

TAFT COLLEGE SENATE-OF-THE-WHOLE AGENDA
MONDAY, APRIL 1, 2019
12:00PM TO 1:00PM
COUGAR ROOM

Call to Order

Public Commentary

March 4, 2019 Minutes (Attachment to Follow)

Information/Discussion Items

1. Faculty Evaluation Procedures—Diane Jones (5 minutes)
2. Report on ASCCC Area A Meeting—Sharyn Eveland (5 Minutes)
3. Upcoming ASCCC Events (5 Minutes)
 - a) [2019 Spring Plenary, April 11-13, Millbrae](#)
 - i. Pre-session Resolutions (additional attachment to follow) **pg. 2**
 - b) [Faculty Leadership Institute, June 13-15, Sacramento](#)
4. Administrative Retreat Rights Recommendations (2 Minutes) **pg. 20**

Action Items

5. ACCJC Annual Report—Brandy Young (5 minutes) **pg. 25**
6. [Improving Online CTE Pathways Grant Program](#) –Adam Bledsoe (10 Minutes) **pg. 28**
7. [Auto-awarding of Certificates and Degrees](#) (10 Minutes) **pg. 30**
8. Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process (5 Minutes) **pg. 32 (see especially pp. 42-44)**

Committee Reports (can be discussed if time allows)

9. Academic Senate Subcommittees
 - a) Academic Development Committee **pg. 74**
 - b) Career Technical Education Committee **pg. 75**
 - c) Curriculum & General Education Committee **pg. 78**
 - i. Academic Policy for the Use of Upper Division Units **pg. 81**
 - d) Distance Education Committee **pg. 82**
 - i. Taft College Distance Learning Approval Form **pg. 83**
 - e) Dual Enrollment Committee **pg. 87**
 - f) Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Steering Committee **pg. 89**
10. Governance Council Subcommittees
 - a) Budget Committee **pg. 90**
 - b) Strategic Planning Committee **pg. 92**

Open Forum for Announcements

Adjournment

The next meeting of the Academic Senate Council is Monday, April 29, at 12:00pm in the Cafeteria Conference Room. Next meeting of the Academic Senate-of-the-whole is Monday, May 6, at 12:00pm in the Cougar Room.



ACADEMIC SENATE
for CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Celebrating 50 years

53rd SPRING SESSION RESOLUTIONS

FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS ON MARCH 22-23, 2019

Disclaimer: The enclosed resolutions do not reflect the position of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, its Executive Committee, or standing committees. They are presented for the purpose of discussion by the field, and to be debated and voted on by academic senate delegates at the Plenary Session on April 13, 2019.

Resolutions Committee 2018-19

Geoffrey Dyer, ASCCC Area A Representative (Chair)

Rebecca Eikey, ASCCC Area C Representative

Sam Foster, ASCCC Area D Representative

Darcie McClelland, El Camino College, Area C

Eric Narveson, Evergreen Valley College, Area B

RESOLUTIONS PROCESS

In order to ensure that deliberations are organized, effective, and meaningful, the Academic Senate uses the following resolution procedure:

- Pre-session resolutions are developed by the Executive Committee (through its committees) and submitted to the pre-session Area Meetings for review.
- Amendments and new pre-session resolutions are generated in the Area Meetings.
- The Resolutions Committee meets to review all pre-session resolutions and combine, re-word, append, or render moot these resolutions as necessary.
- Members of the Senate meet during the session in topic breakouts and give thoughtful consideration to the need for new resolutions and/or amendments.
- After all Session presentations are finished each day, members meet during the resolutions breakouts to discuss the need for new resolutions and/or amendments. Each resolution or amendment must be submitted to the Resolutions Chair before the posted deadlines each day. There are also Area meetings at the Session for discussing, writing, or amending resolutions.
- New resolutions submitted on the second day of session are held to the next session unless the resolution is declared urgent.
- The Resolutions Committee meets again to review all resolutions and amendments and to combine, re-word, append, or render moot the resolutions as necessary.
- The resolutions are debated and voted upon in the general sessions on the last day of the Plenary Session.
- All appendices are available on the ASCCC website.

Prior to plenary session, it is each attendee's responsibility to read the following documents:

- Senate Delegate Roles and Responsibilities (link in Local Senates Handbook or click [here](#))
- Resolution Procedures (Part II in Resolutions Handbook)
- Resolution Writing and General Advice (Part III in Resolutions Handbook)

New delegates are strongly encouraged to attend the New Delegate Orientation on Thursday morning prior to the first breakout session.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The resolutions that have been placed on the Consent Calendar 1) were believed to be noncontroversial, 2) do not potentially reverse a previous position, and 3) do not compete with another proposed resolution. Resolutions that meet these criteria and any subsequent clarifying amendments have been included on the Consent Calendar. To remove a resolution from the Consent Calendar, please see the Consent Calendar section of the *Resolutions Procedures for the Plenary Session*.

Consent Calendar resolutions and amendments are marked with an *.
Resolutions and amendments submitted on Thursday are marked with a +.
Resolutions and amendments submitted on Friday are marked with a #.

- *3.01 S19 Address Privacy and Rights Violation Caused by Education Code §87408 (2011)
- *5.02 S19 Guided Pathways Budget Development
- *9.02 S19 Adopt the Paper *Noncredit Instruction: Opportunity and Challenge*
- *9.03 S19 Documenting Open Educational Resource Options in Course Outline of Record
- *11.01 S19 CCCApply Technical Limitations
- *11.02 S19 Ensure Appropriate Processes for System Technology Procurement
- *13.01 S19 Develop Recommendations for the Implementation of a No-Cost Designation in Course Schedules
- *13.02 S19 Support for Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinators
- *16.01 S19 Adopt the Paper *The Role of the Library Faculty in the California Community College*
- *16.02 S19 Adopt the Paper *Effective Practices for Online Tutoring*
- *21.01 S19 Adopt the Paper *Work-Based Learning in California Community Colleges*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.0 DIVERSITY AND EQUITY	1
*3.01 S19 Address Privacy and Rights Violation Caused by Education Code §87408 (2011).....	1
5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE.....	2
5.01 S19 Funding for Guided Pathways Transformation	2
*5.02 S19 Guided Pathways Budget Development	3
6.0 STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES	4
6.01 S19 Provisionally Support AB 130 (Low, as of 25 February 2019).....	4
6.02 S19 Provisionally Support SB 3 (Allen, as of 28 February 2019).....	5
6.03 S19 Support for SB 291 (Leyva, as of 1 March 2019)	6
9.0 CURRICULUM	7
9.01 S19 CB21 Rubrics for Coding Course Outcomes.....	7
*9.02 S19 Adopt the Paper <i>Noncredit Instruction: Opportunity and Challenge</i>	7
*9.03 S19 Documenting Open Educational Resource Options in Course Outline of Record.....	8
10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST	8
10.01 S19 Disciplines List – Homeland Security	8
11.0 TECHNOLOGY	9
*11.01 S19 CCCApply Technical Limitations	9
*11.02 S19 Ensure Appropriate Processes for System Technology Procurement ...	10
13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS	10
*13.01 S19 Develop Recommendations for the Implementation of a No-Cost Designation in Course Schedules.....	10
*13.02 S19 Support for Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinators.....	11
16.0 LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCES	12
*16.01 S19 Adopt the Paper <i>The Role of the Library Faculty in the California Community College</i>	12
*16.02 S19 Adopt the Paper <i>Effective Practices for Online Tutoring</i>	12
21.0 CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION.....	12
*21.01 S19 Adopt the Paper <i>Work-Based Learning in California Community Colleges</i>	13

3.0 DIVERSITY AND EQUITY

*3.01 S19 Address Privacy and Rights Violation Caused by Education Code §87408 (2011)

Whereas, Hiring procedures for new faculty is an academic and professional matter (Education Code §87360[b]), and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA)¹ prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of disability, and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has determined that individuals with HIV/AIDS meet the definition of people with disabilities²;

Whereas, Revisions to Education Code §87408 (2011) had the effect of broadening the scope of the law from control of the communicable disease tuberculosis to reflect the following:

*(a) When a community college district wishes to employ a person in an academic position and that person has not previously been employed in an academic position in this state, **the district shall require a medical certificate showing that the applicant is free from any communicable disease, including, but not limited to, active tuberculosis, unfitting the applicant to instruct or associate with students.** The medical certificate shall be submitted directly to the governing board by a physician and surgeon licensed under the Business and Professions Code, a physician assistant practicing in compliance with Chapter 7.7 (commencing with Section 3500) of Division 2 of the Business and Professions Code, or a commissioned medical officer exempted from licensure. The medical examination shall have been conducted not more than six months before the submission of the certificate and shall be at the expense of the applicant. A governing board may offer a contract of employment to an applicant subject to the submission of the required medical certificate. Notwithstanding Section 87031, the medical certificate shall become a part of the personnel record of the employee and shall be open to the employee or his or her designee.*

*(b) The governing board of a community college district **may require academic employees** to undergo a periodic medical examination by a physician and surgeon licensed under the Business and Professions Code, a physician assistant practicing in compliance with Chapter 7.7 (commencing with Section 3500) of Division 2 of the Business and Professions Code, or a commissioned medical officer exempted from licensure, to determine that the employee is free from any communicable disease, including, but not limited to, active tuberculosis, unfitting the applicant to instruct or associate with students. The periodic medical examination shall be at the expense of the district. The medical certificate shall*

¹ ADA.gov United States Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division
https://www.ada.gov/2010_regs.htm

² U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/newsroom/wysk/hiv_aids_discrimination.cfm

become a part of the personnel record of the employee and shall be open to the employee or his or her designee.

(Amended by Stats. 2010, Ch. 512, Sec. 9. (SB 1069) Effective January 1, 2011.);³

Whereas, The list of communicable diseases provided by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH)⁴ is quite extensive and includes diseases that are not at risk of transmission in the teaching and learning environment, including HIV/AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), and others; and

Whereas, The act of requiring a medical certificate showing that the applicant is free from any communicative disease such as HIV/AIDS constitutes a violation of workplace rights and civil rights under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and requiring the same for STDs constitutes a grave violation of privacy, and such violations expose districts to litigation;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with stakeholders to remove all language from Education Code §87408 that is discriminatory towards individuals who may be afflicted with diseases that are not at risk of transmission in the teaching and learning environment, including HIV/AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases, and others.

Contact: Leigh Ann Shaw, Skyline College, Equity and Diversity in Action Committee

5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE

5.01 S19 Funding for Guided Pathways Transformation

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) released the *Vision for Success* in 2017 with aspirational goals for system-wide improvement in key metrics, such as increasing by at least 20% the number of California Community Colleges students annually who complete, increasing by 35% the number of students who transfer annually to a California State University/University of California over the next five years, and closing all equity gaps within ten years;

Whereas, The *Vision for Success* states, “the Chancellor’s Office plans to use the Guided Pathways initiative as an organizing framework to align and guide all initiatives aimed at improving student success” and student equity, and all 114 community colleges are currently participating in the California Guided Pathways Award Program and receiving a portion of the \$150 million dollars in funding allocated for 2017-2022;

³http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC§ionNum=87408.

⁴ California Department of Public Health Communicative Disease Control
<https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/PSB/Pages/CommunicableDiseaseControl.aspx>

Whereas, The allocation formula and implementation timeline place the majority of the funding in the first three years, and the resource allocation for each college drops significantly in the fourth and fifth years meaning colleges will see resources fade rapidly in the years when the most productive and sustainable design and innovation work will happen; and

Whereas, The process of designing and implementing a guided pathways framework at a college is a vast and comprehensive undertaking, and the CCCCO has indicated in the “California Community Colleges Guided Pathways (CCC GP) Action Plan, Implementation Timeline, and Allocation Summary” that “full scale adoption is not expected for every college on every element within the five-year time frame”⁵;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges engage with stakeholders and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office in a dialogue regarding realistic, dedicated, and sustainable funding to support inquiry, design, and implementation of guided pathways frameworks across California’s community colleges to ensure colleges make progress toward achieving the goals of the *Vision for Success*.

Contact: Gretchen Ehlers, West Valley College, Guided Pathways Task Force

***5.02 S19 Guided Pathways Budget Development**

Whereas, In recognizing that academic senates and faculty leadership and involvement are critical if any guided pathways effort is to succeed, the California Education Code §88922 requires that colleges participating in the California Community College Guided Pathways Award Program submit “a letter to the chancellor’s office signed by, and expressing the commitment of, the president of the governing board of the community college district, the chief executive officer of the college, and the president of the college’s academic senate to adopt a guided pathways model”;

Whereas, The California Education Code §88922 necessarily ensures support for faculty in implementing the Community College Guided Pathways Grant Program by delineating how funds for the program should be spent:

(g) Participating community colleges may use grant funds to implement guided pathways programs for various limited-term purposes, including, but not necessarily limited to, any, or any combination, including all, of the following: (1) Faculty and staff release time to review and redesign guided pathways programs, instruction, and support services[,] (2) Professional development in areas related to guided pathways[,] (3) Administrative time to coordinate, communicate, and engage college stakeholders in the process of developing and implementing guided pathways programs[,] (4) Upgrades to computer and student information systems to improve tracking of student progress and feedback to students;

⁵ <https://ccgp.cccco.edu/Portals/0/GPWorkPlanInstructions.pdf>

Whereas, Title 5 §53200 delineating academic senates' responsibilities in academic and professional matters includes "(10) processes for institutional planning and budget development" which would encompass any efforts to develop budget processes for local implementation of a guided pathways framework; and

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office will distribute Guided Pathways Grant Program funds for year two, yet there are limited data on how the funds for year one were spent, whether or not the funds were sufficient to support local design and implementation, and if collegial consultation with academic senates was used in developing local guided pathways budget processes;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to ensure proper collegial consultation and transparency in developing guided pathways budget processes, including supporting comparability between colleges in multi-college districts; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with system partners to ensure collegial consultation and transparency in local guided pathways budget development processes.

Contact: Jeffrey Hernandez, East Los Angeles College, Guided Pathways Task Force

6.0 STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

6.01 S19 Provisionally Support AB 130 (Low, as of 25 February 2019)

Whereas, California law established the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) as the coordinating and planning agency for statewide postsecondary education, and CPEC performed a variety of useful functions for California Higher Education, including data collection for all public segments and advising the governor regarding budgetary priorities to preserve access for students, prior to being defunded by the governor and ceasing operations in 2011;

Whereas, AB 130 (Low, as of 25 February 2019) would create the Office of Higher Education Performance and Accountability, which would, among other functions, "review and make recommendations, as necessary, regarding cross-segmental and interagency initiatives and programs in areas that may include, but are not necessarily limited to, efficiencies in instructional delivery, financial aid, transfer, and workforce coordination" and "act as a clearinghouse for postsecondary education information and as a primary source of information for the Legislature, the Governor, and other agencies," thus potentially providing support for California Higher Education that has been needed since the defunding of CPEC;

Whereas, The Office of Higher Education Performance and Accountability-created AB 130 (Low, as of 25 February 2019) would be overseen by an executive director and would include an advisory board consisting of "the Chairperson of the Senate Committee

on Education and the Chairperson of the Assembly Committee on Higher Education, who serve as ex officio members, and six public members with experience in postsecondary education”; and

Whereas, While the Office of Higher Education Performance and Accountability would be required by law to “consult with the higher education segments and stakeholders, as appropriate, in the conduct of its duties and responsibilities” and the members of the advisory board would be required to have experience with higher education, the functionality and benefits of the office would be greatly enhanced if the advisory board were to include direct representation from the segments of public higher education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support AB 130 (Low, as of 25 February 2019) to create the Office of Higher Education Performance and Accountability only in the event that the legislation is amended to include the appointment of faculty representatives appointed by their respective Academic Senates from each of the segments of public higher education in California among the members of the advisory board for the office.

Contact: Executive Committee

6.02 S19 Provisionally Support SB 3 (Allen, as of 28 February 2019)

Whereas, California law established the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) as the coordinating and planning agency for statewide postsecondary education, and CPEC performed a variety of useful functions for California higher education, including data collection for all public segments and advising the governor regarding budgetary priorities to preserve access for students, prior to being defunded by the governor and ceasing operations in 2011;

Whereas, SB 3 (Allen, as of 25 February 2019) would create the Office of Higher Education Performance and Accountability, which would, among other functions, “periodically provide independent oversight on the public postsecondary segments’ and individual campus-based programs and initiatives and cross-segmental and interagency programs and initiatives in areas that include, but are not necessarily limited to, graduation rates, affordability, transfer, financial aid, assessment and placement, remediation, degree and certificate completion, adult education, workforce coordination, student transition into the workforce, effectiveness, and alignment with state goals and performance measures in higher education,” thus potentially providing support for California Higher Education that has been needed since the defunding of CPEC; and

Whereas, The Office of Higher Education Performance and Accountability would be required by law to, “In consultation with the public postsecondary segments, set performance targets for enrollment and degree and certificate completion statewide and by region” and “In consultation with the public postsecondary segments and workforce and development agencies, including, but not limited to, the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, periodically measure the supply and demand of jobs in fields of study statewide and by region” and therefore the functionality and benefits of the office

would be greatly enhanced if the advisory board were to include direct representation from the segments of public higher education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support SB 3 (Allen, as of 25 February 2019) to create the Office of Higher Education Performance and Accountability only in the event that the legislation is amended to include the appointment of faculty representatives appointed by their respective Academic Senates from each of the segments of public higher education in California among the members of the advisory board.

Contact: Executive Committee

6.03 S19 Support for SB 291 (Leyva, as of 1 March 2019)

Whereas, As of 2017, approximately 46 percent of California Community College students receive need-based financial aid, compared to about two-thirds of resident undergraduate students enrolled in the University of California and the California State University systems⁶;

Whereas, Many state and federal student aid programs are structured to help full-time students, which do not benefit community college students who attend college part time;

Whereas, Research conducted by the Institute for College Access and Success (TICAS) has determined that, after factoring in financial aid, the net cost of college is actually more expensive for California Community College students than for their counterparts at the University of California or California State University in seven of the nine regions studied, and that in none of the nine regions was the community college found to be the least expensive option⁷; and

Whereas, Senate Bill 291 (Leyva, as of 1 March 2019), “would establish the California Community College Student Financial Aid Program, to provide need-based grant awards to eligible community college students who attend an eligible California community college, as specified. Subject to an appropriation by the Legislature, the bill specifies that the program shall be administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and implemented by the eligible California community colleges”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support SB 291 (Leyva, as of 1 March 2019) and communicate that support to the legislature and other constituents as appropriate.

⁶ The 2016-2017 Budget: Higher Education Analysis. California Legislative Analyst’s Office. <https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/3372>

⁷ *On the Verge: Costs and Tradeoffs Facing Community College Students*. The Institute for College Access and Success, 2016.

https://ticas.org/sites/default/files/pub_files/on_the_verge.pdf

Contact: Executive Committee

9.0 CURRICULUM

9.01 S19 CB21 Rubrics for Coding Course Outcomes

Whereas, Faculty statewide from English, mathematics, and related disciplines in credit, noncredit, and adult education vetted the CB21 rubrics during the five March 2019 AB 705 Data Revision Project Recoding Regional Meetings;

Whereas, Faculty discipline groups drafted the CB21 rubrics using the federal Educational Functioning Levels (EFLs) currently used by noncredit and adult education practitioners for data reporting purposes for funding and student educational level gains including the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment Systems (CASAS);

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, West Ed, and the RP Group worked on the AB 705 Data Revision Project to create Management Information System (MIS) data elements to more accurately code transfer-level English, mathematics, and quantitative reasoning courses as well as pre-transfer credit and noncredit courses; and

Whereas, Funding and accountability efforts, such as the Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF), AB 705 (Irwin, 2017), AB 1805 (Irwin, 2018) and others, rely on drawing information about our students and colleges from coded elements that were not constructed to accurately calculate and align with these current, high-stakes roles;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges approve the CB21 rubrics and endorse their use for coding course outcomes for local college credit and noncredit courses in English, mathematics, and other related or appropriate disciplines.

Contact: Ginni May, Executive Committee

See Appendix–CB21 Rubrics (forthcoming)

*9.02 S19 Adopt the Paper *Noncredit Instruction: Opportunity and Challenge*

Whereas, Resolution 13.02 F15 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “update its paper *Noncredit Instruction: Opportunity and Challenge*, adopted by the body in Spring 2009, no later than Spring 2017 to include recent developments affecting noncredit, including using noncredit to improve equity and close the achievement gap, leveraging Career Development/College Preparation equalization funding, and addressing an increased emphasis on adult basic skills and workforce education”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Noncredit Instruction: Opportunity and Challenge*⁸ and disseminate to local senates and curriculum committees upon its adoption.

Contact: Craig Rutan, Noncredit Committee

***9.03 S19 Documenting Open Educational Resource Options in Course Outline of Record**

Whereas, In the California Community Colleges the course outline of record is the official document that establishes, among other things, the content, objectives, and instructional materials for a given course and is the basis for articulation;

Whereas, Both the California State University Chancellor's Office and University of California Office of the President are on record establishing that the use of open educational resources (OER) that are comparable to commercial texts with respect to currency and stability does not jeopardize articulation; and

Whereas, Faculty who wish to use OER may be hesitant to do so if such options are not explicitly indicated on the course outline of record, and faculty who wish to specify OER on course outlines of record may be unclear as to how to do so;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop guidelines for how to indicate the option of using open educational resources (OER) on course outlines of record; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to develop mechanisms to encourage faculty to consider open educational resources (OER) when developing or revising courses and to document the use of OER on the course outline of record.

Contact: Michelle Pilati, OER Initiative

10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST

10.01 S19 Disciplines List – Homeland Security

Whereas, Oral and written testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of minimum qualifications for faculty in the California Community Colleges, known as the *Disciplines List*, supported the following addition of the Homeland Security discipline:

Master's degree in Homeland Security, Emergency Management, Emergency

⁸ <https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Noncredit%20Instruction%20-%20Area%20Meeting.pdf>

Preparedness, Crisis Management, Disaster Management, or Cybersecurity; and

Whereas, The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has reviewed the proposal and deemed that the process outlined in the *Disciplines List Revision Handbook* was followed;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the California Community Colleges Board of Governors adopt the proposed addition to the *Disciplines List* for Homeland Security⁹.

Contact: Rebecca Eikey, Standards & Practices Committee

11.0 TECHNOLOGY

***11.01 S19 CCCApply Technical Limitations**

Whereas, The use of CCCApply for all students to enter the California Community Colleges system is required as part of the implementation of the Student Success and Support Program;

Whereas, CCCApply is often the first opportunity in the enrollment and onboarding process for students to make choices about their academic careers that will have a significant impact on their time to degree and dictate their course-taking behavior once enrolled;

Whereas, A major component of many colleges' design and implementation of their guided pathways frameworks is the creation of collections of academic majors with related coursework to support a career area or transfer goal, referred to often as meta-majors, intended to help students choose an academic major that best fits their interests and abilities; and

Whereas, CCCApply's technical limitations severely limit the flexibility colleges have to design meta-majors in ways that are easily communicated to students through CCCApply as well as to implement other student onboarding innovations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges engage the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office in a dialogue regarding modification of the CCCApply application to reduce technical limitations to allow colleges more flexibility to support students and guided pathways innovations.

Contact: Randy Beach, Southwestern College, Guided Pathways Task Force

9

<https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Disciplines%20List%20Revision%20Proposals%20Summary%202018-%28Rev-1%29-4.pdf>

***11.02 S19 Ensure Appropriate Processes for System Technology Procurement**

Whereas, Technology procurement at both the state and local level should be a transparent and inclusive process that involves all impacted constituencies and factors in both the direct and indirect costs associated with the adoption of new technologies;

Whereas, System-level purchases can be both economically and functionally advantageous;

Whereas, The process employed by the Online Education Initiative (now the California Virtual Campus – Online Education Initiative) to identify a course management system and the subsequent adoption of that system by all 114 colleges serves as a model for how a system-level technology selection process should be conducted, demonstrates how an effective process can facilitate local decision-making, and illustrates that the provision of a technology at no cost to the colleges does not bypass local decision-making processes or ensure immediate adoption; and

Whereas, System-level technology selections have impacted and may impact future local technology decisions, but do not presume that a system-level decision will determine local choices;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to ensure that any procurement of technology that the colleges would be required to access is selected via a process that is transparent, inclusive, and respectful of existing local monetary and human investments; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the use of competitive processes for the awarding of grants and the procurement of resources as required in the Standing Orders of the Board of Governors.¹⁰

Contact: Executive Committee

13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS

***13.01 S19 Develop Recommendations for the Implementation of a No-Cost Designation in Course Schedules**

Whereas, SB 1359 (Block, 2016) requires all segments of public higher education in California to “Clearly highlight, by means that may include a symbol or logo in a conspicuous place on the online campus course schedule, the courses that exclusively use

¹⁰ Procedures and Standing Orders of the Board of Governors, November 2108:
http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/Procedures_and_Standings_Orders/November-2018-Procedures-and-Standing-Orders.pdf

digital course materials that are free of charge to students and may have a low-cost option for print versions” (California Education Code §66406.9) as of January, 2018;

Whereas, Determining what course sections qualify for a no-cost identifier as required by SB 1359 (Block, 2016) is subject to interpretation, with some colleges opting to interpret the legislation very strictly and others opting to highlight all courses with no associated costs (i.e., including those courses that have never required a text); and

Whereas, Developing guidance and suggested practices for local senates to consider for the implementation of SB 1359 (Block, 2016) may result in appropriate consistencies across the colleges;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges investigate the approaches used to implement SB 1359 (Block, 2016) across all segments of higher education in California and similar efforts in other states; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop suggested guidelines, policies, and practices for implementation of SB 1359 (Block, 2016) no later than Spring of 2020.

Contact: Michelle Pilati, OER Initiative

***13.02 S19 Support for Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinators**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has urged local academic senates to identify a local open educational resources (OER) point-person to act as a liaison to facilitate OER-related communication between the college and the ASCCC (Resolution 17.02 F18);

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges’ Open Educational Resources (OER) Initiative is supporting the growth of OER use across the colleges by developing resources and supporting local OER Liaisons who may or may not receive support from their colleges;

Whereas, Various opportunities for obtaining funding for local OER efforts, including grants made available by the California Open Educational Resources Council, have required that a coordinator be identified to oversee the work; and

Whereas, Significant increases in OER usage have been reported when a local advocate has dedicated time to support OER adoption;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a collection of resources documenting the value of supporting local Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinators and associated resources (e.g., job descriptions, roles, and responsibilities); and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local colleges to identify and support a Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinator.

Contact: Michelle Pilati, OER Initiative

16.0 LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCES

16.01 S19 Adopt the Paper *The Role of the Library Faculty in the California Community College

Whereas, Resolution 16.01 F17 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “explore methods to update and expand the content of the papers *Library Faculty in California Community College Libraries: Qualifications, Roles, and Responsibilities* and *Standards of Practice for California Community College Library Faculty and Programs* to illustrate the vital and important role that libraries and librarians can, and do, play in contributing to the success of our students”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *The Role of the Library Faculty in the California Community College*¹¹ and disseminate to local senates and curriculum committees upon its adoption.

Contact: Michelle Velasquez Bean, Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Committee

16.02 S19 Adopt the Paper *Effective Practices for Online Tutoring

Whereas, Resolution 13.04 S08 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “research and prepare a paper that addresses effective and non-effective practices for establishing online tutoring programs”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Effective Practices for Online Tutoring*¹² and disseminate to local senates and curriculum committees upon its adoption.

Contact: Michelle Velasquez Bean, Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Committee

21.0 CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION

11

<https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/The%20Role%20of%20the%20Library%20Faculty%20in%20the%20California%20Community%20College%20-%20Area%20Meetings.pdf>

12

<https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Effective%20Practices%20for%20Online%20Tutoring%20for%20Area%20Meetings.pdf>

21.01 S19 Adopt the Paper *Work-Based Learning in California Community Colleges
Whereas, Resolution 13.05 S18 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “develop a paper that clearly explains and differentiates Career and Technical Education, Cooperative Work Experience, internship, and apprenticeship programs, including their regulations, funding models, and overall guiding principles, and bring the paper to the Spring 2019 Plenary Session for approval”;

Resolved, that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Work-Based Learning in California Community Colleges*¹³ and upon its adoption disseminate it to local senates and curriculum committees.

Contact: Cheryl Aschenbach, CTE Leadership Committee

¹³ <https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Work%20Based%20Learning%20-%20Area%20Meetings.pdf>

Accessible Publisher Generated Educational Materials

Whereas, All California Community Colleges are mandated to adhere to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 sections 504 and 508, which require all educational printed and digital materials to be accessible;

Whereas, Resolution 09.10 F15¹ directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) to provide professional guidelines for using publisher generated material yet never explicitly stated that all educational materials should be accessible in adherence with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973;

Whereas, The 2018 ASCCC paper *Ensuring An Effective Online Program: A Faculty Perspective*² recommends the following:

Colleges should have a distance or online education committee under the purview of the local academic senate to deal with academic and professional matters related to courses taught online. Responsibilities of this committee would include the development of recommendations and securing approval from appropriate faculty groups regarding instructional design standards for online courses and participation in the development of recommendations on policies regarding the distance education program, including policies for the ongoing professional development of distance education instructors, policies regarding training in the use of the course management system, and policies for ensuring that all courses and materials are accessible to all people with disabilities; and

Whereas, The World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) has adopted guidelines to make content on the internet accessible to all users;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that local senates work within existing committee structures and procedures to ensure dedication of resources supporting appropriate training and technical support to guarantee accessibility of course materials;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to develop local policies to adopt only course materials, including supplemental or optional materials, that are accessible for all California community college students in alignment with the World Wide Web Consortium's (W3C) Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG); and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges prepare and bring to the body for consideration a paper on accessible course materials that addresses best practices for faculty in selecting and using accessible, publisher generated educational content by spring 2021.

Contact: Amar Abbott, Taft College, Area A

¹ <https://asccc.org/resolutions/professional-guidelines-and-effective-practices-using-publisher-generated-course>

² <https://www.asccc.org/papers/ensuring-effective-online-program-faculty-perspective>

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 developed 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-two~~ years of satisfactory District service and not released for cause;

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.

*WKCCD Board Policies & Procedures
Revised 1/10/18*

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 7254210

Formatted: Font: Italic

Revised 1/10/18
Page 2 of 2

AP 7250 Administrator Retreat Rights (DRAFT)

Reference:

Education Code Sections 87358, 87359, 87454, and 87458
Title 5 Section 53430

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~~two 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.~~
3. The District has a vacancy for which the administrator meets minimum qualifications.
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, and Dean of CTE)



ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR
COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

**2019 Annual Report
Final Submission
3/22/2019**

Taft College
29 Cougar Court
Taft, CA 93268

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm logged into the correct institution's report	Confirmed
2.	Name of individual preparing report:	Brandy Young
3.	Phone number of person preparing report:	661-763-7944
4.	E-mail of person preparing report:	byoung@taftcollege.edu
5.	Type of Institution	California Community College

Headcount Enrollment Data

#	Question	Answer
6.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment:	FY 17/18: 6,488 FY 16/17: 6,303 FY 15/16: 5,925
6a.	Percent Change FY 15/16 to FY 16/17: (calculated) Percent Change FY 16/17 to FY 17/18: (calculated)	6 % 3 %
7.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in degree applicable credit courses:	FY 17/18: 6,456 FY 16/17: 6,175 FY 15/16: 5,778
7a.	Please list any individual program which has experienced a 50% increase or decrease in the last year. None Identified	

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

#	Question	Answer
8.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of distance education:	FY 17/18 2,521 FY 16/17 2,114 FY 15/16 1,891

8a.	Percent Change FY 15/16 to FY 16/17: (calculated) Percent Change FY 16/17 to FY 17/18: (calculated)	12 % 19 %
9.	Do you offer Correspondence Education?	Yes
9a.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Correspondence Education:	FY 17/18 243 FY 16/17 251 FY 15/16 230
9b.	Percent Change FY 15/16 to FY 16/17: (calculated) Percent Change FY 16/17 to FY 17/18: (calculated)	9 % -3 %

Federal Data

#	Question	Answer
10.	List the Graduation Rate per the US Education Department College Scorecard for FY 2017/18	29 %
11.	If your college relies on another source for reporting success metrics, please identify the source (select one).	

Institution Set Standards for Student Achievement

#	Question	Answer						
Course Completion Rates								
12.	List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for successful student course completion rate:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69 %</td> <td>66 %</td> <td>66 %</td> </tr> </table>	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	69 %	66 %	66 %
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18						
69 %	66 %	66 %						
12a.	List your stretch goal (aspirational) for successful student course completion rate:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70 %</td> <td>70 %</td> <td>73 %</td> </tr> </table>	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	70 %	70 %	73 %
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18						
70 %	70 %	73 %						
12b.	List the actual successful student course completion rate:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70 %</td> <td>70 %</td> <td>79 %</td> </tr> </table>	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	70 %	70 %	79 %
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18						
70 %	70 %	79 %						
Certificates								
13.	List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for the number of certificates awarded:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>47</td> <td>47</td> </tr> </table>	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	N/A	47	47
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18						
N/A	47	47						
13a.	List your stretch goal (aspirational) for the number of certificates awarded:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>51</td> </tr> </table>	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	N/A	N/A	51
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18						
N/A	N/A	51						
13b.	List actual number of certificates awarded:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50</td> <td>58</td> <td>116</td> </tr> </table>	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	50	58	116
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18						
50	58	116						
Associate Degree (A.A./A.S.)								
14.	List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for number of degrees awarded:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>305</td> <td>323</td> <td>323</td> </tr> </table>	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	305	323	323
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18						
305	323	323						
14a.	List your stretch goal (aspirational) for the number of degrees awarded:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>333</td> </tr> </table>	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	N/A	N/A	333
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18						
N/A	N/A	333						

14b.	List actual number of degrees awarded:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>323</td> <td>400</td> <td>538</td> </tr> </table>			FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	323	400	538
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18								
323	400	538								
Bachelor's Degree (B.A./B.S.)										
15.	Does your college offer a Bachelor's Degree (B.A./B.S.)?	No								
Transfer										
16.	List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for the number of students who transfer to a 4-year college/university:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>199</td> <td>223</td> <td>223</td> </tr> </table>			FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	199	223	223
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18								
199	223	223								
16a.	List your stretch goal (aspirational) for the number of students who transfer to a 4-year college/university:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>265</td> </tr> </table>			FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	N/A	N/A	265
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18								
N/A	N/A	265								
16b.	List actual number of the number of students who transfer to a 4-year college/university:	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>FY 15/16</td> <td>FY 16/17</td> <td>FY 17/18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>223</td> <td>258</td> <td>177</td> </tr> </table>			FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	223	258	177
FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18								
223	258	177								
17.	Examination pass rates in programs for which students must pass a licensure examination in order to work in their field of study:									
	Program	Examination	Institution set standard	FY 15/16 Pass Rate	FY 16/17 Pass Rate	FY 17/18 Pass Rate				
	Dental Hygiene	state	95 %	100 %	100 %	100 %				
18.	Job placement rates for students completing certificate programs and CTE (career-technical education) degrees:									
	Program	Institution set standard	FY 15/16 Job Placement Rate	FY 16/17 Job Placement Rate	FY 17/18 Job Placement Rate					
	Early Childcare Education	69 %	68.4 %	83.3 %	81.5 %					
	Dental Hygiene	69 %	100 %	88.2 %	100 %					
	Liberal Arts Allied Health	69 %	71.4 %	77.4 %	67 %					
	Management	83.5 %	71.4 %	92.3 %	n/a %					
	Administration of Justice	76.7 %	73.3 %	93.8 %	n/a %					

Other Information

19.	Please use this text box to provide any comments regarding the data submitted in this report (optional, no limit). None
-----	---

Taft College
29 Cougar Court Drive
Taft, CA 93268
(661)763-7000

Taft College
Dr. Debra Daniels
President/Superintendent
(661) 763-7710

Taft College
Jessica Grimes
Interim Dean of Instruction and CTE
(661) 763-7721

March 8, 2019

Improving Online Career and Technical Education (CTE) Pathways Grant Program Letter of Intent

Proposed Project Title: Building and Improving Online CTE Certificates

Proposed Project Summary: Taft College has an interest in applying for the Improving Online CTE Pathways grant. As a rural community college with a majority of students commuting to campus, offering more online CTE programs would provide the flexibility and access for more students to complete their programs.

We are in the initial stages of increasing online access to CTE program to meet industry demands. Workforce labor market information indicates that flexible, online programs align with student need. Therefore, our focus will be to identify CTE certificate programs that have a clear regional workforce need in this region and can be offered fully online. Of those identified programs, we plan to target courses that have yet to be taught online and pay faculty to build those courses online.

For the CTE certificate programs that are already taught fully online, we will identify courses with lower success rates and/or enrollment and pay faculty to align the targeted courses to the CVC-OEI rubric. Where possible, we will use Zero Textbook Cost Materials and/or Open Educational resources for each course aligned to the CVC-OEI rubric.

The project will require instructional design support to assist faculty in designing courses that align with the rubric, specifically to help overcome accessibility challenges. Additionally, a data technician will be required to collect the data necessary to track progress towards reaching our desired success metrics.

Success will be measured not only by how many CTE certificate and degree programs are offered fully online, but also measured by how many of those programs have courses aligned to the CVC-OEI rubric.

These activities will increase enrollment, retention, persistence, and success rates. Certificates and programs that are offered fully online, with high quality courses, will see an increase in successful completers.

Proposed Total Budget Request: \$0 - \$100,000

Primary Goal of Proposed Project: Build new online certificates, credentials, and programs (Track 2)

Areas Proposed Project Best Aligns:

- To fill gaps in existing on-ground certificates, credentials or programs
- To build online certificate, credential or program that addresses regional workforce needs
- To create online programs using industry content, Zero Textbook Cost Materials, and/or Open Educational Resources

Level of Certainty: After local discussion on the number of certificate programs and degrees targeted, it is possible the Zero Textbook Cost Materials and/or Open Educational Resources will be deemphasized, unless they are already present in the course. In prioritizing course alignment to the CVC-OEI rubric, there may not be enough time to search and vet appropriate ZTC-OER material.

Authorized Organization Representative:

Project Director/Principal Investigator:

Dr. Debra S. Daniels
Superintendent/President
(661)763-7710
ddaniels@taftcollege.edu

Jessica Grimes
Interim Dean of Instruction and CTE
(661)763-7721
jfrimes@taftcollege.edu

ASCCC Adopted Resolution

Degree and Certificate Awards in Response to the New Funding Formula

Fall

2018

Resolution Number:

09.01

Contact:

[Stephanie Curry](#)

Category:

Curriculum

Whereas, The Student Centered Funding Formula that was enacted by the governor's 2018-19 Budget Trailer Bill on June 27, 2018^[1] provides monetary incentives for college districts to award the associate degree for transfer over a local associate degree, and when possible multiple degrees or certificates to a single student;

Whereas, The Student Centered Funding Formula may disadvantage smaller colleges that offer fewer local degrees or associate degrees for transfer than larger colleges, as well as colleges that lack robust degree audit programs, as auto-awarding degrees and certificates may be more difficult at such colleges;

Whereas, For students transferring to the University of California, a private institution, or an out-of-state institution, a local associate degree may provide better preparation than an associate degree for transfer; and

Whereas, An increase in the number of degrees or certificates a student is awarded should indicate additional qualifications attained by the student that are above and beyond the qualifications a student would earn from a single degree or certificate, and there are implications, known and unknown, with awarding students degrees and certificates that may impact their short-term and long-term educational opportunities;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and other stakeholders to support the efforts of colleges to best meet the educational goals of students in both awarding associate degrees and, when appropriate, guiding students through transfer preparation when the University of California or California State University does not require an associate degree;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and other stakeholders to provide guidance to colleges for awarding multiple degrees or certificates to a single student;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to work with their colleges to establish processes to ensure that no degrees or certificates will be auto-awarded without the expressed and informed affirmative consent of each student; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and other stakeholders to advise local academic senates and curriculum committees about the effects on financial aid when auto-awarding degrees and certificates.

MSC

[1] http://dof.ca.gov/Budget/Trailer_Bill_Language/documents/CommunityCollegeStudent-FocusedApportionmentsFormula_001.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 or 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**

A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures

ADOPTED SPRING 2018

EQUITY AND DIVERSITY ACTION COMMITTEE 2017-2018

DOLORES DAVISON, CHAIR, Foothill College

SAM FOSTER, Fullerton College

EARTHA JOHNSON, Victor Valley College

ORLANDO SHANNON, Lassen College

MICHAEL WYLY, Solano College

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
WHAT HAS CHANGED SINCE THE LAST PAPER.....	2
SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE EEO FUND ALLOCATION MODEL AND IMPACT ON HIRING PRACTICES ...	3
HIRING PROCESSES AND PRIORITIZATIONS	5
THE FORMATION OF THE HIRING COMMITTEE.....	8
THE ROLE OF FACULTY ON FACULTY HIRING COMMITTEES.....	9
THE ROLE OF ADMINISTRATORS IN HIRING FACULTY	9
TRAINING THE HIRING COMMITTEE.....	10
DEVELOPING OBJECTIVES	11
THE JOB DESCRIPTION	11
ADVERTISING AND RECRUITING	13
INITIAL SCREENING	14
INTERVIEW PROCESS AND QUESTIONS	15
SELECTING THE FINALISTS	16
FINALIST INTERVIEWS.....	17
WHAT HAPPENS IF A SEARCH FAILS?	17
OTHER HIRING PROCESSES: PART-TIME HIRING.....	18
OTHER HIRING PROCESSES: FULL-TIME TEMPORARY REPLACEMENT FACULTY.....	18
OTHER HIRING PROCESSES: CRITICAL OR EMERGENCY HIRING OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME FACULTY	19
BEYOND HIRING: MENTORING AND RETAINING NEW FACULTY	20
BEYOND HIRING: CONSIDERATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE RETREAT RIGHTS.....	21
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HIRING PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES.....	23
CONCLUSION.....	23
APPENDICES	25
APPENDIX A: EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY FUND MULTIPLE METHOD ALLOCATION MODEL CERTIFICATION FORM	27
APPENDIX B: EXAMPLES OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICES RELATED TO HIRING PROCESSES	31

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 CCCCOC 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>

² <http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Reports/2016-EEO-and-Diversity-Handbook-ADA.pdf>

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)³, 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

3 <http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Reports/2016-EEO-and-Diversity-Handbook- ADA.pdf>

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*⁴ 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 CCCC, 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:

4 <https://www.asccc.org/papers/equivalence-minimum-qualifications-1>

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.⁶ 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.

6 Wong v. Ohlone College (2006) at <http://caselaw.findlaw.com/ca-court-of-appeal/1419242.html>

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: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Chief Human Resources Officer

Name: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Chief Executive Officer (Chancellor or President/Superintendent)

Name: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

President/Chair, District Board of Trustees

Date of governing board's approval/certification: _____, 2018

Name: _____

Title: *President/Chair, Board of Trustees* _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

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

<http://www.lassencollege.edu/about/employment/Documents/LCC-Selection-and-Hiring-Manual.pdf>

Equity Handbook for Hiring – Los Rios Community College District

[http://www.losrios.edu/hr/Equity%20Hiring%20Handbook%20Final%20Version%202%20\(3.16.2015\).pdf](http://www.losrios.edu/hr/Equity%20Hiring%20Handbook%20Final%20Version%202%20(3.16.2015).pdf)

Faculty Hiring Manual – Solano Community College (2017)

http://www.solano.edu/academic_senate/1617/SCC%20Hiring%20Guidelinesdraft41217MW%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 LCFA 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

ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 6, 2019

3:00 S-11

Members Present: Lori Sundgren, Danielle Kerr, Kamala Carlson, Joe'll Chaidez, Janis Mendenhall, Diane Jones

Absent: Dr. Windy Martinez, Kent Miller, Celina Aldaco

Guests: Geoffrey Dyer

1. Approve February minutes
Diane approved. Joe'll seconded.
2. Go over notes/observations from orientation video-Joe'll
Committee shared notes from the orientation video, which each member watched ahead of the meeting. Joe'll will draft a letter to send to Severo and Windy with our recommendations. This is part of Guided Pathways.
3. Continue Guided Pathways Trello work-Joe'll
Joe'll has been making notes on the Trello board. He showed us his updates. ADC has completed the Guided Pathways Trello board that was assigned to us.
4. Guided Self Placement-Joe'll
Darcy, Joe'll, and Jason Zsiba have been working on Guided Self Placement for the website. They are using the state guidelines. The goal is to finish before the catalog due date in April.
5. Fall scheduling (Math and English)- Diane, Kamala, Danielle
Kamala and Diane shared Math and English Fall 2019 scheduling information. English will have one face to face and one online 1000 section for summer. Fall will have multiple sections of 1000, which will be the lowest level offered. Math has cut 14 sections (63 units) for the 2019 calendar year. There will be one section of 230 and one section of 240.
6. Building Bridges-Kamala, Danielle
Sarah, Windy, Nicole, and Kamala all presented. Danielle set up and decorated. The Basic Skills/ SEAP budget sponsored \$2000.
7. California Acceleration Project Conference-Joe'll, Lori
Did not get to.



TAFT COLLEGE

CTE COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

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)



SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

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
February 7, 2019, 3:10 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., in the Cougar Room.

Members Present: K. Bandy A. Bledsoe, J. Chaidez, T. Furman, V. Jacobi, J. Martinez, M. Mayfield, M. Oja, J. Rangel-Escobedo, D. Rodenhauser, D. Vohnout, B. Young, and W. Null-ASO Representative

Members Absent: S. Balason, K. Carlson, and J. Grimes

Guests: n/a

MINUTES

I. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** From the February 7th, 2019 Curriculum & General Education meeting (3)
An edit was made to item IV. A. of the January 2019 minutes. The motion approved was only to add textbooks and resource packets to all CORs. "Disciplines" discussions has been tabled until after Academic Senate training takes place. That training was scheduled to be completed during Spring 2019 In-service. On a motion by M.Oja, seconded by J. Rangel-Escobedo, and unanimously carried by all, the February 2019 minutes were approved.

II. **Tabled from October 2018 C & GE meeting:**

A. **Course Revision:**

1. PSYC 2003 Child Growth and Development (5)

The Social Science division has decided to keep the proposed revision as a PSYC COR with an ECE TOP code. On a motion by K. Bandy, seconded by K. Carlson, and unanimously carried by all, the COR revision was approved to move forward to the next District Board meeting held on March 13, 2019.

III. **Action Item:**

A. **Child and Adolescent Development for Transfer (11)**

The committee reviewed the template. The division agreed with the creation of this degree. A motion to develop a "draft" was made by J. Rangel-Escobedo, seconded by K. Bandy, and unanimously carried by all, the draft for this ADT will be reviewed at our next C & GE meeting held on March 7th 2019.

B. **Upper Division coursework Policy (13)**

The committee reviewed the draft created by V. Jacobi. Minor edits were made to the policy draft. Edits include removing the 3rd sentence that talks about accepting subject credits. The wording was made to read more clearly for the students. On a motion by J. Rangel-Escobedo, seconded by J. Martinez, and unanimously carried by all, the policy was approved.

IV. **DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

A. **Catalog Additions**

*Curriculum and General Education Committee Minutes for
February 7, 2019*

1. Program example (14)

The group reviewed the current layout of our ADT's in the catalog. The student representative affirmed the layout is very clear & should not cause confusion. V. Jacobi explained that we are following the templates approved by the state of California. In following these templates, we cannot add or replace required content. V. Jacobi reminded the committee who is to initiate program revisions once they have inactivated courses. Each division will look at their sections and make/request edits as needed.

B. Guided Pathways/Meta Majors

Seven areas of interest were identified with the use of student surveys. These areas of interest are now on the dashboard. These interest areas will be re-evaluated in 2 years. Student feedback will be used in the evaluation.

C. AP on Transcripts

This item was tabled. It may be discussed at our March C & GE meeting.

D. Auto awarding certificates

T. Furman shared the auto-awarding process with the group. Students who qualify for a certificate will be identified by an internal TC report. T. Furman shared the benefits of auto-awarding certificates, by auto-awarding TC keeps the student engaged in their studies. The auto-awarding process is still in the works. V. Jacobi agreed to be the voice of the Curriculum Committee if questions come up.

E. Other (19)

Item E. was used to discuss Disciplines on CORs. The committee talked about the process. It was decided to add a "Disciplines" section to the supplemental data table as part of the five-year review cycle. Division chairs will create the "Disciplines" list for every COR in the review process.

V. INFORMATIONAL ITEM:

1. Program Status, please see the table below:

Program	Tech Review Approved	C & GE Approved	Board Approved	State Approved	Revisions
*AA-T Elementary Teacher Education	2/24/2015	3/9/2015	4/8/2015	Under Review	
AA-T Sociology	1/16/2018	2/6/2018	3/14/2018	Approved	
*ADT – Economics	4/24/18	5/3/18	6/13/18	Approved	
Liberal Arts Area of Emphasis: Math and Science	9/18/18	9/28/18	10/10/18	Approved	

* **New Program**

VI. NEXT MEETING: February/March (TBA) 2019 in the Cougar room

Academic Policy for the Use of Upper Division Units

Taft College will accept coursework completed at the upper division level from a regionally accredited college or university within all of the following conditions:

1. The coursework must be deemed comparable to a Taft College course by the appropriate discipline faculty, division chair, C-ID descriptor, or an articulation agreement.
2. Courses may be used to meet content credit in a program requirement, a local associate degree's general education requirement, or a prerequisite.
- ~~3. Courses will be accepted for subject credit only; units will not be awarded.~~
4. Maximum subject credit for upper division units will be allowed.
5. Courses will not be used to certify CSU GE or IGETC certification

Students should be aware that transfer schools (receiving colleges or universities) may count the upper division units as upper division units, so students will still need 60 lower division units for transfer.

TAFT COLLEGE
Distance Education Committee Minutes

February 08, 2019

1:10 pm – 2:00 pm

Attendees: Amar Abbott, Jennifer Altenhofel, Nicole Avina, Adam Bledsoe, Jill Brown, Brian Jean, Kelly Kulzer-Reyes, Joy Reynolds, Sara Wallace.

Absent: Geoffrey Dyer

AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the January 18, 2019 Meeting.
 - a. Jen accepts the minutes, Joy seconds, and all approve.
2. Course Approvals for Distance Learning- Is this course appropriate to be taught in the online format.
 - a. BSAD 2900- **Comments:**
 - i. **Question 2** was not addressed as thoroughly as it could have been. Instructor does not list any anticipated challenges on the form. Altenhofel expressed concerns that there will be potential difficulties when it comes to the use of technology, but no anticipated challenges in the course. How will students be supported when attempting to use course related technologies?
 - ii. The course, being a Hallmark course, does not justify it as needing to be taught online.
 - b. ENER 2900- **Comments:**
 - i. **Question 5**, Altenhofel did not see enough explanation in the response. Although some know that Layne's Unit 0 Getting Started Module will help students with course navigation and troubleshooting, not all will. She'd like to see a more robust response. Suggested response to this question: Explain the general guide's ability to help students.
 - c. STSU 1525- **Comments:**
 - i. **Question 2**, no unique challenges are anticipated. There are unique challenges for every course taught in the online format. This course will rely on outside websites, how will you address assuring all links will be working for the course?
 - d. STSU 1530- **Comments:**
 - i. **Question 2**, virtual tours can present unique challenges with accessibility. How will that be addressed?
 - e. STSU 1550- **Comments:**
 - i. Question 4, can be addressed in a more thorough manner.
3. Distance Learning Approval Form

Additional Comments:

1. This form was supposed to be a step 1 of the bigger process.
2. Who will be checking to make sure courses are following through with what they state in the form.
3. Ideas for future in-service trainings on how to train faculty to fill out the DL approval form.

Taft College Distance Learning Approval Form Addendum to the Course Outline of Record

Course #:

Course Title:

Submitted by:

Date:

Please submit this form electronically as a Word file to the Director of Distance Education

1. This course is being approved for online, offline, and hybrid delivery. If you feel one or more of those deliveries is not appropriate for this course, please select and explain below:

Course is appropriate for all three methods of delivery (no explanation needed)

Course is not appropriate for online delivery:

Course is not appropriate for offline delivery:

Course is not appropriate for hybrid delivery:

2. 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 you are not sure, ask the division chair and/or the DE Director to determine.
 - This course will NOT push the percentage of Distance Learning courses offered in the program over 50%
 - This course will push the percentage of Distance Learning courses offered in the program over 50% and a Substantive Change has been submitted to ACCJC.
3. All course outcomes identified in the Course Outline of Record must be met in the distance learning environment. Identify any unique challenges related to outcomes in this course specific to the distance education environment. For those identified, explain how they may be met in a distance learning environment.
 - Beyond maintaining regular and effective contact and adhering to accessibility requirements, this course does not present any unique challenges to meeting all course outcomes (no explanation needed).

Potential challenges to meeting course outcomes:

- Educational materials
- Labs
- Models
- Presentations
- Requirements to present in front of live audience
- Other:

Explain how identified each challenge can be met in a distance learning environment:

4. In accordance with [Title 5](#) and [AP 4105](#) this course must promote regular effective instructor/student contact.

I/We have read the full text of [Title 5](#) Section 55204 Instructor Contact, [AP 4105](#), and the guidelines listed below. Having thoughtfully considered the educational value of offering this course in the distance education environment, I/We agree that this course will consistently promote regular effective instructor/student contact.

Regular Effective Contact Guidelines: DE courses are considered the “virtual equivalent” to in-person courses. Lack of regular, timely, and effective contact between students and instructors is a major factor in student attrition and poor performance in online courses. Therefore, an instructor shall regularly initiate interaction with students to determine that they are accessing and comprehending course material and that they are participating regularly in the activities in the course. In doing so, the following guidelines should be followed:

- I. Syllabus includes a communication policy that explains or states the following:
 - a. the frequency of all contact initiated by the instructor.
 - b. the timeliness of response to student-initiated contact.
 - c. the course policy regarding student-initiated contact (where to post questions, assignments, etc.)
 - d. important dates, such as assignment and assessment deadlines.
 - e. Instructor contact information which includes virtual or in-person office hours.
 - f. The student-to-student contact requirements for the course
- II. Weekly contact is maintained and occurs as often as is appropriate for the course.
- III. Frequent and substantive feedback is provided throughout the course.
- IV. Regarding the type of contact that will exist in all Taft College distance learning courses, instructors will use three or more of the following methods to maintain contact with students outlined in [AP 4105](#).

5. In accordance with [Title 5](#) and [AP 5145](#) 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).

I/We have read the full text of [Title 5](#), [AP 5145](#) and the requirements listed below. To ensure access to education for all students, I/We agree that the course content will be designed and maintained to ensure that it is ADA and 508 compliant.

ADA and 508 Compliance Requirements:

- a. Videos are accurately captioned.
- b. Audio files are transcribed.
- c. Objects (including images, tables, and charts) have alternative text.
- d. Course materials are “readable” in terms of font, color contrast, and spacing. Color is not the only method used to convey meaning.
- e. Hyperlink text is meaningful.
- f. Documents are created in such a way that screen reading software can “read” them. (i.e. styles are used; column header rows in tables are specified, etc.)

DE Committee Comments:

Date forwarded to the Curriculum Committee:

Curriculum Committee Comments:

Course Approved or Disapproved

Minutes – Taft College Dual Enrollment Committee Wednesday, February 6, 2019

Attendees: Greg Golling, Diane Jones, Caroline Schoneweis, Kristi Richards, Vicki Jacobi, Tori Furman, Jessica Grimes, Tammy Sutherland, Mary Alice Finn and Bill Devine

Minutes were approved for the 12/05/18 meeting

1. Special Admit Policies and Procedures Update

Kristi and Tammy reported that things were running smoothly. Kristi will bring the concurrent student enrollment numbers to the March meeting. Tammy reported that there were 3 or 4 special circumstance students that were over the Taft College 11-unit limit. The VP of Student Services approved these exceptions since the State of California allows 15 units. Tammy will bring this documentation to the March meeting and the committee can discuss a possible to change the 11-unit limit. Kristi also reported on a student concurrently enrolled in the career exploration course. This course used to be transferrable and no longer is therefore students should not be able to enroll concurrently under our current guidelines. Diane expressed an interest that the committee consistently follow the special admit guidelines. Vicki reported a student success course 1510 had just been approved and it is transferrable so it would be available for concurrent enrollment. Tori mentioned that a course called Career Choices could also be developed to meet this need but has not gone through the curriculum process yet.

2. Dual Enrollment for Academic Year 2018-19

Tammy reported that the dual enrollment courses are going strong. Vicki reported that Speech 1511 would change to Communication 1511. There was discussion about kinesiology majors not needing biology, however that presents a problem for the high school when a student takes anatomy the first semester, but doesn't need the biology course the second semester. Vicki and Tori mentioned that the pathways could be updated and then a meeting between the counseling departments could be arranged to communicate the updates.

3. Dual Enrollment MOU

Greg had emailed the draft MOU out with the meeting materials and asked if there were any corrections or changes needed to the document. The updated document will be emailed out with the March meeting materials. Vicki reminded the committee that there are other ways for students to receive college credit other than via dual enrollment courses such as AP Exam credit, 2+2 Tech Prep credit, and credit by exam.

4. Student Success Course at BVHS

Jessica reported there was an interest in offering a student success course as dual enrollment at BVHS. The committee felt that BVHS could offer their students a student success course and then those students who attend Taft College could apply for credit under the 2+2 Tech Prep guidelines. This process might also work well for energy technology courses offered in the TUHS oil academy.

5. Dual Enrollment planning 2019-20

The committee wants to get the dual enrollment MOU finalized so it can move forward to the Board of Trustees at both TC and TUHS. Mary Alice requested that two sections of each dual enrollment course be added to the schedule and if the high school numbers do not materialize then sections could be cancelled. Greg agreed to communicate this request to our schedule technician, Jeanene.

6. Other

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 March meeting.

Next meeting – Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 12:10pm in the Cougar Room



Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Steering Committee

Minutes

Friday, February 8, 2019
Counseling Center Conference Room
11:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m.

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

Guest: Sharyn Eveland and Amar Abbott

Absent: Tina Mendoza

Secretary: Brandy Young

The meeting was called to order at 11:10 a.m.

Public Commentary

None

Approval of Minutes from January 18, 2019

Minutes were approved without changes.

Information/Discussion Items

1. Review Data and ACCJC Standards - Vicki reviewed her matrix that she has been working on for a few years now. The matrix is a compilation of the ACCJC Standards relative to SLOs, activities to support the standards and the evidence. A column has been added for gap analysis. Vicki will email this document out to the committee. A lengthy conversation was had regarding SLOs and the changes happening in this area pertaining to accreditation.

2. eLumen Widget Tool Presentation - Sharyn and Brandy will continue to work on this project.

3. May In-service ideas - Vicki will reach out to the Professional Development Committee to reserve time for an activity involving SLO data analysis. Possibly provide training and demonstrations using Results Explorer in eLumen.

Action Items

None

Other/Open Forum for Announcements

Vicki shared a signature assignment for Quantitative Reasoning. She reviewed a rough draft, *"Give each student a relevant chart specific to the discipline; either a chart, a diagram or a table, or a graph and have them convert it to relevant information. Interpret the data. Apply judgement to draw conclusions based on assumptions to support an argument"*. The idea is to have all faculty use this in their classes in order to assess the Quantitative Reasoning ISLO. If only a few disciplines use this assessment, it could start the conversation and give a general idea how our students are doing.

Adjournment (12:00 a.m.)

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

Respectfully submitted by Brandy Young



BUDGET COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 8, 2019, 8:10 a.m.

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



**Minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee
9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
Friday, March 8, 2019
Counseling Center Conference Room**

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

Members absent: None

Secretary: Brandy Young

Approval of Minutes - February 8, 2019

Minutes were approved without changes.

Vision for Success

Brandy distributed two handouts: February 13th Chancellor's Office memo and the Vision for Success Local Goal Reporting form template. Julie began the discussion with an overview of the Chancellor's memo and went over the timeline. She explained the process of entering the goals into NOVA; the online application for the Vision for Success (VfS) goals. Julie reviewed the Local Goal template. She stated that most of the goals are already aligned with our current Strategic Action Plan (SAP). SPC will review the local goal setting requirements and our SAP goals and confirm where they align and identify any gaps where additional goals may need to be set. When the SAP was developed the Student Success Metrics (SSM) were not available. The Chancellor's Office is requesting the SSM be used to set the VfS goals. The Committee discussed the various goals and how they overlap with our other projects, the Equity Plan and the ACCJC Annual Report. Julie reminded the committee about the ACCJC webinar on the Annual Report in two weeks.

The VfS Local Goal template will be Board approved prior to May 31st. The Strategic Action Plan may need to be amended in order for the metrics to align correctly with the VfS goals. This can be Board approved at a later date.

The Committee discussed the methodology in setting the SAP goals (using cohort data) versus the SSM data. Should we use the model we currently have in the SAP and update the data or do we go with a completely different system and compare the two. The committee agreed to use what we currently have. We will assess the goals and update as needed.

A special meeting with a few key SPC members will be scheduled to review our current data set from the SAP and bring it back to the larger group in the format of the Local Goal template. Key points of discussion on the differences in the metrics:

- Goal 5 - Equity - disproportionate impact to be eliminated in 10 years
- Goal 1 - our SAP completion goal was modest compared to the system wide goal of 20%
- Our Goals 1 through 4 should be modest - this will help us achieve goal 5
- We could stay with the modest percentages for increase we have now and decide at a later date if we want to increase them later
- We want to remain as consistent as possible with what is in our current SAP

Strategic Planning Committee
March 8, 2019

- The draft VsF template will be reviewed at Governance Council on March 22
- The completed draft will be sent out to all SPC members prior to March 22 for review and input
- April 5th SPC meeting the draft will be finalized
- The completed template will go to the Board in May and will need to be completed by April 26th
- Faculty will be gone April 15th thru 19th and Sharyn, Vicki and Geoffrey will be gone April 10, 11 and 12th
- The draft template should be circulated back out to SPC by March 18

Accreditation Steering Committee - Roles and Responsibilities

Key points of discussion:

- A retreat has been scheduled for March 29th for the SPC members to identify roles and responsibilities of the ASC members and their subcommittees
- Amar Abbott will demonstrate MindView as a possible tool for the evidence repository
- Themes will be identified at the retreat and phases will be created for steps and processes align with the accreditation timeline
- It is important to provide a strong visual of the process to the subcommittees
- Locate Charter for the ASC (was one created?)
- The committee discussed possible editing tools - Office 365- Sharepoint - we want to be mindful of overwriting controls
- Provide packets to the subcommittees- major areas and themes/checklist for gap analysis

The next SPC regular meeting will be on April 5th at 10:30 a.m. in the Counseling Center Conference Room.

Respectfully submitted by: Brandy Young