting number.

- Human Resources reviews the diversity of applicant and interview pools for each position/recruitment, and takes appropriate measures if/when concerns occur. Applicant and employee demographics are reviewed annually with the Board of Trustees (Attached are District’s EEO Plan Analysis of Applicant Pools, Plan Component 10: Analysis of District Workforce and Applicant Pool, and P-5121 providing for steps/review for ensuring diversity in hiring). Per the District’s EEO Plan and Board Regulations/Policies on Hiring Committees (R-5121 and R-5122 attached) each hiring committee member is required to receive required Title 5 Hire Committee training and each committee must include a trained Equity Representative.

- Each classified, faculty and management Los Rios CCD job application (attached) includes a section for applicants to address their experience/background related to diversity and cultural competence.

- Every Los Rios job description across all classifications includes the requirement that the individual demonstrate sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, gender identity, sexual orientation and ethnic backgrounds of community college students (current job advertisements attached).

- The Los Rios CCD Faculty Hiring Manual requires hire committees to include screening and interview criteria on a candidate’s ability/experience with diversity. (Faculty Hiring Manual – Sections VI – A, VI – B, and VII – A).

- All classified, faculty and managerial interviews include at least one question pertaining to diversity. (samples attached).

- Per the Equity Manual on Hiring, applicant pools may not be released for review by hiring committees until both the screening criteria and interview questions have been finalized.
Upon a recommendation for hire, the Equity Representative completes an EEO Checklist (attached), which addresses the District’s commitment to equity, fairness and inclusion/diversity.

**Special Hiring Situations — Lassen Community College**

A. Emergency hiring may be conducted when time factors, special issues, or business necessity warrant immediate appointments as determined by the Superintendent/President.

i. Emergency hiring may be conducted to fill a short-term “classified” position for no more than sixty (60) days to allow for full and open recruitment.

ii. Emergency hiring may be conducted to fill a part-time teaching assignment for up to one semester.

iii. Interim appointment for administrative and managerial assignments may be made for up to one year to fill a vacancy or a new position. When a regular faculty member is appointed to an interim assignment, procedures in Section 7 of the LCF contract will apply.

B. In-house or promotion only hiring

i. In-house hiring is permitted when it has been determined that no new position has been created according to Title V regulations.

Whenever in-house or promotion only hiring is permitted by law, all qualified internal candidates will be given an opportunity to apply. Qualified internal candidates are regular employees.

Procedures for classified in-house hiring are in the classified union contract.

**Administrative Retreat Rights — Solano Community College District**

Per EDC 87454 and 87458, there are two conditions wherein a current administrator may invoke retreat rights to faculty:

- Any tenured employee, when assigned from a faculty position, or assigned and special or other type of work, or given special classification or designation, shall retain status as a tenured faculty member.

- A person employed in an administrative position that is not part of classified service, whose first day of paid service as a faculty member or administrator is on or after July 1, 1990, who has not previously acquired tenured status as a faculty member in the same district, and who is not under contract in a program or project to perform services conducted under contract with public or private agencies, or in other categorically funded projects of indeterminate duration, shall have the right to become a first-year probationary faculty member once the administrative assignment expires or is terminated, if all of the following conditions apply:
• In mutual agreement with the senate, procedure is followed to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate to determine that the administrator possesses the minimum qualifications for employment as a faculty member.

• In mutual agreement with the senate, procedure is followed to provide the academic senate with an opportunity to present its views to the governing board before the board makes a determination and that the written record of the decision, including the views of the academic senate, shall be available for review pursuant to EDC 87358.

• The administrator has completed at least two years of satisfactory service, including any time previously served as a faculty member, in the district.

• The termination of the administrative assignment is for any reason other than dismissal for cause.

• There is an identified, first-year, probationary faculty position available to which the administrator may retreat, as, if there is no currently identified first-year probationary faculty position to which the requesting administrator could be appointed at the time of termination, the College is not required to grant the request of the administrator. (Ref. Wong vs. Ohlone College, No. A109823, 28 March, 2006.)

Procedures for Retreat Rights for Administrators Not Previously Tenured by the District:

• The Superintendent-President or the Vice-President of Human Resources will communicate to the Academic Senate President the intent of the administrator to retreat to a faculty position, as well as evidence that the administrator meets required conditions, when possible, this communication should occur as soon as possible and no later than the end of February of the current academic year to allow for timely input, including at least two bi-monthly meetings of the academic senate, prior to the issuance of March 15th notifications. The proposed job description of the teaching position will be provided as well. Where possible, these procedures should parallel the agreed upon timeline for the ranking of faculty hiring priorities.

• As soon as possible, the Vice-President of Human Resources shall arrange for the Academic Senate President to review the minimum qualifications of the administrator to ensure the qualifications of the administrator align with the most recent iteration of the “Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges,” adopted by the Board of Governors in consultation with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The Academic Senate President may also include an appointee from the identified discipline in the consultation process. Where the identified position requires specific expertise, reasonable assurance the administrator can fulfill assigned faculty duties should be provided by the district. Should the identified administrator not meet the minimum qualifications, there is no equivalency process.

• Once minimum qualifications have been verified, the district, in consultation with the affected discipline and its academic dean, shall provide to the academic senate a revised job description, if relevant, as well as quantitative and qualitative data per the Department Profile and Summary of Projected Need form as outlined in section II.1 of this document.
• The completed Department Profile and Summary of Projected Need form will be provided to the Academic Senate and placed on the agenda by its president as soon as possible for information and discussion.

• The Academic Senate shall base its recommendations to the Board of Trustee using the same criteria it considers in discussing all hiring prioritizations. In addition, the senate shall consider the impact of the position on current adjunct faculty, the potential for other full-time hires in areas where the need is greater, the fiscal sustainability of the position, any impact on the diversity of teaching faculty, and any potential impact on student success.

• At the following meeting, or as soon as possible, the Academic Senate will take action to direct its president to communicate in writing its recommendations to the governing board. The Academic Senate President may also choose to speak to the item at a meeting of the Board of Trustee.

• The Superintendent-President will provide to the Academic Senate an explanation of action taken by the board in writing, to include reference to the written record of the decision, including the views of the Academic Senate, pursuant to EDC 87358.

**Mentoring Expectations and Practices – Sacramento City College**

• Meet with the mentee several times throughout the first semester

• Share his or her syllabi, and, if possible, copies of syllabi prepared by other faculty.

• Introduce the mentee to colleagues and staff within the department, the division, and at the college.

• Orient the mentee to routine college procedures such as textbook requisition, supply requisition, travel authorizations, forms (e.g., flex obligation form and course availability), duplication requests, parking permits, and key requests.

• Serve as a resource to explain departmental, division, and college practices, culture, and procedures.

• Include the mentee in formal and informal social activities of the department, division, and college.

• Provide assistance in learning new teaching techniques, presentation materials, student involvement.

• Introduce the mentee to the location of important instructional support services.

• Orient the mentees to the location of services available to assist students (transfer center, tutoring services, career center, assessment center, learning disabilities center, and others)

• Help mentee solve problems (curriculum, instruction, or relationships).

• Be accessible, trustworthy, and understanding.

• Visit the mentee's class relatively often and give feedback.
• Encourage mentee to observe the teaching of other faculty.

• Give assistance if grievance issues arise. (See Dean, and or Office of Instruction, Equity Office.)

• Demonstrate professional competence.

• Help new faculty find ways to manage the administrative details of teaching

• Provide information to faculty, including directing them to the “Faculty How To” page at https://www.scc.losrios.edu/facultyhowto/

**Faculty Mentoring Practices at American River College:**
www.arc.losrios.edu/Documents/CTL/facmentor.pdf
Existing Criteria for Ranking Faculty Position Requests, Developed by Division Chairs and IAR&P, Adopted by the Taft College Academic Senate on January 6, 2012

*Definitions discussed in Division Chairs Meeting, October 9, 2017
*Approved to go forward to Senate-of-the-whole by Academic Senate Council on October 18, 2017
*Approved by the Senate-of-the-whole on November 6, 2017

- Use program review data to ensure consistency in the data.
- Have either HR of Instruction determine the salary and benefits for the faculty position.
- Consider funding sources because that could allow us to cover Non teaching faculty, CTE or Grants that are not as clearly defined in the criteria. This is always a major concern.

**Immediate Impact on Existing Programs**

- Current faculty overload
- Adjunct faculty units
- FTES per year
- Narrative on percentage of units being taught in adjunct and overload
- Narrative on any type of trends.
- Narrative on what programs this position serves.

**Impact on Major Requirements**

- Majors covered by this position
- Actual Declared majors
- Narrative

**Impact on Transfer/Completion for Certificate Programs**

- Narrative on the courses that this position will include and how they fit into the particular program.

**Distinction between GE and Programs (Gen Ed. is precedent) Transfer/CTE/Basic Skills**

- Narrative on the courses that this position will include.
- Are those courses GE, Transfer, CTE or Basic Skills

**Number of Students Served**

- Enrollment data
- Narrative on the trend

**Student Need (professional services needed to help student success i.e. counselor)**
- Narrative on what services the students will need to be successful (This is likely very similar for all faculty positions)

Number of Other Faculty Remaining in Division
- Narrative on the remaining faculty in the division. (Also covered in #1)

Linked to Program Review and Planning
- Narrative

Fits Mission of the College—CTE and Transfer, community needs, student needs
- Narrative

Campus/Faculty Resources
- Salary and benefits should be the same for all new faculty (Figures could be developed by either HR or Instruction)
- Additional resources necessary for this position.

How Many Students in Each Major  (Could be moved to #3)
- Breakdown of majors within the division by semester or by year.
- Narrative on if there is sufficient student population for this position

Length of Time Position has been Vacant
- Narrative – retirement, replacement, new
BP 7250   Educational Administrators

Reference:

*Education Code Sections 72411 et seq., 87002(b), and 87457-87460; Government Code Section 3540.1(g) and (m)*

An administrator is a person employed by the Board in a supervisory or management position as defined in Government Code Sections 3540, et seq.

Educational administrators are those who exercise direct responsibility for supervising the operation of or formulating policy regarding the instructional or student services programs of the District.

An educational administrator who has not previously acquired tenure as a faculty member in the District shall have the right to become a first year probationary faculty member once his or her administrative assignment expires or is terminated, if the following criteria are met:

1. The administrator meets the criteria established by the District for minimum qualifications for a faculty position, in accordance with procedures developing jointly by the Superintendent/President and the Academic Senate and approved by the Board. The Board shall rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate to determine that an administrator possesses minimum qualifications for employment as a faculty member.

2. The requirements of Education Code Section 87458(c) and (d), or any successor statute, are met with respect to prior satisfactory service and reason for termination of the administrative assignment.

3. The District has a vacancy for which the administrator meets minimum qualifications.

4. The administrator has completed at least three years of satisfactory District service.

Educational administrators shall be compensated in the manner provided for by the appointment or contract of employment. Compensation shall be set by the Board upon recommendation by the Superintendent/President. Educational Administrators shall further be entitled to health and welfare benefits made available by action of the Board upon recommendation by the Superintendent/President.

Educational administrators shall be entitled to vacation leave, sick leave, and other leaves as provided by law, these policies, and administrative procedures adopted by the Superintendent/President.
Every educational administrator shall be employed by an appointment or contract of up to 4 years in duration.

The Board may, with the consent of the administrator concerned, terminate, effective on the next succeeding first day of July, the terms of employment and any contract of employment with the administrator, and reemploy the administrator on any terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed upon by the Board and the administrator, for a new term to commence on the effective date of the termination of the existing term of employment.

If the Board determines that the administrator is not to be reemployed when his/her appointment or contract expires, notice to an administrator shall be in accordance with the terms of the existing contract. If the contract is silent, notice shall be in accordance with Education Code Section 72411.

See Administrative Procedure 7251[?]
Educational administrators are eligible to retreat to faculty status through the following procedure and by the criteria delineated herein.

**Educational Administrators without Prior Faculty Tenure Rights in the West Kern Community College District**

An educational administrator* employed on or after July 1, 1990, who has not previously acquired tenured status as a faculty member of the WKCC District shall have the right of assignment as a first-year probationary faculty member once his/her administrative assignment ends, or if the administrator’s request for assignment is approved, if all of the following apply:

1. The administrator has completed at least three years of satisfactory District service.
2. The termination of the administrative assignment is for any reason other than dismissal for cause.
3. There are sufficient assignments in the discipline or service currently held by temporary faculty to make a full-time assignment for an additional faculty member.
4. The administrator is not replacing a regular (tenured) faculty member or a contract (probationary) faculty member.
5. The assignments of the administrators will be governed as follows:

   A. The administrator shall only be assigned to a discipline in which he/she holds the appropriate credential or meets the minimum qualifications.
   B. The Academic Senate will determine that the administrator possesses the appropriate credential or minimum qualifications for employment as a faculty member.
   C. The Academic Senate may present its views on the assignment in writing to the Board of Trustees together with the recommendation presented to the Board by the Superintendent/President.
   D. The written record of the decision, including the views of the Academic Senate, shall be available for review pursuant to Education Code 87358.

**Educational or Classified Administrators with Prior Faculty Tenure Rights in the West Kern Community College District**
An administrator with prior faculty tenure rights in the WKCC District shall retain his/her status as a tenured faculty member (Education Code 87454) and shall be able to return to a faculty position in a discipline in which they hold the appropriate credential or meet the minimum qualifications as follows:

1. The administrator is not replacing a regular (tenured) faculty member or a contract (probationary) faculty member unless the cause of reassignment is due to a reduction in force.

2. The administrator’s current seniority rank will be used if the cause for return to the classroom is a reduction in force.

3. The return of the administrator to a faculty position shall be governed as follows:

   A. The administrator shall notify the District of his/her intention to return to a faculty assignment at the beginning of the next academic year by February 1 of the current year.

   B. The administrator will be returned to a faculty position in a discipline in which they hold the appropriate credential or meet the minimum qualifications at the beginning of the next academic year.

*(Superintendent/President, Executive Vice-President of Administrative Services, Vice-President of Student Services, Vice-President of Instruction, Director of Dental Hygiene, Dean of Student Services, Director of Distance Education, and Dean of CTE)*
ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 30, 2019

COUNSELING CONFERENCE ROOM

Members Present: Lori Sundgren, Dr. Windy Martinez, Stacey Falgout, Joe’ll Chaidez, Janis Mendenhall, Diane Jones, Kamala Carlson, Danielle Kerr, Kent Miller

Absent: Celina Aldaco

1. Approve December minutes
   Diane approved, Joe’ll seconded.

2. Change May meeting date
   May meeting is changed to Wednesday, May 15.

3. Basic Skills Annual Program Review
   Committee reviewed the Basic Skills APR and approved submission. Joe’ll commented that it appears to be mostly regarding tutoring.

4. Guided Pathways Trello
   Committee looked at a printout of the ADC’s Guided Pathways Trello page. We looked at each number and decided whether or not the goal falls under the purview of the ADC. If it does, is it in progress or completed? Lori will update Trello page.

5. Professional Development Update
   Lori and Joe’ll will be attending the annual CAP conference in Sacramento. Kamala spoke about Building Bridges (March 1 in Bakersfield). Both are at least partially funded by the Basic Skills budget.
1. Approve January minutes
   *Minutes approved by Diane, seconded by Joe’ll*

2. Geoffrey – New transfer level English course
   *Geoffrey talked about a four unit transfer level English course that he is developing as an alternative to a co-requisite model. He brought an example of Fullerton College’s enhanced transfer level course.*

3. Math lab data (incentivized vs. not)
   *Lori brought a breakdown of math lab attendance from last fall. It shows classes where tutoring is incentivized vs. classes that do not incentivize tutoring.*

4. Orientation video
   *Did not get to this agenda item.*

5. Guided Pathways Trello board
   *Committee continued to work on ADC Guided Pathways Trello board. In discussion, some questions arose, which Joe’ll will take back to the Guided Pathways committee.*
Minutes
Thursday, 02/07/19
12:30PM-1:30PM in Room S11

Attendees: John Eigenauer, Tori Furman, Vicki Jacobi, Kristi Richards, Becky Roth

Welcome

Approval of Minutes

V. Jacobi moved J. Eigenauer second.

Information Items (10 minutes)

1. ECE Permitting & ECE Career Readiness COR Update (Becky)
   Becky sought clarification on the ECE Career Readiness COR item. Tori clarified that in the December meeting, she, Vicki, and Becky discussed drafting a course that would educate students on the permitting process, along with introducing students to various career and permitting options. No progress has been made. Tori offered to begin drafting and send to Vicki and Becky in March.

   Becky shared that Taft College would not be able to become an “ECE Permitting” site and that Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office is not either but that they provide step by step support services to students, including a live scan, and send off their completed permit applications on a regular basis. She mentioned that would could send someone from Taft College to KCSOS for training and develop a support program on our campus with hopes that we will increase the number of permits awarded to TC students. She mentioned that the Child Development Consortium can pay for the application fee and how important is that the application is completed correctly to avoid having to re-apply. Kristi, Tori, and Becky will get together in Spring to develop a support process for ECE permitting.

2. Brain storm potential CTE programs
   Potential programs that TC should explore include:

   Logistics, Cybersecurity, Ag or Food Inspector, Comp TIA (prep classes), Programming (J. Eigenauer mentioned teaching faculty challenges), CODA- Occupational Therapy Assistant, Psych Tech, Kinesiology-related certificate, Medical Coding, Legal Office Assistant

Discussion Items (45 minutes)

3. CTE Funding Request Process
   a. Review Requests
02/05/2019 Funding Request from B. Roth regarding Instruction-ECEFS was denied. Food is not an allowable expense. The committee supports the professional development activity and is requesting that CTE District Funds or ECEFS District Funds be used for this event.

01/17/2019 Funding Request from K. Kulzer regarding Disability Studies professional development travel needs additional information. The committee supports professional development but would like to see expense justification documents like those submitted for travel requests through instruction (conference brochure, hotel quote, google map mileage, etc.)

05/05/2019 Funding Request from K. Kulzer regarding Disability Studies course development materials. The committee supports covering this expense but clarified that the courses mentioned have not yet been developed or approved and that the requestor may need to investigate the library’s policy on storing materials for coursework that isn’t active.

b. Discuss schedule/process
   Group voted to make adjustments to the current CTE Funding Request process which include passing along requests of less than $500 directly to administration with administration providing a monthly balance of project funds left available. Furthermore, the due dates for requests were adjusted to better align with the APR-R & Goal Form cycle with funding confirmations provided by May of current year for following year projects. Tori will send new process/schedule to Aldrin for updating on webpage.

4. CTE Master Plan Template Overhaul
   Time did not allow a thorough review of CTE Master Plan Template. Group decided that it might be easiest for Tori to develop a sample template sheet that included feedback from December meeting and send that one sheet to the CTE Committee for feedback. Tori will do that prior to the March meeting.

Other/Open Forum for Announcements (5 minutes)

Next meeting Thursday, 3/7/19 12:30pm-1:30pm in S-11

Items: Review APR & Goal Sheets for CTE Related Programs; Review 2019-2020 Funding Request Forms; Continue CTE Master Plan Template

Action Item Recap:

Draft ECE Career Readiness COR- Tori (send out in March)
Develop ECE Permitting Support Services- Kristi, Becky, Tori (Spring 2019)
Additional information needed on funding request (Kelly Kulzer)
CTE Funding Request Form Update to Aldrin (Tori)
Draft CTE Master Plan Template Sheet for programs (Tori)
Adjourn Meeting
Mission

In supporting the mission of Taft College, the Career Technical Education Committee is charged with enhancing communication and transparency among CTE programs, non-CTE programs, management and administrators. To fulfill this assignment, the Career Technical Education Committee will provide a forum for continual dialogue amongst CTE-related stakeholders who will make recommendations to guide intentional CTE development, enhancement, planning and sustainability providing guidance via strategies and approaches to maximize CTE program success and funding.

Role of the Career Technical Education Committee:

the Career Technical Education Committee, a standing committee of the Academic Senate and Taft College, makes recommendations to the Curriculum and General Education Committee, Management, and Administration regarding:

- Strong Workforce Funding
- Application of grant and outside funding opportunities relating to Career Technical Education
- Sustainability of Career Technical Education programs and positions
- Student, Staff/Faculty, Community, and Program impact of CTE-related decisions
- The creation/adoption/proposition of CTE policies and agreements

Specific Responsibilities:

1. Enhances communication among CTE and non-CTE programs at TC.
2. Advocates for Taft College Career Technical Education programs using a transparent process to promote the development, expansion, and improvement of Career Technical Education programs on campus.
3. Reviews labor market trends for career pathways and skills development.
4. Makes recommendations regarding innovation in the development of new programs and the directions of existing programs.
5. Researches and discusses industry trends.
6. Gathers and utilizes labor market information.
7. Encourages information-sharing and the leveraging of resources whenever possible.
8. Determines the necessary skills, student recruitment needs, and overall costs of establishing new programs.
9. Reviews proposed policies, agreements, etc.
10. Recommends distribution of CTE related funding (Perkins funds, Transitions, Strong Workforce, Prop monies…. Etc.)
11. Provides guidelines for appropriate processes and protocols relating to CTE planning.
12. Identify job shadowing, field trip, guest speaker, internship, work experience, job placement, mentor, and similar opportunities for CTE students
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF INSTRUCTION
CURRICULUM AND GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Curriculum and General Education Committee Meeting
January 11, 2019, 10:10 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., in the Cougar Room.


Members Absent: S. Balason, K. Bandy, D. Vohnout, ASO Representative

Guests: T. Smith, T. Payne, D. Layne, G. Clarke

The next meeting of the Curriculum and General Education Committee will be held on Friday January 11, 2019 from 10:10 am - 12:00 pm in the Cougar Room.

AGENDA

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: From the November 28, 2018 Curriculum & General Education meeting

On a motion by K. Carlson, seconded by J. Rangel-Escobedo, and unanimously carried by all, the November 2018 minutes were approved.

II. CONSENT ITEMS:

A. Course Revision:

1. PSYC 1500 Introduction to Psychology

On a motion by M. Oja, seconded by M. Mayfield, and unanimously carried by all, the course revision was approved to move forward to the next Board meeting held on February 13, 2019.

III. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Course Revisions:

1. IES 1102 Passport Safety Training

On a motion by M. Oja, seconded by J. Rangel-Escobedo, and unanimously carried by all, the course revision was approved to move forward to the next Board meeting held on February 13, 2019.

B. NEW Course:

1. STSU 1530 Transitioning from High School to College

On a motion by J. Rangel-Escobedo, seconded by K. Carlson, and unanimously carried by all, the new course was approved to move forward to the next Board meeting held on February 13, 2019.

IV. Action Item:

A. Disciplines/Textbooks on COR
On a motion by K. Carlson, seconded by M. Oja, and unanimously carried by all, textbooks and resource packets to be listed on CORS was approved. Disciplines on CORS was tabled until after Academic Senate training is complete.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

A. Guided Pathways/Meta Majors
V. Jacobi briefly updated the group on the current state of Guided Pathways/Meta Majors. Counseling has been working on identifying interest area/meta majors. They will have an update at our next C & GE meeting held on February 7th, 2019.

B. Upper Division coursework Policy
The group reviewed a “draft” policy on upper division course work. Minor edits were made. A final vote will take place at our next C & GE meeting held on February 7th, 2019.

C. AP on Transcripts
The group briefly discussed AP on transcripts. This item will be discussed at our next C & GE meeting held on February 7th, 2019.

D. Catalog Additions
Each Division was asked to review their section of the Catalog. The committee will discuss ADT’s and the way they are displayed in the catalog. This item will be discussed at our next C & GE meeting held on February 7th, 2019.

VI. INFORMATIONAL ITEM:

1. Program Status, please see the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Tech Review Approved</th>
<th>C &amp; GE Approved</th>
<th>Board Approved</th>
<th>State Approved</th>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA-T Sociology</td>
<td>1/16/2018</td>
<td>2/6/2018</td>
<td>3/14/2018</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Area of Emphasis: Math and Science</td>
<td>9/18/18</td>
<td>9/28/18</td>
<td>10/10/18</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* New Program

VII. NEXT MEETING: February 2019 in the Cougar room
Attendees: Amar Abbott, Jennifer Altenhofel, Nicole Avina, Adam Bledsoe, Jill Brown, Kelly Kulzer-Reyes, Sara Wallace
Absent: Brian Jean, Geoffrey Dyer

1. Approval of the Minutes of the November 16, 2018 Meeting.
   a. Sara Wallace approves, Jennifer Altenhofel seconds, Joy Reynolds abstains due to absence, everyone else, in favor.
2. Appoint Faculty Co-chair
   a. Jennifer Altenhofel nominated Kelly Kulzer-Reyes as the DE Committee Co-chair, Sara Wallace seconds the motion, all in favor.
   b. Adam reminded everyone that he is no longer a voting member of the committee. He will only vote in the occasion that there is a tied vote. He will serve as the tie breaker.
3. Spring Meeting Dates: DE Committee meet dates will remain the second Friday of the month, from 12:00-1:00 in S-11. We prefer reserving S-11 as the meeting room, and the PDC as a back-up room, should S-11 be occupied.
4. Distance Learning Approval Form
   a. Remove the top section of the form that specifies if the course is Online, Hybrid, and Offline: Joy is concerned that hybrid math will become fully online math, for specific courses, she had the same concerns for some hybrid science courses.
   b. DE Course Process: After doing some research, it was discovered that once a course goes through the DE course approval process, it is approved for all modes. Instruction does not keep track of online, hybrid, and offline courses individually. They are lumped together as approved or not approved. Concern was expressed about a course being approved for hybrid, then being taught fully online, when faculty do not want certain courses fully online. Adam suggested we get a firm answer, is this form for hybrid courses, or just for online & offline. Jennifer called instruction to get more information on the DE Course Approval process. She verifies that once a course is approved, it is approved for all 3 modes.

   Resolve: It was agreed that we separate Hybrid course approvals from the online/offline course approval process. Doing this will address faculty concerns about hybrid only courses turning into fully-online courses.
   c. Separate the online course approval from the offline course approval process: offline courses are primarily taught for our prison population, and the needs are drastically different. Should we have a separate process for all modes? Do we need 3 different forms for DE Course approval? What would happen with previous course approvals? It was agreed that division chairs have last say on whether or not a course will be taught offline. If faculty do not want to teach offline, they have never been forced to do so. Do we need to add a local requirement to go with this process? Would a future VPI ever try to force a faculty member to teach an offline course if it is approved through this process?
Past practice has been that our TCI/MCCF coordinator communicates with division chairs to get courses on the offline list each term.

**Resolve:** Jennifer suggests the person that filling out the form, answer each question on the form for online and offline (separately). Directions of “Answer each question for both modalities Online/Offline” will be added to the form.

d. The form will be updated to say Taft College Online and Offline (only) Course Approval form.

e. We will update ‘DE Coordinator’ to say DE ‘Director’.

f. Jennifer suggested that we add a definition of Distance Education to clarify things for individuals filling out the form.

g. Is increasing enrollment a valid reason to submit for a course to be taught online?

**Resolve:** Remove this question from the form.

h. Question 1: What are the unique challenges for this course, specific to the Distance Education environment, and how will they be met? We’d like to add previous potential challenges mentioned in bullet list format. Presentations, labs, educational materials, accessibility, models, required audience for specific presentations (speech), etc.

i. Question 2 (was Q3): How does this course promote regular effective instruction/student contact? Coming back to this question when we re-adjourn.

5. **Upcoming DE Topics**

   a. Guided Pathways Trello Board- We’ll have to monitor it and be added to the board.

   b. Success rates

   c. Proctorio: Joy would like to talk about this tool.

   d. Checklist for faculty attempting the OEI process, make the rubric process as easy as possible. Is the OEI rubric used school wide? Should we suggest it? Kelly is interested in using it as a resource but not as a mandatory rubric for course development.

   e. Face to Face Canvas workshops: can we offer more of these throughout the year?

   f. Online evaluation process
Minutes – Taft College Dual Enrollment Committee
Wednesday, December 5, 2018

Attendees: Greg Golling, Diane Jones, Caroline Schoneweis, Darcy Bogle, Vicki Jacobi, Tori Furman, Tammy Sutherland, and Bill Devine

Minutes were approved for the 11/07/18 meeting

1. Special Admit Policies and Procedures Update
Tammy reported with the instructor's signature no longer being required she does have to check that the students do not enroll in more than the 11-unit limit. Darcy also reported that if the students are flagged correctly in our system then they are unable to enroll in more than 11 units.

2. Dual Enrollment for Academic Year 2018-19
Diane researched the collective bargaining issues related to dual enrollment programs and because the Taft College Faculty Association represents all fulltime and adjunct faculty the issues regarding minimum qualifications for faculty teaching the classes, class size limits, and unit load (no more than 67% or 10 units per semester) all need to be followed in order to not violate the contract. Diane also reported that most community colleges have MOU's with the respective high school districts that clearly outline the program and she has agreed to bring a draft MOU to the February meeting for the committee to consider. Tammy fully supports following the TC Faculty contract, however currently TUHS has 40 students enrolled in TUHS Anatomy and most of them will enroll in TC Biology 1510 for the Spring 2019 semester. If TC adds an additional section of the Biology 1510 course, the current instructor will be over the 67% allowed unit load by 2 units at the high school and the instructor is also scheduled to teach other TC Spring 2019 courses, potentially putting the instructor 8 units over the allowed unit load. The other option is for TC to keep the one section and over enroll the course to accommodate the TUHS students. This would violate the class size limit for the Biology 1510 course. The committee is recommending to TC’s Vice-President of Instruction that the lesser of the two evils is to over enroll the one section of Biology 1510, and the high school will split the course into two classes. The committee further agreed that moving forward the dual enrollment program would not violate any part of the TC Faculty contract and that a MOU should be put in place to outline these guidelines. Elements of what should be included in the MOU were discussed and the question was raised as to whether TUHS faculty can decline to teach a dual enrollment class. Tammy reminded the committee that juniors or seniors can enroll in the Psychology and Speech courses, however only seniors can enroll in English 1500 and English 1600. There was discussion about how AB 705 affects dual enrollment courses. We believe that AB 705 would not have any impact on English 1500 at the high school. Vicki has not yet heard back from Laura Hope at the Chancellor’s office regarding this issue. Hopefully Vicki will be able to report back at our next meeting.

3. Student Success Course at BVHS
Greg reported that Jessica was unable to attend the meeting and asked that this item be tabled until our next meeting.

4. CCAP Welding Agreement
Tori Furman mentioned the need to document that Taft College has pursued this option due to the requirements of the CCP2 grant, which runs through 2021. The
committee believes that concurrent enrollment is a better option until the high school can build the need from the freshman level up. Currently there is not CCAP agreement between TC and TUHS.

5. Other
   Greg mentioned that when TC instructors get substitutes for their classes the substitutes must also meet minimum qualifications for the course. This would also apply to the TC dual enrollment courses taught at the high school. Tammy asked if any math classes should be added to the TUHS preference sheet for the fall. Diane reported that the earliest a dual enrollment math class might be offered would be Spring 2020. Due to lack of time, Diane stated that she would provide an update with the potential obstacles involved in offering Stat 1510 or Math 2100 at the February meeting.

Next meeting – Wednesday, February 6, 2019, at 12:10pm in the Cougar Room
Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Between West Kern Community College District (WKCCD) and Taft Union High School District (TUHSD) Dual Enrollment Program and Concurrent Enrollment Program

Purpose
The purpose of the dual enrollment program is to afford current high school students the opportunity to enroll in dual-credit courses to expand student access to affordable higher education, provide challenging academic experiences to qualified high school students and reduce the costs of a college education for students and their families. Successful completion of transfer courses will enable students to simultaneously earn college credit transferable to two-and-four-year colleges and universities and satisfy high school graduation requirements. Dual enrollment course offerings are meant to enrich the TUHSD high school curriculum program and not supplant the high school curriculum program.

The purpose of the concurrent enrollment program is to afford current high school students the opportunity to enroll in college courses in order to give them higher education experiences while still in high school. Successful completion of college courses will enable students to earn WKCCD college credit. TUHSD will determine when dual-credit is awarded for concurrent enrollment courses.

Program Management
The WKCCD Dual Enrollment Committee will manage the dual enrollment and concurrent enrollment programs as delineated in this document. The WKCCD Dual Enrollment Committee will evaluate any grant funding opportunities sought by the WKCCD or TUHSD for dual enrollment or concurrent enrollment, prior to the start of the grant application process. The committee consists of administrators and faculty members from both WKCCD and TUHSD (see charter).

Dual Enrollment Program

Course Offerings
Dual enrollment courses are taught during the TUHSD school day on the TUHSD campus with the exception of Online PSYC 1500. The dual enrollment program offerings are shown in the table below. Dual enrollment courses are offered in the same manner, rigor, and in accordance with the same policies and procedures, including class-size limits as all other WKCCD courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Class Size Limit</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Instructor Load</th>
<th>Required Instruction Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online PSYC 1500</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGL 1500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2020</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Class Size Limit</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Instructor Load</th>
<th>Required Instruction Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMM 1511</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGL 1600</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIOL 1510</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staffing
Faculty members assigned to teach dual enrollment courses must meet the minimum qualifications as defined by the Chancellor’s office document *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*, as well as, relevant WKCCD hiring criteria. Substitute Faculty members must also meet the minimum qualifications described above. Faculty members teaching dual enrollment courses are adjunct faculty of the WKCCD and are represented and subject to the guidelines of the Taft College Faculty Collective bargaining agreement. Faculty members teaching dual enrollment courses or other WKCCD courses may teach up to sixty-seven percent (67%) of a full-time WKCCD teaching load.

Compensation
TUHSD shall be solely responsible for all salaries, wages, benefits, and fully funded STRS contributions for faculty members teaching dual enrollment courses on the TUHSD campus. TUHSD will be the employer of record for the purposes of compensation, assignment monitoring, and reporting to any and all appropriate agencies pursuant to state and federal law, including but not limited to, provision of workers compensation coverage, payroll taxes, and STRS employer contributions.

Evaluation
It will be the sole responsibility of WKCCD to conduct faculty evaluations of faculty members teaching dual enrollment courses in accordance with the Taft College Faculty Collective bargaining agreement.

Academic Advising
Academic advising and support services for students enrolled in dual enrollment courses will be the primary responsibility of the TUHSD.

Concurrent Enrollment Program
High school students must follow the procedures outlined on the WKCCD website (link shown below) to enroll in courses via the concurrent enrollment program.


WKCCD and TUHSD agree to annually review and/or change the terms of this MOU via the WKCCD Dual Enrollment committee. The MOU shall remain in effect until the WKCCD Dual Enrollment committee recommends changes to the terms of the MOU.

West Kern Community College District

Dr. Debra Daniels
Superintendent/President

Date: ________________

Taft Union High School District

Dr. Blanca Cavazos
Superintendent

Date: ________________
Special Meeting
Minutes
Friday, December 7, 2018
Counseling Center Conference Room
9:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.

Present: Paul Blake, Mike Jiles, James May, and Terri Smith
Absent: Vicki Jacobi and Tina Mendoza

The committee held a special meeting to discuss spring inservice. During this inservice, there will be a presentation on Quantitative Reasoning. Quantitative Reasoning is the ISLO scheduled for campus wide assessment. Vicki will demonstrate a couple of methods for different disciplines to assess this. The “pendulum” demonstration was fairly popular with faculty so Vicki might use a similar demonstration.

Originally, there was going to be a fun activity that modeled the Jeopardy game. This activity is postponed. Instead, there will be an activity focusing on meta-majors.

Other/Open Forum for Announcements (None)
Adjournment (11:15 a.m.)

Next Meeting: The December meeting will be cancelled due to the holiday break. The next regularly scheduled meeting is on January 19, 2019.

Respectfully submitted by Brandy Young
Present: Paul Blake, Vicki Jacobi, Mike Jiles, James May, and Terri Smith
Guest: Sharyn Eveland
Absent: Tina Mendoza
Secretary: Brandy Young

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m.

Public Commentary
None

Approval of Minutes from October 19, 2018 and December 7, 2018
Minutes were approved without changes. The November 9th meeting was cancelled due to lack of quorum.

Information/Discussion Items
Common Assessments for Quantitative Reasoning – spring inservice faculty comments
- John Eigenauer suggested a book on common assessment. Vicki will research this and create an assessment to share in eLumen.
- Some faculty suggested that the focus of SLO Day should be on the SLO data pulled from eLumen. The committee discussed the use of the “widget” tool in eLumen. A dashboard can be created for faculty to use. Possible training for this can happen during May inservice.
- Another possible inservice topic is training on how to measure and assess correctly. Some faculty have stated that they don’t know if they are doing it correctly.
- Rubric training is another topic suggested – consistency across disciplines.

Action Items
Set February, March, April and May Goals
- February – review data and ACCJC
- eLumen widget tool – training in reporting
- Assessment training
- May inservice - finalize

Other/Open Forum for Announcements (None)
Adjournment (10:00 a.m.)

Next Meeting: The next meeting of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Steering Committee will be on February 8, 2019 at 11:00 a.m. in the Counseling Center Conference Room.

Respectfully submitted by Brandy Young
Members Present: Brock McMurray, Bill Devine, Sharyn Eveland, Geoffrey Dyer, Jessica Grimes, Brandy Young, Whisper-Lynn Null

Members Absent: Amanda Bauer and Sheri Horn-Bunk

Guests: Justin Madding, Recorder

The Budget Committee meeting of February 8, 2019, was called to order by Brock McMurray at 8:10 a.m.

1. Minutes

The minutes from January 25, 2019, were reviewed and approved by consensus.

2. 19/20 Budget Development Calendar

McMurray reviewed the February Budget Development Calendar deadlines with the committee. We are a little behind schedule as to revenue assumptions and APR funding sources, but we can make up time later in the month and early March.

3. Budget Update

McMurray said that there is not much of an update since last meeting that is not covered in the SCFF training later in this meeting.

Devine asked if McMurray has any impression as to whether it is good or bad for us that the governor is proposing to delay full implementation of SCFF at 60/20/20. McMurray said that it may be good for us, but not in a significant amount. It is good because we are funded at a higher rate for FTES, but if we can improve our other metrics then it can balance out.

4. Budget Committee Goal: Integrated Study of the Student Centered Funding Formula

McMurray provided a handout titled “Student Centered Funding Formula”. One of our Budget Committee goals for this year was to learn more about the new funding formula. This one page spreadsheet is an attempt to simplify things and facilitate discussion. McMurray also referred to his budget workshop binder to explain advanced apportionment estimates and how it is used in budget development.

Referring to the handout, McMurray explained Total Compensational Revenue and how that number is slightly different than the number we used to develop the budget. He explained what a deficit coefficient is and how it is used to make up the different between the budgeted revenues and Total Compensational Revenue. We have not received confirmation that we will receive a deficit coefficient.

McMurray explained the Base Allocation section of the handout. Basic Allocation is calculated based on our size, location, and FTES. The total Base Allocation is comprised of Basic Allocation, Credit FTES, and Non-Credit FTES. McMurray referred the committee to the box outlining 3 year average FTES calculation. He explained how the 3 year average calculation hurts us and any other college that is
growing. If you are growing, then you have to consistently serve more students with less resources. Growing colleges are lobbying for the option of the 3 year average or prior year FTES. That way growing colleges are not penalized by the calculation.

Young asked when we report on our FTES. McMurray said that the reporting is done through the 320 report.

The committee discussed CDCP and what types of courses would qualify.

McMurray explained the Supplemental Allocation portion of SCFF. The Supplemental Allocation is based on need, which includes PELL, Nonresident fee waiver, and California Promise Grant recipients, and is 20% of new formula. He clarified that it is not necessarily 20% of our allocation, but is 20% of the funds allocated by the State for SCFF.

McMurray explained the Student Success Allocation, which is currently 10% of SCFF. He covered each of the metrics and answered questions about what is included in the metrics and the value placed on each one. Those success metrics are valued higher if they are achieved by a student of need. The committee discussed the importance of credit certificates, which are Chancellor’s Office approved certificates only, and how auto awarding can increase that particular metric.

5. Other

None.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

________________________
Justin Madding
**Student Centered Funding Formula**

### Basic Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FTES</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single College District &lt;=10,000</td>
<td>$3,952,985</td>
<td>$3,952,984.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural College Designation</td>
<td>$1,210,866</td>
<td>$1,210,865.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,163,850.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FTES</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-Year Average Credit</td>
<td>$4,934</td>
<td>$2,786.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Admit</td>
<td>$7,224</td>
<td>$128,808.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated Credit</td>
<td>$7,224</td>
<td>$430,422.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$2,863.45</td>
<td>$14,305,552.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Credit FTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FTES</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Non Credit</td>
<td>$3,347</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDCP</td>
<td>$5,457</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated Non-Credit</td>
<td>$3,347</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Head Count*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td>919</td>
<td>$1,374,824.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Nonresident Fee Waiver</td>
<td></td>
<td>919</td>
<td>$131,417.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Promise Grant Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td>919</td>
<td>$2,987,669.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,493,910.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supplemental Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Head Count*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>$468,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degrees for Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>$184,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
<td>$27,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine or More CTE Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
<td>$137,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer**</td>
<td></td>
<td>660</td>
<td>$265,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Level Math and English</td>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
<td>$46,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved Regional Living Wage**</td>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
<td>$938,960.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>$2,069,980.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Head Count*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$99,400.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degrees for Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td>666</td>
<td>$43,956.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td>333</td>
<td>$6,327.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine or More CTE Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>$30,802.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer**</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$35,464.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Level Math and English</td>
<td></td>
<td>333</td>
<td>$8,658.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved Regional Living Wage**</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>$31,468.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>826</td>
<td>$256,077.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Success Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Head Count*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-California Promise Grant Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td>333</td>
<td>$95,571.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td>333</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degrees for Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td>444</td>
<td>$39,072.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>$5,238.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine or More CTE Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$29,637.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer**</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>$37,296.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Level Math and English</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>$7,326.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved Regional Living Wage**</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$36,408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>$250,638.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCFF Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SCFF</td>
<td>$26,540,008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budgeted Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Budgeted SCFF</td>
<td>$26,646,917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budgeted vs SCFF Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted SCFF Total - SCFF Total</td>
<td>$(106,909)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Head Counts Based on 2017-18

**Transfer Data & Achieved Regional Living Wage Based on 2016-17 data
Minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee
9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
Thursday, January 10, 2019
Counseling Center Conference Room

Members present: Severo Balason, Amanda Bauer, Deb Daniels, Sharyn Eveland, Vicki Jacobi, Tori Furman, Greg Golling, Jessica Grimes, and Windy Martinez

Members absent: Julie Marty-Pearson

Guest: Curt Belcher and Geoffrey Dyer

Secretary and Classified Representative: Brandy Young

Approval of Minutes – December 7, 2018 – Minutes approved without changes.

Planning Guide
The Planning Guide is nearing completion. Severo will provide Sharyn with the new SEA Plan. Vicki is still working on the Instruction Plan. The committee will review the completed Guide at the February meeting and send forward to the Governance Council for review and approval. This conversation revealed that we should have a Board Policy and Administrative Procedure for updating the Mission and Vision statements. This will be an item suggested at the January Governance Council committee updates.

Accreditation Steering Committee Membership
- Review 2015 ASC and subcommittee membership lists
  - The Committee reviewed the old membership lists. The ASC membership will be finalized after the January 25th training. The training participants invited are as follows:
    - Julie Marty-PearsonExecutive Dir. IR
    - Brandy YoungLearning Outcomes Tech/CSEA
    - Vicki JacobiAcademic Senate VP/SLO Coord./Faculty
    - Geoffrey DyerAcademic Senate Pres./Faculty
    - Windy MartinezDean of SS
    - Greg GollingFaculty/Science Department
    - Severo BalasonVPSS
    - Deb DanielsSuperintendent/Pres
    - Tori FurmanCareer Development Counselor/Faculty
    - Jessica GrimesInterim Dean of Instruction/CTE
    - Sharyn EvelandFaculty/Social Services Department
    - Brock McMurrayEVP Admin Services
    - Heather MeasonExecutive Dir. HR
    - Andy PrestageExecutive Dir. IT
    - Amar AbbotHigh Tech Center Access Specialist
    - Amanda BauerExecutive Dir. Fiscal Services
    - Adam BledsoeDirector Distance Learning
    - CSEA Rep. Possibly Greg Hawkins or Jeanene Robertson
Review old timeline in preparation for ISER training – Jan. 25
- The committee discussed the direction and emphasis ACCJC will focus on. We will need to focus on providing evidence that we are actually doing what we say we are doing; following Board Policies and Administrative Procedures.
- Sharyn stated that we are going to focus on gathering evidence and keep our story short.
- Vicki suggested that we research other schools who have recently gone through their ISER. ACCJC actions are posted in mid-January. We should look at schools who were re-accredited without negative recommendations.
- The Committee will be able to devise a clear plan after the January 25th training agenda has been made available.

Other
- Annual Program Review
  - Geoffrey briefly discussed the newly adopted practice (two years in a row) of reviewing APRs and goal forms at Governance Council during the month of February. The purpose of this practice is to evaluate and ensure goals, which are funded at some level, are actually improving the metrics outlined in the APR. This practice was developed in order to meet the ACCJC recommendation.
  - Sharyn pointed out the process or analysis is broken up into two parts: 1. Metrics – tying it back and 2. Process – does it work? The timeline seems to be the issue.
  - This process will be discussed at the January 18th Governance Council meeting
- Chancellor’s Office Vision for Success
  - Geoffrey asked the Committee to please keep in mind the Chancellor’s Office Vision for Success. This topic will be a future agenda item for discussion to ensure we are following all guidelines and meeting all deadlines.

The next SPC meeting will be on February 8th at 9:30 a.m. in the Counseling Center Conference Room.

Respectfully submitted by: Brandy Young
Minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee
9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
Friday, February 8, 2019
Counseling Center Conference Room

Members present: Vicki Jacobi, Sharyn Eveland, Marty Morales, Tori Furman, Greg Golling, Jessica Grimes, and Julie Marty-Pearson

Members absent: Amanda Bauer, Windy Martinez and Severo Balason

Secretary: Brandy Young

Approval of Minutes – January 10, 2019
Minutes were approved with the following changes:
- In the Accreditation Steering Committee Membership list, correct Tori’s title to Career Development Counselor and add CTE to Jessica’s title.

Planning Guide
Sharyn is still making edits to the document. Vicki is still working on her piece. The guide will be a living document. The name has been changed to Taft College Timelines, Responsibilities, and Institutional Plans, “TC TRIP.” There are still more pieces to be added. Will bring to the Governance Council in March. It is important to note that the guide will be updated as needed.

ACCJC Training – Quick Recap
Julie gave a brief overview of the training that was held on January 25th.

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) Membership and Timeline
Julie reviewed the two handouts: 1. Accreditation Steering Committee and 2. Tentative Timeline and Process for 2021 ISER. Amanda Bauer was not included in the original steering committee document and will be added. Add Amar Abbott’s title: High Tech Center Access Specialist. The ASC Secretary has yet to be decided. Julie and Dr. Daniels will be co-chairs of the ASC. Julie asked for suggestions. Suggestions are:
- Add a Counseling rep
- Add Brandy Young as ASC Secretary
- The new VPI may want to sit on SPC and the ASC. We will need to confirm with her when she starts. The Interim Dean of Instruction position will be added to the subcommittee list if the VPI joins SPC
- Sharyn will be the new Academic Senate President in fall 2019
- Remove Vicki Jacobi as co-chair of Standard I. She will be a member of a subcommittee
- Add the Faculty Union President as a co-chair to Standard III

The Committee discussed the development of the timeline and the ASC. There was much discussion on how the subcommittees should be formed. It was recommended that we choose a small group that is represented by each constituent, Classified, Management and Faculty to be on a subcommittee and identify resources (individuals with specific information to assist).
- Identify the Chair, the subcommittee members and the related resources
- Define the roles of the Chairs, Subcommittees and resources
Define the sequence of activity of the subcommittee, i.e., evidence collection
Activities should be sequenced to go with the overall plan to address the standards
The Chairs should understand the sequence of activities that take place, designate time for those activities to occur with deadlines
A “retreat like” meeting will be scheduled so that accreditation themes can be identified
Sources of evidence will be identified to support the thematic pieces
Use Vicki’s SLO template
This information will be shared with Chairs and subcommittees to identify gaps
Form subcommittees in fall 2019, train them on documentation strategies
Organizational tools for evidence repository – MindView and Trello?
Use Nvivo for qualitative and quantitative analysis tool – for Standards thematic data
Roles and responsibilities will be discussed at the March 8th meeting
Theme Retreat scheduled for March 29th 9 a.m. to 2 p.m.
Present information to the Governance Council in May and give continuous updates as needed

Program Review and Strategic Action Plan Alignment
The committee will begin the discussion on possibly revising the program review process. Many people have expressed an interest in going to a 2 or 3 year comprehensive process and continue with an annual update of goals. (Not necessarily create new goals each year). The issue is measuring improvement in such a short time period. The funding timeline is a factor as well. This item will be discussed at the March or April meeting and go to Governance Council for review.

The next SPC meeting will be on March 8th at 9:30 a.m. in the Counseling Center Conference Room.

Respectfully submitted by: Brandy Young