ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
December 1, 2011
3:00 p.m. – SSV 151

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- **a. November 17, 2011 (attachment)**

5. REPORTS (5 minutes maximum)
- **a. Honors Committee – Karen Lubick**
- **b. Faculty Professional Development – Kathryn Mitchell**

6. ACTION ITEM
- **a. Equivalencies:**
  - **Mathematics (attachment)**

7. DISCUSSION ITEM
- **a. SLO Assessment Report**
- **b. Student Success Task Force Recommendations Review**
- **c. Hayward Award Nomination – due December 5, 2011**

8. SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS
- **a. Appointments**
  - **Academic Ranking**
    - **Kenan Shahla – Associate Professor**
- **b. Announcements**
  - Accreditation Institute – February 10, 2012 – February 12, 2012, Anaheim Sheraton Park
  - Academic Academy – February 24, 2012 – February 25, 2012, Anaheim Doubletree
  - Vocational Education Leadership Institute – March 21, 2012 – March 23, 2012, San Francisco Airport Westin
  - Statewide Academic Senate Spring 2012 Plenary Session – San Francisco Airport Westin
  - Faculty Leadership Institute – June 14, 2012 – June 16, 2012, TBA
  - Curriculum Institute – July 12, 2012 – July 14, 2012, San Francisco Airport Westin
  - Statewide Academic Senate Fall 2012 Plenary Session – November 8, 2012 – November 10, 2012, Irvine Marriott

9. ADJOURNMENT

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

Antelope Valley College prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sex, gender, race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cancer-related medical condition, or genetic predisposition. Upon request, we will consider reasonable accommodation to permit individuals with protected disabilities to (1) complete the employment or admission process, (b) perform essential job functions, (c) enjoy benefits and privileges of similarly-situated individuals without disabilities, and (d) participate in instruction, programs, services, activities, or events.

Upon request, this agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with disabilities, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct such request to Mr. Christos Valiotis, Academic Senate President, at (661) 722-6306 (weekdays between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.) at least 48 hours before the meeting, if possible. Public records related to agenda items for open session are available for public inspection 72 hours prior to each regular meeting at the Antelope Valley College Academic Senate's Office, Administration Building, 3041 West Avenue K, Lancaster, California 93536.

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
ADDENDUM AGENDA
December 1, 2011
3:00 p.m. – SSV 151

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

1. ACTION ITEM

a. **Equivalencies**

- **Biological Sciences (attachment)**
- **Emergency Medical Technologies (attachment)**
- **Geography (attachment)**
- **Nursing Science/Clinical Practice (attachment)**
- **Physics/Astronomy (attachment**

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

Antelope Valley College prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sex, gender, race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cancer-related medical condition, or genetic predisposition. Upon request, we will consider reasonable accommodation to permit individuals with protected disabilities to (1) complete the employment or admission process, (b) perform essential job functions, (c) enjoy benefits and privileges of similarly-situated individuals without disabilities, and (d) participate in instruction, programs, services, activities, or events.

Upon request, this agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with disabilities, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct such request to Mr. Christos Valiotis, Academic Senate President, at (661) 722-6306 (weekdays between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.) at least 48 hours before the meeting, if possible. Public records related to agenda items for open session are available for public inspection 72 hours prior to each regular meeting at the Antelope Valley College Academic Senate's Office, Administration Building, 3041 West Avenue K, Lancaster, California 93536.

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
December 1, 2011
3:00 p.m. – SSV 151

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mr. Christos Valiotis, Academic Senate President, called the December 1, 2011 Academic Senate meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

- Mr. Valiotis announced a ceramic sale is happening today to support the Ceramics classes. Free ice cream is being served to anyone who supports the ceramic sale.
- This is the last Academic Senate meeting for the fall 2011 semester. The Senate Executive will handle any Senate business occurring during the Intersession break.
- Budget update: According to the latest State budget projections, the state is expected to have an estimated 13 billion dollar deficit. This would trigger budget scenario Tier 2. The District is expecting to see midyear cuts to the current budget. The District planned accordingly for this budget scenario although the big question now is how much money will be deferred and will have to be borrowed to cover operational expenses. The California Community College system is expected to take a $102 million dollar hit to the overall budget.
- SPBC members discussed the staffing requirements for the two new buildings (Performing Arts Theatre and the Health Science). The new buildings will require additional staffing to support maintenance and operations. It is estimated there is a 1.1 million dollar staffing need to get buildings minimally operational.
- Seven faculty have come forward to announce their retirement intensions for this academic year. In addition, the Technical Education Dean, Ms. Margaret Drake, announced her intention to retire at the end of the academic year. The District is currently discussing the possibilities of finding replacements.
- At the last Mutual Agreement Council meeting the group engaged in discussion on reinstating the Vice President of Student Services position. The first search to replace the Vice President of Administrative Services was not successful. The District will conduct another search in the near future. The interview process for the Palmdale Director position has been completed and the candidate's name will be announced after the December board meeting.
- There are several faculty leadership conference opportunities available throughout the academic year. Faculty interested in acquiring leadership knowledge should consider attending one of the Statewide Academic Senate sponsored leadership institutes. Faculty need to continue advocating for themselves and encourage colleagues to consider future leadership opportunities. The Senate currently does not have any means to sponsor faculty but the expenses are completely tax deductible for faculty choosing to participate.

3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

- Dr. Susan Lowry stated she was a member of the recent hiring committee for the Vice President of Administrative Services position. It became very evident the District is going to have to make efforts to increase the salary scale for some Administrative positions in order to be competitive with other Districts. This is a difficult topic to broach in fiscally uncertain times but having experienced first hand the disappointment and frustration of trying to hire a qualified candidate for this important campus position made the situation very obvious. Hiring committee members were continually frustrated and disappointed because many candidates dropped out of the hiring pool to take other positions with higher salaries. The District is going to have to conduct another hiring search, as there were not enough qualified candidates in the pool to continue with the hiring process. Faculty need to be aware this action is absolutely necessary to ensure the District is able to attract qualified candidates for future hiring pools.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. November 17, 2011 (attachment)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the November 17, 2011 Academic Senate meeting minutes. Ms. MaryAnne Holcomb presented a hard copy of grammatical errors needing to be made. Motion carried as corrected.

5. REPORTS (5 minutes maximum)

a. Honors Committee – Karen Lubick

Ms. Lubick reported she was recently informed that two AVC Honors students were winners of speech contests. She extended her congratulations on the work and achievements of these particular students. The Honors Committee met three times during the fall semester (September 26, 2011; October 24, 2011; and November 28, 2011). During the course of the semester committee members approved the following new honors sections: HIST 108H (Shafer); ENGL 102H (Memmer); PHIL 105H (S. Zhu); GEOG 105H (Pesses); and ThArts 101H (Heebner). The committee also discussed and reviewed Honors eligibility requirements. The committee approved adding a program eligibility requirement of Math 102 in addition to the existing English 101. Students joining the program in fall 2012 will be held to the new requirement. The program will limit the Math/Science offerings that have this prerequisite for at least one year to allow the change to go into effect. The efforts to formalize the Honors Option Proposal process the committee has approved specific forms required from faculty and students. Instructors have been extremely cooperative in filling out the necessary proposal form. There have been ten new Honors Option contracts approved during the fall semester. More approvals are anticipated for the spring 2012 semester. All approved faculty names will be added to the approved list for future semesters. Ms. Lubick extended her gratitude to Ms. Susan Knapp, Honors Counselor, for assisting in the certification process for UCLA and UCI Honors transfer students. The certification process will begin in January/February 2012 for students transferring in fall 2012. Faculty were recently sent a reminder via email to keep track of students demonstrating excellence in discipline courses for possible nomination for Subject Area Awards. The Honors Program web page was redesigned to facilitate ease in accessing and downloading Honors forms. Ms. Lubick indicated she has been working with Mr. Stephen Burns to fine tune the web page and remedy some minor issues. During the course of the fall 2011 semester, Ms. Lubick visited Theatre Arts 101H (Heebner) and Comm 101H (McDermott) courses. After the visit, the Honors instructor is supplied with a memorandum discussing what was seen and if it was deemed an honors environment. Then a recommendation is made to the committee to have the instructor teach the section again. During the spring 2012 semester, Ms. Lubick will begin training and transitioning some of the leadership responsibilities to Mr. John Vento to prepare him to assume the leadership role of the Honors Program Coordinator beginning fall 2012.

b. Faculty Professional Development – Kathryn Mitchell

Ms. Kathy Mitchell responded to an inquiry regarding faculty performing additional work hours to coordinate Honors Option requirements and not being awarded Professional Development credit. She indicated the committee has become the repository for all tasks performed by faculty. This particular task is part of the development of courses which is a contractual and outside the Professional Development guidelines. The committee is responsible to adhering to the established State Guidelines and AVCFT Contract.

The committee has been working on determining the most critical professional development needs by using the evaluations received from faculty. A small list of recommended topics will be included in the call for 2012 – 2013 FPD Proposals. In addition, the spring 2012 Welcome Back Day is being coordinated and scheduled for Friday, February 3, 2012 from 8 am – 3 pm. The day will follow the same format as the previous spring Welcome Back Day (6 hours offered, 3 sessions, 2 presentations to choose from for sessions I and II, while session III will be dedicated to SLOs; presentation times will be 90 minutes). The presentations for spring 2012 Welcome Back Day will include: Basic Skills – AVC Quest for Success, Classroom Safety, Teaching Online: How to Get Started, SLO training, and possibly a presentation by the Distance Education and Technology Committee.

The call for 2012 – 2013 Professional Development Proposals will be distributed to faculty. The deadline date for submissions is set for Monday, February 27, 2012. Adjunct fall 2011 semester contracts were due over one week ago. There are currently 87 delinquent contracts (35 faculty have completed required hours but failed to submit their paperwork, and 13 adjunct faculty will be short hours for the semester.) The committee will be working on obtaining the delinquent contracts before the end of the semester.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the December 1, 2011 Academic Senate Meeting Agenda to include additional equivalencies as action items. Motion carried.

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. Equivalencies:

- **Biological Sciences (attachment)**
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the Biological Sciences Equivalency language submitted by discipline faculty. Motion carried.

- **Emergency Medical Technologies (attachment)**
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the Emergency Medical Technologies Equivalency language submitted by discipline faculty. Motion carried.

- **Geography (attachment)**
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the Geography Equivalency language submitted by discipline faculty. Motion carried.

- **Mathematics (attachment)**
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the Mathematics Equivalency language submitted by discipline faculty. Motion carried.

- **Nursing Science/Clinical Practice (attachment)**
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the Nursing Science/Clinical Practice Equivalency language submitted by discipline faculty. Motion carried.

- **Physics/Astronomy (attachment)**
  A motion was made and seconded to approve the Physics/Astronomy Equivalency language submitted by discipline faculty. Motion carried.

7. DISCUSSION ITEM

a. SLO Assessment Report

Mr. Christos Valiotis provided an update on the SLO progress according to data compiled by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning. The Senate Executive members have been discussing having Senators take an active role in ensuring SLO work is being completed at the division level. Faculty need to be made aware that the District must demonstrate all SLOs have been assessed by October 2012 for Accreditation purposes. Mr. Valiotis reviewed SLO/OO deadline dates, statistical data, and compliance rates per division. He announced the fall 2011 semester would end in a week and all student grades are required to be submitted by the end of the following week, which would also be a good time to submit SLO course data for entry into WEAVE. He emphasized the data is not only needed for Accreditation but is tied into the Program Review process as well. The task of compiling and entering data must be performed on a regular basis. Faculty must make a big push to ensure SLO data is entered before the spring 2012 semester. It is important for faculty to take this issue seriously. The SLO Committee has established two days (December 13-14, 2011) as WEAVE Data Days. Faculty can go to specified labs to enter data and obtain assistance from SLO Committee members. The designated days have been established to encourage faculty to utilize this time to enter fall 2011 SLO data.

b. Student Success Task Force Recommendations Review

Mr. Valiotis provided an opportunity for Senators to express their concerns on any topics or issues written in the Student Success Task Force Recommendations. He indicated one of the big issues discussed at length at the Fall Statewide Academic Senate Plenary Session was on course repeatability. The legislature is pushing to restrict funding for courses that are repeated because it is believed a significant amount of money is spent on allowing courses to be repeated. This is a big issue for athletic and performing arts courses. In the case of performance based courses the repeatability clause would not apply, and athletic courses are said to be altered to restrict courses to a maximum of 350 total contact hours. Ms. Maria Clinton reported faculty need to be aware the repeatability clause applies to core courses as part of a degree used for transfer purposes. The Chancellor's Office is moving towards wanting to only offer Basic Skills, transfer, and CTE Courses.

Mr. Ken Lee indicated he had two concerns regarding the repeatability issue. The Forensic course would become a victim to the repeatability clause unless it is included in the Communication Associate of Arts – Transfer (AA-T) degree. Ms. Clinton stated she spoke with Mr. Tom Graves regarding this matter and indicated what needed to be done to include the course in the Communication AA-T degree. Another issue is the Model United Nation (MUN) course which students will not be able to participate in the MUN program for two years as needed to build the skills needed to be successful in the program, although an athlete can participate in sports for two years. Ms. Clinton emphasized these are two different issues governed by different rules. Athletic courses are being restricted to a maximum of 350 total contact hours. Mr. Valiotis interjected if the Legislature accepts the repeatability recommendation there is nothing indicating the Chancellor's Office will move forward to implement this clause. The Chancellor's Office will have to determine an implementation plan and process. Ultimately, funding sources and impact on Title 5 will have to be determined. This clause will have a significant impact on various aspects of education and will take time to completely implement. Dr. Glenn Haller stated these issues can easily become another unfunded mandate although faculty don't want to fall into the trap of complacency. A legislator can easily pick up any of the issues written within the Task Force recommendations and create a bill. There is nothing that can be done if a bill impacting community college education or funding slips under the radar.

Another big issue discussed at the Fall Statewide Academic Senate Plenary Session was the Task Force recommendation to incentivize funding and implementing District Score Cards. The Governor has taken an active role in moving this issue to the legislature as he has proposed a couple of bills including performance based funding which would significantly impact community colleges. It is likely he is pushing some sort of agenda relating to higher education.

Dr. Susan Lowry suggested creating a response using a singular voice. If faculty have an organization on campus that are discussing any of the recommendations it should be forwarded to the Academic Senate or the Faculty Union to incorporate. Faculty should have received a copy of Ms. Carolyn Burrell's thorough analysis of the recommendations. The Task Force consisted of a large majority of individuals who have a limited understanding or knowledge of how community colleges operate, and only four faculty members. Faculty are mobilizing and expressing their concerns regarding the Task Force recommendations.

Mr. Ron Chapman stated if the faculty don't respond to the Task Force Recommendations it would be deemed as acquiescence. He suggested faculty move to approve a vote of no confidence for the Task Force. Mr. Valiotis reported this was a resolution that was proposed at the Fall Statewide Academic Senate Fall Plenary Session but was voted down. It was determined that taking this action would eliminate the faculty voice at the table and then ultimately allow someone else to make decisions regarding faculty careers/lives. Ms. Clinton emphasized the importance of ensuring the faculty don't give up the right to renegotiate and provide suggestions to language revisions. Mr. Mike Pesses inquired if there is any way for faculty to include their voices and if the recommendation revisions are not seen as satisfactorily changed in the final document, then faculty could then institute a vote of no confidence. Dr. Lowry emphasized the need for political power at the state level which requires money. The faculty voice is divided among two entities: the Academic Senate which has ethos, and the CTA (Union) which has the money. Both of these entities need to pull together to fight this battle in unity.

Mr. Valiotis reported some of the issues and concerns brought forward by faculty have been supported therefore he is hopeful the Task Force will continue to heed faculty concerns when revising recommendation language. He stated that if additional information pertaining to the Task Force Recommendations is provided during the break it would forwarded to faculty via email. In addition, a discussion item will be included on the first Senate meeting agenda of the spring 2012 semester.

c. Hayward Award Nomination – due December 5, 2011

The Hayward Award Nomination submissions must be received at the state level no later than December 5, 2011, which will require all local nominations to be submitted no later than tomorrow, December 2, 2011. This is a very prestigious award that has been won by several AVC Faculty members. The Senate Executive is hopeful that another worthy faculty is nominated to submit to the state for consideration.

8. SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

a. Appointments

- **Academic Ranking**
  - Kenan Shahla – Associate Professor

    A motion was made and seconded to approve the academic ranking request of Associate Professor for Mr. Kenan Shahla. Motion carried.

b. Announcements

- Accreditation Institute – February 10, 2012 – February 12, 2012, Anaheim Sheraton Park
- Academic Academy – February 24, 2012 – February 25, 2012, Anaheim Doubletree
- Vocational Education Leadership Institute – March 21, 2012 – March 23, 2012, San Francisco Airport Westin
- Statewide Academic Senate Spring 2012 Plenary Session – San Francisco Airport Westin
- Faculty Leadership Institute – June 14, 2012 – June 16, 2012, TBA
- Curriculum Institute – July 12, 2012 – July 14, 2012, San Francisco Airport Westin
- Statewide Academic Senate Fall 2012 Plenary Session – November 8, 2012 – November 10, 2012, Irvine Marriott

9. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the December 1, 2011 Academic Senate Meeting at 4:16 p.m. Motion carried.

MEMBERS PRESENT			
Ron Chapman	MaryAnne Holcomb	Berkeley Price	Elizabeth Sundberg
Chris Dundee	Susan Knapp	Terry Rezek	John Toth
Luis Echeverria	Ken Lee	Van Rider	Christos Valiotis
Glenn Haller	Ty Mettler	Sandra Robinson	Larry Veres
Jack Halliday	Rosa Onofre (proxy)	Casey Scudmore	Pavinee Villapando
Mike Hancock	Mike Pesses	Ken Shafer	
MEMBERS ABSENT		GUEST PRESENT/EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS	
Mark Covert	Alexandra Schroer	Maria Clinton	Susan Lowry
		Karen Lubick	Kathryn Mitchell

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

ACADEMIC SENATE
Equivalency Review Form

The discipline faculty in the Math, Science, & Engineering division/area has reviewed the most current (2008) Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges for the following disciplines Biological Sciences.

The discipline faculty agree that: (Select **only** one)

☐ **an equivalency for this discipline is not needed.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline contains a broad range of degree requirements for all those who are prepared to teach within the discipline.*

☒ **a new equivalency.**

☒ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency does not need revision.** *The Minimum Qualification for the designated discipline has not changed.*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline have changed (attach revised equivalency proposal for Senate review).*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The approved equivalency is below the Education Code Section 87359 which requires individuals employed by the district to possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable Minimum Qualifications* ***or*** *no longer meets the criteria set forth by the AVC Academic Senate Equivalency Procedure and, therefore, needs revision (attach revised equivalency proposed for Senate review).*

Date: 11/14/11

Academic Senate Representative

Academic Senate Representative

Discipline Faculty:

Debra A. Seickert

Barbara Fredette

Equivalency Procedure Approved: May 31, 2007 Senate Meeting
9/6/07- MQ Form established: revised 10/19/10

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

Math/Science Division
Minimum Qualifications & Equivalencies
Biological Sciences

Minimum Qualifications: Master's in any biological science OR Bachelor's in any biological science AND Master's in biochemistry, biophysics, or marine science OR the equivalent.

Academic Affairs Division, California Community Colleges

Antelope Valley College Equivalency:

- Bachelor's in any biological science and a Master's in an area related to biology with at least 24 semester units of courses in biology or a closely related field of which 18 units may be at the upper division level.

Approved: February 17, 2005 Senate Meeting

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

ACADEMIC SENATE
Equivalency Review Form

The discipline faculty in the Health Sciences division/area has reviewed the most current (2008) Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges for the following disciplines Emergency Medical Technologies.

The discipline faculty agree that: (Select **only** one)

☐ **an equivalency for this discipline is not needed.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline contains a broad range of degree requirements for all those who are prepared to teach within the discipline.*

☐ **a new equivalency.**

☒ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency does not need revision.** *The Minimum Qualification for the designated discipline has not changed.*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline have changed (attach revised equivalency proposal for Senate review).*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The approved equivalency is below the Education Code Section 87359 which requires individuals employed by the district to possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable Minimum Qualifications or no longer meets the criteria set forth by the AVC Academic Senate Equivalency Procedure and, therefore, needs revision (attach revised equivalency proposed for Senate review).*

Date: 10-25-11

Elizabeth A Sundbey
Academic Senate Representative

Sandra Robinson
Academic Senate Representative

Discipline Faculty:

Lori Dodge

Equivalency Procedure Approved: May 31, 2007 Senate Meeting
9/6/07- MQ Form established: revised 10/19/10

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

Health Sciences Division
Minimum Qualifications & Equivalencies
Emergency Medical Technologies

Minimum Qualifications: Any Bachelor's degree **AND** two years of experience **OR** any Associate's degree **AND** six years of experience
Academic Affairs Division, California Community Colleges

Antelope Valley College Equivalency:

The division approved the following equivalency, which is the minimum required by the Los Angeles County Emergency Medical Services Agency:

- Physician, registered nurse, physician assistant, or paramedic currently licensed in California; or, and EMT-II or EMT-I who is currently certified in California, with a minimum of an Associate of Arts degree or equivalent, **AND**

- At least two years of academic or clinical experience in the practice of emergency medicine or prehospital care in the last five years, with at least six years total experience in the field, **AND**

- Approval by the program director in coordination with the program clinical coordinator, and in accordance with Title 22 requirements, as qualified to teach the assigned topics.

Approved: June 4, 2009 Senate Meeting

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

ACADEMIC SENATE
Equivalency Review Form

The discipline faculty in the Math, Science, and Engineering division/area has reviewed the most current (2008) Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges for the following disciplines Geography.

The discipline faculty agree that: (Select **only** one)

☐ **an equivalency for this discipline is not needed.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline contains a broad range of degree requirements for all those who are prepared to teach within the discipline.*

☑ **a new equivalency.**

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency does not need revision.** *The Minimum Qualification for the designated discipline has not changed.*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline have changed (attach revised equivalency proposal for Senate review).*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The approved equivalency is below the Education Code Section 87359 which requires individuals employed by the district to possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable Minimum Qualifications* ***or*** *no longer meets the criteria set forth by the AVC Academic Senate Equivalency Procedure and, therefore, needs revision (attach revised equivalency proposed for Senate review).*

Date: 11/28/11

Academic Senate Representative

Academic Senate Representative

Discipline Faculty:

Equivalency Procedure Approved: May 31, 2007 Senate Meeting
9/6/07- MQ Form established: revised 10/19/10

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

Math/Science Division
Minimum Qualifications & Equivalencies
Geography

Minimum Qualifications: Master's in geography OR Bachelor's in geography AND Master's in geology, history, meteorology, or oceanography OR the equivalent OR see interdisciplinary studies

Academic Affairs Division, California Community Colleges

Antelope Valley College Equivalency:

- Bachelor's in geography AND Master's in other social, physical, or life science with at least 24 semester units of courses in geography, cartography, and/or geographic information systems (GIS) of which 18 units may be at the upper division level.

Approved: February 17, 2005 Senate Meeting

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

ACADEMIC SENATE
Equivalency Review Form

The discipline faculty in the **Math, Science and Engineering** division/area has reviewed the most current (2008) Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges for the following disciplines **Mathematics**.

The discipline faculty agree that: (Select **only** one)

☐ **an equivalency for this discipline is not needed.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline contains a broad range of degree requirements for all those who are prepared to teach within the discipline.*

☐ **a new equivalency.**

☑ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency does not need revision.** *The Minimum Qualification for the designated discipline has not changed.*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline have changed (attach revised equivalency proposal for Senate review).*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The approved equivalency is below the Education Code Section 87359 which requires individuals employed by the district to possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable Minimum Qualifications* ***or*** *no longer meets the criteria set forth by the AVC Academic Senate Equivalency Procedure and, therefore, needs revision (attach revised equivalency proposed for Senate review).*

Date: _____

_____ Academic Senate Representative

_____ Academic Senate Representative

Discipline Faculty:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Equivalency Procedure Approved: May 31, 2007 Senate Meeting
9/6/07- MQ Form established: revised 10/19/10

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

Math, Science and Engineering Division
Minimum Qualifications & Equivalencies
Mathematics

Minimum Qualifications: Master's in mathematics or applied mathematics **OR** Bachelor's in either of the above **AND** Master's in statistics, physics, or mathematics education **OR** the equivalent.

Academic Affairs Division, California Community Colleges

Antelope Valley College Equivalency:

- A Master's degree in Engineering, Physics, or Computer Science with 24 semester units of closely related coursework to Mathematics of which 18 units may be at the upper division level.

Approved: June 4, 2009 Senate Meeting

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

ACADEMIC SENATE
Equivalency Review Form

The discipline faculty in the Health Sciences division/area has reviewed the most current (2008) Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges for the following disciplines Nursing Science Clinical Practice.

The discipline faculty agree that: (Select **only** one)

☐ **an equivalency for this discipline is not needed.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline contains a broad range of degree requirements for all those who are prepared to teach within the discipline.*

☐ **a new equivalency.**

☒ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency does not need revision.** *The Minimum Qualification for the designated discipline has not changed.*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline have changed (attach revised equivalency proposal for Senate review).*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The approved equivalency is below the Education Code Section 87359 which requires individuals employed by the district to possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable Minimum Qualifications or no longer meets the criteria set forth by the AVC Academic Senate Equivalency Procedure and, therefore, needs revision (attach revised equivalency proposed for Senate review).*

Date: 10/25/11

Elizabeth A Sundberg
Academic Senate Representative

Sandra Robinson
Academic Senate Representative

Discipline Faculty:

V. Beatty

B Curry

Debra Dickinson

Susan Snyder

Linda Harmon

Sandra Hughes

Equivalency Procedure Approved: May 31, 2007 Senate Meeting
9/6/07- MQ Form established: revised 10/19/10

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

Health Science Division
Minimum Qualifications & Equivalencies
Nursing Science/Clinical Practice

Minimum Qualifications: Any bachelor's degree and two years of experience, or any associate degree and six years of experience.
Academic Affairs Division, California Community Colleges

Antelope Valley College Equivalency:

- Bachelor's degree in registered nursing or nursing science from an accredited college or university and two years of experience. At least one year of nursing experience within the previous five years as a registered nurse providing direct patient care.

OR

- Associate's degree in registered nursing or nursing science from an accredited college or university and six years of experience. At least one year of nursing experience within the previous five years as a registered nurse providing direct patient care.

Approved: April 13, 2009 Health Sciences Division Meeting

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

ACADEMIC SENATE
Equivalency Review Form

The discipline faculty in the Math, Science, and Engineering division/area has reviewed the most current (2008) Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges for the following disciplines Physics/Astronomy.

The discipline faculty agree that: (Select **only** one)

☐ **an equivalency for this discipline is not needed.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline contains a broad range of degree requirements for all those who are prepared to teach within the discipline.*

☒ **a new equivalency.**

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency does not need revision.** *The Minimum Qualification for the designated discipline has not changed.*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The Minimum Qualifications for the designated discipline have changed (attach revised equivalency proposal for Senate review).*

☐ **the current (within the last three years) Academic Senate approved equivalency requires revision.** *The approved equivalency is below the Education Code Section 87359 which requires individuals employed by the district to possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable Minimum Qualifications* ***or*** *no longer meets the criteria set forth by the AVC Academic Senate Equivalency Procedure and, therefore, needs revision (attach revised equivalency proposed for Senate review).*

Date: 11/28/11

Academic Senate Representative

Academic Senate Representative

Discipline Faculty:

Mark McCann

Equivalency Procedure Approved: May 31, 2007 Senate Meeting
9/6/07- MQ Form established: revised 10/19/10

ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

Math/Science Division
Minimum Qualifications & Equivalencies
Physics/Astronomy

Minimum Qualifications: Master's in physics, astronomy, or astrophysics OR Bachelor's in physics or astronomy AND Master's in engineering, mathematics, meteorology, or geophysics OR the equivalent.
Academic Affairs Division, California Community Colleges

Antelope Valley College Equivalency:

- Bachelor's in physics or astronomy AND Master's in planetary science. OR
- Bachelor's in physics or astronomy AND Master's in science education with at least 24 semester units of courses in physics of which 18 units may be at the upper division level.

Approved: February 17, 2005 Senate Meeting

Entity	Outcomes/Objectives	Measures	Targets	Findings	Action Plans
Astronomy 101	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Computer Information Science 159	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Library Studies 107	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Math 120	Final	In-Progress	Final	Final	Final
Music 132	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Music 255A	In-Progress	In-Progress	In-Progress	Final	Final
Physical Education 195	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Radiologic Technology 210	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Water Treatment 120	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final

Entity	Outcomes/Objectives	Measures	Targets	Findings	Action Plans
Art 101	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Art 102	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Art 103	Final	Final	In-Progress	None	Final
Astronomy 101	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Auto Body 112	Final	In-Progress	None	None	Final
Auto Body 115	In-Progress	In-Progress	In-Progress	None	Final
Auto Body 122	In-Progress	In-Progress	None	None	Final
Auto Body 212	Final	In-Progress	None	None	Final
Auto Body 215	In-Progress	In-Progress	None	None	Final
Auto Body 222	In-Progress	In-Progress	None	None	Final
Business 111	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Business 113	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Business 212	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Computer Information Science 101	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Computer Information Science 111	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Computer Information Science 121	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Computer Information Science 145	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Computer Information Science 159	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Computer Information Science 161	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Library Studies 107	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Management 101	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Management 212	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Marketing 101	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Marketing 112	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Math 120	Final	In-Progress	Final	Final	Final
Music 132	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Music 255A	In-Progress	In-Progress	In-Progress	Final	Final
Physical Education 195	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Political Science 101	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Political Science 120	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Political Science 200	Final	None	None	None	Final
Political Science 201	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Political Science 202	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Radiologic Technology 210	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Sociology 101	Final	Final	In-Progress	None	Final
Sociology 105	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Sociology 110	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Sociology 111	Final	None	None	None	Final
Sociology 112	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Sociology 115	Final	Final	Final	None	Final
Sociology 120	Final	Final	In-Progress	None	Final
Water Treatment 120	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
Welding 130	Final	Final	Final	None	Final

Important Dates and Deadlines from the SLO Committee

December 13 **December 14**	**Fall 2011 WEAVE Data Days- Room BE 321** **8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.** Aaron and Melanie will be available for individualized help with SLO/PLO data, WEAVEonline data entry, and other SLO-related issues.
December 16	**Deadline for Fall 2011 SLO/PLO WEAVE data entry.**
January 1 **through** **June 30, 2012**	**Spring 2012 Reporting Cycle**
March 9	**Deadline for Fall 2011-related WEAVE Action Plan entry.** Incorporate Fall 2011 SLO/PLO data into both course and program level Action Plans. Be certain to document discussion related to the plan and post documentation in the WEAVE Document Repository for the course or program.
June 5 **June 6**	**Spring 2012 WEAVE Data Days- Room TBD** **8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.**
June 8	**Deadline for Spring 2012 SLO/PLO WEAVE data entry.**

Summary of ASCCC Positions on the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success Draft Recommendations

This document summarizes the ASCCC positions that pertain to the draft recommendations of the CCC Task Force on Student Success (dated September 30, 2011). Formal ASCCC positions are adopted by resolution. Resolutions are referenced by the term (F = fall, S = spring) and year of adoption, and a number (XX.XX). Complete resolutions are available at www.asccc.org.

The following positions relate to the recommendations in general terms:

F11 13.07 Implementation of Student Success Task Force Recommendations: **Support a phased approach to any implementation** of the SSTF recommendations that controls for multiple variables and leads to validated conclusions about the effectiveness of the recommendations.

***F11 13.13** Reporting of How Feedback on Student Success Task Force Draft Recommendations was Addressed: **ASCCC requests that the SSTF formally communicate to the field how the feedback received through the vetting process on the recommendations has been addressed**.

F11 13. 15 Endorse CCCI Response to Student Success Task Force Recommendations

***F11 13. 18** Objection to the Language of the Student Success Task Force Report: **ASCCC urges the SSTF to use language that acknowledges and respects the expertise and experience of community college faculty in planning for curriculum and instruction** based on our students' best interests and characteristics.

***F11 19.04** Full-Time Faculty and Student Success: SSTF **should Include a recommendation to increase the number of full time faculty.**

***Adopted by acclamation.**

Chapter 1. Increase College and Career Readiness

1.1. Collaborate with K-12 to jointly develop common core standards for college and career readiness.

Comments: Current HS graduation standards are currently well-below college readiness standards. It is uncertain what role K-12 assessments will play in the future. Faculty primacy must guide the establishment of standards.

F11 15.01 Faculty Primacy in Alignment of Standards with K-12: calls to study the common core standards and insists on faculty primacy in determining standards.

Chapter 2. Strengthen Support for Entering Students

2.1.Develop and implement common centralized diagnostic assessments.

The ASCCC supports the development of a centralized assessment option with locally established multiple measures and cut scores.

F11 13.03 Support Centralized Assessment Instrument with Local Cut Scores for Placement: **ASCCC maintains the importance of faculty primacy with respect to the use of assessment for placement scores and the application of multiple measures**, **supports the establishment of a centralized standard assessment as an option provided there is a local determination of cut scores for placement, and encourages local academic senates to support selection of this assessment option for local use.**

2.2. Require students to participate in diagnostic assessment, orientation and the development of an educational plan.

While existing positions support this in concept, they note the challenge of providing such services without adequate funding to do so.

S11 5.02 Incentives to Encourage Student Behaviors for Success: **data indicate that participating in such incentives as educational planning, early assessment, and attending college full time can positively affect success**

F11 8.02 Faculty Advisors: **ASCCC will investigate existing programs in California community colleges in which counseling faculty train faculty hired in other discipline areas as faculty advisors** and report by the Fall 2012 Plenary Session on the potential of such programs to help meet the needs of California community college students.

2.3 Develop and use technology applications to better guide students in educational process.

ASCCC supports E-Transcripts and the use of degree audits, but expresses concern regarding the impact of centralized technology projects and asserts the role of the Academic Senate (especially counseling faculty) in determinations to be made about matriculation-related technological applications.

F00 11.08 **No support for centralized technology projects until reviewed for educational policy implications** and effects on students.

11.01 F11 Consultation Regarding Technology Tools Impacting Student Services: "..**oppose implementing any centralized electronic education plans, degree audits, or other technological tools, without the direct involvement of the Academic Senate, with a specific reliance on counseling faculty, to determine the appropriateness and utility of the system**."

2.4 Require students showing a lack of college readiness to participate in support resources.

ASCCC supports providing student success courses for all who can benefit.

2.5 Require students to declare a program of study early in their academic careers

ASCCC has no formal position on the declaration of a "program of study". There is, however, concern about the "high stakes" nature of declaring a program of study and/or establishing an education plan as established in the draft recommendations.

Chapter 3. Incentivize Successful Student Behaviors

3.1. Adopt system wide enrollment priorities reflecting core mission of community colleges.

ASCCC opposes this recommendation until it has been determined that the proposed enrollment priorities will not have a negative disproportionate impact.

F11 13.11 Student Success Task Force Recommendations: Priority Enrollment: **Request that recommendation 3.1 of the SSTF not move forward until the potential impact on traditionally underserved and under-performing populations has been thoroughly researched and it has been determined that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on these populations**.

F11 13.14 Earned-Unit Limitations for Registration Priority Concerns: "**urge colleges and policy-makers to ensure that community college students who are legitimately engaged in programs or coursework appropriate to the California community college mission are able to maintain registration priority without undue burden**".

3.2. Require students receiving Board of Governors fee waivers to meet various conditions and requirements.

ASCCC has some concerns about this recommendation, but could support it provided there are appropriate protections in place.

F10 6.01 Evaluation and Revision of Financial Aid Systems: **urge state and federal officials to evaluate and revise the current financial aid system in order to incentivize more productive and academically sound behavior by students**

F11 7.02 Modification to the Requirements of the Board of Governors (BOG) Fee Waiver: **work with the CCCCO to define appropriate conditions that would allow students to continue receiving a BOG waiver based on satisfactory academic progress**.

F11 7.05 Implementation of Potential Board of Governors Waiver Change: **"prior to deeming students ineligible to receive a Board of Governors fee waiver the college will implement an intervention plan to allow the student to meet satisfactory progress standards within a reasonable time**." Colleges should have an intervention plan & sufficient funding for intervention.

3.3. Provide students opportunity to consider attending full time.

ASCCC has no direct position, but does support incentivizing successful student behaviors.

3.4. Require students to begin addressing Basic Skills deficiencies in their first year.

While ASCCC does not have positions directly related to this topic, our established support for incentivizing effective student behaviors would suggest that we would favor this in concept. The impact of adjusting course offerings to accomplish this is a given. Colleges that are revisiting their use of prerequisites may already be, effectively, implementing this recommendation.

Chapter 4. Align Course Offering to Meet Student Needs

4.1. Focus course offerings and schedules on needs of students.

While student educational plans may provide useful information when determining a college's course offerings, the concept of a "high stakes" educational plan and a classroom of students who are and are not "state-supported" is strongly opposed (although it is supported when the class is a mix of state-supported credit students and fee-supported community service students who do not earn credit). It was noted that this creates a system where students who have the resources can take whatever courses they want, while those who do not will be limited to the courses delineated in an ed plan. In addition, ASCCC opposes the elimination of non-CDCP noncredit courses. ASCCC does support a determination of what courses should and should not be credit, in addition to fully funding the CDCP noncredit areas. **ASCCC urges the SSTF to include the March 2005 Board of Governors' noncredit funding proposal in their recommendations.**

9.02 F11 Defining Credit and Noncredit Basic Skills and Basic Skills Apportionment: ASCCC will **explore the appropriate division of credit and noncredit basic skills classes**, **supports funding noncredit CDCP classes at apportionment rates commensurate with the March 2005 Board of Governors' recommendations**; and urges **the SSTF to include the March 2005 Board of Governors' noncredit funding proposal in their recommendations.**

F11 13.04 Course Development and Enrollment Priorities: "**urge local academic senates to ensure that course development and enrollment management are appropriately determined by documented educational need and further refined by fiscal considerations**."

Chapter 5. Improve the Education of Basic Skills Students

5.1. Support the development of alternatives to traditional basic skills curriculum.

ASCCC has always supported curricular innovation including alternatives to traditional pedagogy. Colleges are using basic skills funding already to improve basic skills instruction – it is not clear how this differs from the status quo. It is also not clear how BSI dollars would both be used here – and as a part of 8.1/8.2.

5.2. Develop comprehensive strategy for addressing basic skills education in California.

ASCCC supports assigning all of adult education to the CCCs, "but only if sufficient funding to address this mission is provided." (**F11 6.03**) Furthermore, it is ASCCC's position that input from ESL faculty is needed.

F11 6.04 Removal of ESL Students from Student Success Task Force Recommendations: Seek ESL faculty input & inform SSTF of differences between ESL & basic skills.

Chapter 6. Revitalize and ReEnvision Professional Development

6.1. Create a continuum of mandatory professional development opportunities.

Professional development is within the purview of the academic senate and faculty are best equipped to make any determination with respect to the appropriateness of professional development activities.

F11 19.03 Uphold Local Control of Professional Development Activities

6.2. Direct professional development resources toward improving basic skills instruction and support services. (Also see 6.1)

Faculty are open to reviewing the Title 5 regulations regarding the use of professional development as a means of improving basic skills instruction.

F11 19.07 Review of Title 5 Regulations Pertaining to Professional Development: **"develop a definition of faculty professional development and clarify the types of activities that would satisfy faculty professional development** and bring this definition back for approval at Fall Plenary 2012", **support the use of faculty professional development as a means of improving instruction, particularly with respect to meeting the needs of basic skills students**, and **assert the primacy of faculty in determining what faculty professional development activities are most appropriate**".

Chapter 7. Enable Efficient Statewide Leadership & Increase Coordination Among Colleges

7.1. Develop and support a strong community college system office.

The ability of the CO to "promulgate Title 5 regulations without first obtaining approval from the Department of Finance" is problematic and ASCCC opposes the proposed funding revisions for the CO. (**F11 5.02).**

7.2. Set local student success goals consistent with statewide goals.

7.3. Implement student success score card.

ASCCC supports accountability but opposes the use of simplistic accountability measures of student success (F10 6.05).

7.4. Develop and support a longitudinal student record system.

Chapter 8. Align Resources with Student Success Recommendations

8.1. Consolidate select categorical programs.

ASCCC has always opposed categorical consolidation.

8.2. Invest in the new Student Success Initiative fund.

Although ASCCC supports common assessment, we could not support the Student Success Initiative (SSI) as currently proposed due to its ties to common assessment and the "score card". If these ties were removed and the SSI were, effectively, a fund to restore categorical programs, ASCCC could support it.. ASCCC has a position supporting the use of new dollars to be dedicated to categoricals.

8.3. Promote flexibility and innovation in basic skills through alternative funding mechanism.

The ASCCC opposes this recommendation. Recommendation 8.3 is as form of performance-based funding, presumes common curriculum statewide, and creates problematic incentives.

8.4. Do not implement outcome□based funding.

ASCCC opposes any form of outcome-based funding.

SSTF Recommendations

Chapter 1: Increase College and Career Readiness (115 words)

POLICY STATEMENT: Community Colleges will collaborate with the State Board of Education, the California Department of Education, and other statewide efforts to define and address college and career readiness.

> Recommendation 1.1: Community Colleges will collaborate with K-12 education to jointly develop common standards for college and career readiness that are aligned with high school exit standards.

Students are entering into college underprepared, and in order to help students to be prepared for college and careers, community college must align its curriculum with the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) standards. The alignment will reduce the need for remediation in college by setting clear standards for college coursework. When students understand the performance expectations, then they will be able to prepare for higher education and their careers. The K-12 may discuss changes for the adjustment to statues of the Early Assessment Program[1]. Leadership of the Academic Senate, the Board of Governors, and the Chancellor will require that community college representatives sit in "key committees" to negotiate and implement standards and definitions.

Chapter 2: Strengthen Support for Entering Students (273 words)

POLICY STATEMENT: Community colleges will provide stronger support for students entering college to identify and meet their goals. Stronger support will be facilitated by centralized, integrated and student-friendly technology to better guide students in their educational planning process.

> Recommendation 2.1: Community colleges will develop and implement a common centralized assessment for English reading and writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language (ESL) that can provide diagnostic information to inform curriculum development and student placement and that, over time, will be aligned with the K-12 Common Core State Standards and assessments.
>
> Recommendation 2.3: Community colleges will develop and use centralized and integrated technology, which can be accessed through campus or district web portals, to better guide students in their educational process.
>
> Recommendation 2.4: Require students whose diagnostic assessments show a lack of readiness for college to participate in a support resource, such as a student success course, provided by the college for new students.
>
> Recommendation 2.5: Encourage students to declare a program of study upon admission and require declaration by the end their second term.

---

[1] The Early Assessment Program (EAP) is a collaborative effort among the State Board of Education (SBE), the California Department of Education (CDE) and the California State University (CSU). The program was established to provide opportunities for students to measure their readiness for college-level English and mathematics in their junior year of high school, and to facilitate opportunities for them to improve their skills during their senior year. **More than 60 percent of the nearly 40,000 first-time freshmen admitted to the CSU require remedial education in English, mathematics or both. These 25,000 freshmen all have taken the required college preparatory curriculum and earned at least a B grade point average in high school.** The cost in time and money to these students and to the state is substantial. Moreover, these students are confused by seemingly having done the right things in high school only to find out after admission to the CSU that they need further preparation. From http://www.calstate.edu/eap/

A centralized data system, controlled by the Chancellor's Office and integrated into local college existing data systems and website, will support students in their selection of their programs of study ,select courses and career goals based on their skill sets, enable students to self-manage their education plans, to find the right transfer college, to manage their financial aid and payments, to purchase textbooks, and to access online library resources. When new students are enrolled in the college, they will be required to take the Chancellor's Office diagnostic assessment to determine college readiness levels in English, math, and ESL. Before the end of the second term (after 15 semester credits), students would be required to declare a program of study. After counseling, those who cannot make that declaration will lose priority registration. The centralized electronic "self-management" services provide a warehouse of student data which can help to track students into courses that are more appropriate to their skill levels and interests; the program will use an algorithm similar to the one that Netflix uses. The goal is to reduce redundancies in student courses, determine which courses should be offered at each local college, and determine how to allocate funds in order to meet the needs of the local students. The centralized technology will not be ready until after 2014, but there will be an incentivized voluntary program in the interim. In order for this centralized system to be put into place, there will be significant changes to Title V and Seymour-Campbell Matriculation Act, as well as costs that will be absorbed by the districts, but savings realized by the centralized system will help to offset the costs of implementation.

Chapter 3: Incentivize Successful Student Behaviors

The State wishes to see students be more focused on completion in their matriculation process. It claims there are some perverse inccentives to completion. For instance:

> "Policies that enable students to wander around the curriculum, withdraw and repeat classes multiple times, avoid services that could steer them along a productive pathway, and accumulate an unlimited number of units are a disservice to enrolled students and to those who can't get into the system for lack of available classes."

Therefore:

> "The Community Colleges will adopt system-wide enrollment priorities that: (1) reflect the core mission of transfer, career technical education and basic skills development; (2) encourage students to identify their educational objective and follow a prescribed path most likely to lead to success; (3) ensure access and the opportunity for success for new students; and (4) incentivize students to make progress toward their educational goal."

The state claims to have the authority to do this already, by mandating what our priorities should be in registration, and by giving help to those students with special needs—returning veterans and so forth.

They are also planning to use the BOG Waiver as an incentive to make students focus on and achieve their stated goals. They intend to:

"Require students receiving Board of Governors (BOG) fee waivers to meet various conditions and requirements, as specified below.

(A) Require students receiving a BOG fee waiver to identify a degree, certificate, transfer or career advancement goal.

(B) Require students to meet institutional satisfactory progress standards to be eligible for the fee waiver renewal.

(C) Limit the number of units covered under a BOG fee waiver to 110 units."

The State also sees that students who go full time are more successful. However, aside from providing more and more efficient financial aid, there is no means of achieving this goal.

The ASCCC has no direct concerns with most of these recommendations. However,they are concerned with possible disproportionate impact on students with few financial resources.

One final recommendation here:

Recommendation 3.4

"Community Colleges will require students to begin addressing basic skills deficiencies in their first year and continue remediation as part of their education plan."

Implementation Requirements:

"Title 5 sections 55200-02 already permit community college districts to require students assessed below collegiate level to begin remediation in their first year by following the procedures for establishing prerequisites or co-requisites.

• However, a more direct approach would be to adopt a new Title 5 regulation making the requirement explicit for all students at all colleges."

ASCCC again agrees with the principle. However, it is clear what an impact there would be if we required students to take all pre-college math reading and writing before anything else.

Chapter 4:

Align Course Offerings to Meet Student Needs

The concern here is that colleges have a lot of classes on their rosters that do not lead students directly to a degreel a certificate or transfer. There are courses of community interest that lead nowhere. The state would like to remedy this.

One method they would like to try is to fund courses based on their imclusion in student ed plans.

From their document:

> "…the Board of Governors and the legislature should ensure that state subsidization for instruction, whether it be credit or noncredit courses, is limited to those courses that are included in a program of study and informed by a student education plan."

The plan would be to make students pay the full cost for any class that is not directly a part of their "ed plan" leading to a specific goal.

Implementation Requirements

- Amend statute and Title 5 regulations to reflect that apportionments may only be claimed if scheduled courses are part of student education plans.
- Amend statute (Education Code 78300) and Title 5 as needed to explicitly allow colleges to enroll community service students in otherwise state-supported credit classes, where there is excess capacity in those classes.
- Current law authorizes community college districts to offer community service classes, but specifies that no General Fund dollars be used to support these classes.
- Under this recommendation, students having the course in their education plan would pay the credit enrollment fee, while students not having the course in their education plan would pay a fee covering the full cost of instruction
- BOG would need to adopt new Title 5 regulations to provide districts with the necessary guidance concerning the setting of the fees and calculation of proportionate cost.
- Amend statute to limit the scope of allowable non-credit classes to only those identified as Career Development or College Preparation (CDCP.)
- Adopt Recommendation 7.1 to increase the statutory authority of the CCC Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) thus allowing for oversight regarding course offerings as well as dissemination of enrollment management best practices for establishing community education programs that respond to community needs while also providing a source of income to the campus.
- Adopt Recommendation 2.2, which revamps the concept and use ofstudent education plans to focus the student on a more prescriptive course of study and concurrently provide a clear roadmap for colleges to determine course demand.

ASCCC provides the following commentary:

While student ed plans may provide useful information when determining a college's course offerings, the concept of a "high stakes" ed plan and a classroom of students who are not "state supported" is strongly opposed (although a mix of state-supported for-credit stuidents and fee-supported non-credit students is fine). We note that in this system, students with the resources can

take whatever courses they want, while those who do not will be limited to courses delineated in an ed plan.

Chapter 5

Improve the Education of Basic Skills students

The concern here is that 60% of students need basic skills on entry into community college, but only 10% of students are taking basic skills courses. Also success rates in Basic Skills classes are low, and there is a large differential of success between whites, Asians, Hispanics and African Americans, with the African Americans experiencing the lowest success rates.

Therefore,

> "Community Colleges will support the development of alternatives to traditional basic skills curriculum and incentivize colleges to take to scale model programs for delivering basic skills instruction."

This means that funding for basic skills will be altered to give incentives for innovation.

Implementation Requirements:

> "• Authorize the reallocation of Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) dollars in the annual Budget Act.
>
> • Chancellor's Office will adopt amended guidelines to redistribute the BSI funding to:
>
> Target a fixed portion of the money to specifically incentivize faculty redesign of curriculum and support innovations in basic skills instruction.
>
> o Develop clear curricular pathways from basic skills into collegiate level coursework.
>
> • Amend Title 5 regulations to remove the requirement that supplemental instruction, with regards to basic skills support, be tied to a specific course. This would explicitly enable the use of supplemental instruction for the benefit of basic skills students.
>
> o Under current regulation (Title 5 Section 58050 and 58172), apportionment can only be claimed for supplemental instruction provided through a learning center if the hours of instruction are tied to a specific course and the hours are laid out in the course outline of record for the course. Given that the needs of basic skills students vary and are hard to predict, such restrictions prevent colleges from funding this form of support for basic skills students.
>
> • Implementation of Recommendation 8.3 - which establishes an alternative funding model for basic skills – would provide a financial incentive to further encourage innovation in the delivery of basic skills instruction."

ASCCC comments this way: We have always supported currcular innovation including alternatives to traditional pedagogy. Colleges are already using Basic Skills Funding to improve basic skills inastruction. It is not clear how this differs form the status quo.

Furthermore,

> "The state should develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing basic skills education in California that results in a system that provides all adults with the access to education in mathematics, English, and English as a Second Language (ESL.)"

This section refers back to the recommendations of chapter 1—coordinating with the K-12 system. It also discusses the "demise" of the Adult Basic Education system, when the state allowed the K-12 system to be more flexible in its use of the funds provided to it for ABE programs—apparently these programs were "flexed" right out of existence—the money used for other categorical programs as K-12 budgets shrank.

It is implied that community colleges would be the better place to house Adult Basic Education.

Oddly, with this recommendation, the discussion is vague, and specifically asks for guidance from the legislature and the governor's office.

ASCCC responds: we support assigning all of adult education to the CCCs, but only if sufficient funding to address this mission is provided.

Chapter 6: Revitalize and Re-envision Professional Development

POLICY STATEMENT

The community college system will develop and support the continued and focused professional development for all faculty and staff.

Key Language:

> The Task Force believes that, as a community college system, we must adopt a more systemic and long-term approach to professional development
>
> faculty should be the primary focus of professional development efforts, with a targeted emphasis on part-time faculty, who teach up to 50 percent of the courses on a given campus.

Recommendation 6.1

Community colleges will create a continuum of strategic professional development opportunities, for all faculty, staff and administrators to be better prepared to respond to the evolving student needs and measures of student success.

> The intent of this recommendation is to change the emphasis on professional development from short-term programs and one-day workshops to a more systematic and long-term approach to promote student success. This recommendation would shift more control of the professional development program to the Board of Governors from the Academic Senate and faculty.

Key Language:

> Faculty, staff and administrators need consistent, thoughtful, and productive professional development activities that are tied to a set of outcomes linking to a state agenda for student success.

The Board of Governors should have the ability to direct colleges to respond to what are agreed upon strategic professional development activities.

Given the level of responsibility granted to the Academic Senate on instructional matters, the Board of Governors should solicit their input on a regular basis with regards to statewide professional development goals and direction.

ASCCC Position

Professional development is within the purview of the academic senate and faculty are best equipped to make any determination with respect to the appropriateness of professional development activities.

ASCCC Resolution

F11 19.03 Uphold Local Control of Professional Development Activities

Recommendation 6.2

Community Colleges will direct professional development resources targeted at both faculty and staff toward improving basic skills instruction and support services.

This recommendation seeks to continue and expand basic skills professional development programs by directing allocations to support those programs. The recommendation encourages special programs in a variety of areas and disciplines to promote systematic basic skills improvement.

Key Language:

The pedagogical approaches to be included should respond not only to discipline issues but also within the context of economic or cultural differences of students.

California should continue to direct and coordinate special programs in vocational education, economic development, science, mathematics, categorical areas, and others in order to integrate basic skills improvement throughout the entire community college system.

ASCCC Position

Faculty are open to reviewing the Title 5 regulations regarding the use of professional development as a means of improving basic skills instruction.

ASCCC Resolution

F11 19.07 Review of Title 5 Regulations Pertaining to Professional Development: **"develop a definition of faculty professional development and clarify the types of activities that would satisfy faculty professional development** and bring this definition back for approval at Fall Plenary 2012", **support the use of faculty professional development as a means of improving instruction, particularly with respect to meeting the needs of basic skills students**, and **assert the primacy of faculty in determining what faculty professional development activities are most appropriate**".

Chapter 7: Enable Efficient Statewide Leadership and Increase Coordination Among Colleges

POLICY STATEMENT

The State should authorize greater coordination and support among colleges so that California's diverse community colleges can function more as a system.

Key Language

Unlike the UC Board of Regents and the CSU Board of Trustees, the CCC Chancellor's Office is a state agency under the control of the Governor.

only the CCC Chancellor lacks the ability to appoint senior management staff such as vice chancellor's and deans. This severely reduces the authority of the Chancellor and diminishes the Chancellor's ability to lead the system. Furthermore, only the CCC is subject to state civil service hiring regulations.

many of the colleges face common challenges that could be most efficiently addressed through more structured leadership from the Chancellor's Office. For example, colleges often develop extremely effective educational programs that could benefit all of the colleges, but the system lacks a robust method of disseminating effective best practice information to the colleges.

Recommendation 7.1

The state should develop and support a strong community college system office with commensurate authority, appropriate staffing, and adequate resources to provide leadership, oversight, technical assistance and dissemination of best practices. Further, the state should grant the Community College Chancellor's Office the authority to implement policy, consistent with state law.

This recommendation seeks to align the authority of the California Community College Chancellor's Office with the UC Board of Regents and the CSU Board of Trustees. A further intent of this recommendation is better coordination among the community colleges to allow better dissemination of information regarding best practices.

Requirements for Implementation

- Amend statute (Education Code 70901.5) to allow the Chancellor's Office to promulgate Title 5 regulations without first obtaining approval from the Department of Finance
- Revise funding for the Chancellors Office by financing the office through alternative means, possibly through the use of ongoing Proposition 98 funding, to be taken from the community colleges share of the Proposition 98 guarantee, or a fee-based system.
- Centrally fund statewide initiatives (technology and professional development)

ASCCC Position

The ability of the CO to "promulgate Title 5 regulations without first obtaining approval from the Department of Finance" is problematic and ASCCC opposes the proposed funding revisions for the CO. (**F11 5.02).**

Recommendation 7.2

In collaboration with the CCC Chancellor's Office, districts and colleges will identify specific goals for student success and report their progress towards meeting these goals in a public and transparent manner (consistent with Recommendation 7.3).

The Chancellor's Office will establish specific goal for student success, allowing individual districts and colleges to prioritize these goals and establish strategies in regards to local considerations. Accountability for these goals will be reported through a "score card," which will include intermediate measures and ultimate outcomes.

Key Language

The Chancellor's Office, in consultation with the various internal and external stakeholders, will establish an overarching series of goals, with districts and individual colleges prioritizing these goals and establishing strategies that address local considerations.

The Chancellor's Office will implement robust accountability reporting (via a publicly understandable "score card" per recommendation 7.3), which will include progress made on intermediate measures of student success as well as ultimate outcomes.

ASCCC Position

None Listed

Recommendation 7.3

Implement a student success score card.

This recommendation seeks to keep the focus of educational leaders on student success by reporting metrics of student success by a score care on a state and local level. The score card will include momentum points, which include rates of completion of units, and completion outcomes, the awarding of certificate and degrees as well as transfers to four-year universities. Colleges will be compared to past performance to account for local, economic, and demographic variables. Data based on ethnicity will be included to attempt to close equity gaps.

Key Language

the California Community Colleges will implement a new accountably tool that would present key student success metrics in a clear and concise manner. These score cards will be posted at the state and local level to help concentrate the focus of educational leaders on student performance. In order to focus state and local efforts on closing equity gaps, the score cards will include break outs by ethnic group.

The success metrics included on the score card would measure a variety of student outcomes, including successfully reaching "momentum points," such as completion of a basic skills sequence and earning specified thresholds of units, which have been shown to lead to successful program completion. In calculating gains in performance, each college would be compared against its own past performance, thus neutralizing differences associated with local economic and demographic variables

Examples of intermediate outcomes include:

- rate of earning 15 units, 30 units and 60 units;
- rate of completion of a college level (degree applicable) course in math and English;
- basic skills improvement rate

Examples of completion outcomes would include

- earning a certificate,

- complete an associate degree,
- transferring to a four-year institution.

The Chancellor's Office will develop score card metrics and format, in consultation with internal and external stakeholders.

ASCCC Position

ASCCC supports accountability but opposes the use of simplistic accountability measures of student success (F10 6.05).

Recommendation 7.4

The state of California should develop and support a longitudinal student record system to monitor student progress from elementary through postsecondary education and into the workplace.

This recommendation proposes a central state-wide comprehensive student record system that aggregates and leverages data from all the separate education segments (CCC, CDE, CSU, and UC) to improve student instruction. The recommendation proposes that a shared data system would allow community colleges to synchronize assessments, allow faculty to incorporate post-enrollment student outcomes into their curriculum development, and prevent students from taking courses that are unnecessary for meeting transfer requirements to four-year colleges and universities or obtaining a degree or certificate.

Key Language

The community colleges need system-wide student level data that can link to the other higher education segments, K-12, and the workforce in order to analyze progress and identify, improve, and implement strategies that are effective at improving student outcomes.

A shared data system would allow colleges to synchronize assessments and have a common standard to determine readiness for credit bearing coursework. Further, robust data would better enable faculty members to incorporate post-enrollment student outcomes into their curriculum development.

Because of the lack of coordination between community colleges today, many students continue to take courses even after meeting the requirements for a certificate or transfer to a UC or CSU simply because they are not aware that they have completed the requirements.

ASCCC Position

None Listed

Chapter 8: Align Resources with Student Success Recommendations

POLICY STATEMENT

Both the redirection of existing resources and he acquisition of new resources will be necessary to implement the recommendations contained in this report .

Key Language:

Despite efforts to contain costs, many aspects of this Student Success Plan will require additional funding in order to implement the recommendations at scale and achieve significant positive impacts on student outcomes.

Recommendation 8.1

Consolidate select categorical programs.

This recommendation would allow community colleges to consolidate 21 existing categorical programs into the following broad areas: Student Support Initiative, Faculty Support Initiative, Workforce Development Initiative, and Other, which includes Disabled Student Services and Programs and other programs which are mandated by state and federal law. The Task Force believes that the increased flexibility of combining these programs will allow individual colleges to develop strategies that best address their students and institution.

Key Language:

While well intentioned, the cumulative effect of this budget practice has been to create 21 separate programs that local colleges must manage and coordinate as they attempt to focus on the ultimate objective of helping students achieve their educational goals.

This proposal does not mandate that districts shift their categorical resources and districts may choose to maintain categorical programs consistent with past practice. However, districts wishing to restructure categorical programs in a more coordinated and unified manner will now have greater authority to do so. This additional flexibility will allow districts to craft student success strategies that best fit their students and institutions.

The Task Force recommends that the existing 21 categorical programs be consolidated as follows

- Student Support Initiative
  Combine eight existing programs into the new Student Success Initiative. These include: Basic Skills; Financial Aid; CalWORKs; Foster Care; Matriculation; Physical Plant and Instructional Equipment; Fund for Student Success; Child Care Tax Bailout. This fund would then be augmented as the first priority for new state monies.

- Faculty Support Initiative
  Combine four existing programs into a consolidated faculty support program. These include: Equal Employment Opportunity; Part-Time Faculty Office Hours; Part-Time Faculty Health Insurance; and Part-Time Faculty Compensation.

- Workforce Development Initiative
  Combine four existing workforce training programs into a consolidated workforce program. These include: Economic and Workforce Development; Career Technical Education; Nursing Support; and Apprenticeship

- Other Programs
  The remaining categorical program would be treated as follows

    - Disabled Student Services and Programs would remain a separate categorical program due to federal and statement mandates to provide educational access to students with disabilities.

- Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program, the Academic Senate, and Transfer and Articulation would remain separate categorical programs due to their critical statewide functions.
- Extended Opportunity Program and Services would remain a separate categorical program.

ASCCC Position

ASCCC has always opposed categorical consolidation.

Recommendation 8.2
Invest in the Student Support Initiative

This recommendation proposed that any new monies appropriated by the system for the academic year beginning in 2012 would augment the Student Support Initiative. In order to receive this funding, districts must develop and submit student success plans that are consistent with state and local district goals. Districts would also be required to adopt a common assessment and the accountability score card.

Key Language

- Beginning with the 2012-13 State Budget, the first priority for new monies appropriated to the system would be to augment the Student Support Initiative.
- Receipt of these funds by a district would be conditioned on the district developing and submitting to the Chancellor's Office local student success plans that are consistent with state and local district goal setting (as outlined in chapter 7) and address student equity impacts.
- Further, as a condition of receiving Student Support Initiative funds, districts would be required to implement the common assessment proposed in Recommendation 2.1 and the accountability score card described in Recommendation 7.3.

Response from the ASCCC

Although ASCCC supports common assessment, we could not support the Student Success Initiative (SSI) as currently proposed due to its ties to common assessment and the "score card". If these ties were removed and the SSI were, effectively, a fund to restore categorical programs, ASCCC could support it.. ASCCC has a position supporting the use of new dollars to be dedicated to categoricals.

Recommendation 8.3
Establish an alternative funding model to encourage innovation and flexibility in the delivery of basic skills instruction.

This recommendation proposes an alternative funding model for basic skills instruction. Instead of funding colleges based on an FTES allocation model, funding would be determined by successfully moving student through the basic skills sequence into college-level courses.

Key Language:

Rather than having "seat time" as the dominant driver in basic skills funding, the development and implementation of an alternative funding model would reimburse colleges for successfully moving students from below college level to college level. This approach would allow districts to

innovate and develop programs built around student needs rather than the standard FTES allocation model.

ASCCC Position

The ASCCC opposes this recommendation. Recommendation 8.3 is as form of performance-based funding, presumes common curriculum statewide, and creates problematic incentives.

Recommendation 8.4
Do not implement outcomes-based funding at this time.

The Task Force explored the idea of outcome-based funding but had reservations for the following reasons,: community colleges might favor the best students to improve success, colleges serving disadvantaged students might be financially penalized, and the unpredictability of funding might undermine the ability of colleges to plan and support effective programs. Although a review of outcome-based funding in other states addressed these concerns, the recommendation at this time is not to implement them because there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate a positive impact on student success. However, the public reporting of outcome data was recommended by the Task Force due to its effect on planning and decisions of college leadership.

Key Language

The underlying premise of outcomes-based funding is that by providing funding to colleges in manner that rewards improvement in desired outcomes, college personnel will develop a greater focus on student success and modify activities and investments to harness the greatest possible achievement in the specified outcomes.

As the Task Force examined the topic, they considered potential concerns about this funding model including: (1) the risk that community colleges might "cream" students in order to improve success rates; (2) that colleges serving more disadvantaged population might be financially penalized; and (3) that increased funding volatility might actually undermine the ability of colleges to plan and support effective programs.

After a review of outcome based funding in other states, the Task Force reached the following conclusions:
Their success metrics focus on momentum points and reward colleges for a variety of outcomes including advancing students through a basic skills sequence and accumulating specified thresholds of units that have been shown to be important "tipping points" leading to successful program completion. Each college is compared against its own past performance, thus neutralizing differences associated with local economic and demographic variables. The outcomes-based funding mechanism involves a relatively small portion of overall funding, thus limiting funding volatility

For many Task Force members, the lack of evidence demonstrating that outcome-based funding made a positive impact on student success was an important factor in their decision to reject implementing outcome-based funding at this time.

it was the public reporting of outcome data that had the greatest effect on the planning and decisions of college leaders. This information fueled a spirited discussion in the Task Force that

led to a widely supported recommendation that the California Community Colleges implement a new outcome based accountably tool that would present key student success metrics in a clear and concise manner

ASCCC Position

ASCCC opposes any form of outcome-based funding.

General Comments

I have read the draft recommendations of the CCC Student Success Task Force. The report seems preoccupied with "efficiency" and redistribution/saving of CC funding. It also focuses on a top-down management structure, giving sweeping power to the CO. It does great damage to the categorical funds. Frankly, I have the feeling that faculty are not really "partners" in these recommendations. It is as if we have not really been concerned with student success, so the CO has to restructure everything to make it happen. It appears that the goal is to push out degrees and certificates--as many as possible. There are many reasons students do not get degrees or certificates. It does not mean they were not successful. It just means they didn't get a degree or certificate. Success cannot be measured solely by how many pieces of paper we give out to students.

I have read the CCA Feedback, CCCI resolutions, and the Statewide Academic Senate resolutions and concur with their findings. Below are some of my thoughts on the recommendations. Just my 2 cents.

p. 3 I find the introductory scenario quite naïve. It assumes that students can be "channeled" in a very short time into certain pathways which will work flawlessly help them meet their goals. I find it a very confining statement which focuses only on students who are seeking certificates, associates degrees, or transfer. We also serve other types of students, including community members--those "life-long learners" we so often talk about.

p. 7 "…completion rates are too low and must increase". Increased completion rates are desirable, but sometimes difficult to achieve due to a wide variety of variables. The Task Force uses the word "must"--as if they can give us an order for a commodity. We must increase our production of widgets. It is not that simple.

"…we can no longer be satisfied with providing students open access and limited success." We provide open access. We do our best to help students succeed. However, success is not something the college can magically give to students. Students are active participants in creating their own success. We can offer them every opportunity to be successful, but, ultimately, students must seize that opportunity. Not all students will. Community colleges cannot be responsible for those who simply are unable to succeed for a variety of reasons.

p. 8 "…end the fragmentation between K-12 …a reformed community college system will be more responsive to the needs of their students". This assumes that we, as community colleges, have a closer connection to K-12 and need to align ourselves with them in some way. Why just us? High school students apply to and attend CSUs and UCs. Are these systems being told to change their policies and procedures to align themselves to K-12? It doesn't appear so. What proof is there that a "reformed" community college system will be more responsive to students. This assumes we have failed to be responsive, an assumption which is not supported in this paper.

p.19 "This local approach to assessment has failed to serve students by allowing for significant variation between campuses…" Is there proof of this? Variation does not necessarily equal failure. What works for one campus may not work well for another due to a number of factors.

p. 20 "…and requiring students to declare a program of study early…" This limits exploration during the first few semesters. The ability to change majors based on what is being learned during the general education years is very important. Heaven knows I changed majors a few times!

"In the same manner that companies like Netflix and the Apollo Group have created tightly integrated online pathways for their customers, the CCC system needs to look towards the creation of centralized student support modules that offer high interactivity with local campus and district IT and administrative systems." Colleges are not corporations. Students are not customers looking to buy a product. This model is flawed beyond redemption for creating avenues for learning, exploring new ideas, and creative thinking.

p. 21 "By shifting the lower-need, self-directing students to online tools we free up advisors and counselors to focus their face-to-face interactions with those students most in need". Have the members of the task force interacted with a community college student recently? Many of our students are not comfortable with computers, or do not have the resources to purchase all of the electronic devices needed to access online systems. Let me make this perfectly clear also: an online system cannot and should not replace counselors. Nor should counselors be replaced by para-professionals. Students deserve qualified faculty counselors who will take an active interest in their college experience. Machines are not going to cut it. More counselors are needed, not less.

p. 22 "The centralized assessment must be diagnostic to ensure placement into appropriate coursework, and inform faculty efforts to design appropriate curriculum." Faculty do not need a centralized assessment tool to help them design their classes. Faculty are perfectly capable of designing their own assessments (or learning how to) and choosing to adjust course content—or not--as appropriate.

P. 24 "Community colleges will develop and use centralized and integrated technology…" Centralized is not always better, especially if controlled at the state level far from individual campuses. The ability to customize technology for the needs of a particular campus is extremely important.

"An electronic library resource and library catalog". The ability to choose the appropriate software for library automation should be left to each individual college. One size does not fit all—trust me. I'd also like to know what "an electronic library resource" is. Do they mean online databases? This is unclear.

p. 25 "Secure additional state funding…" About every other page there is some mention of additional funding. Eventually this gets around to Prop. 98 money. Everything is focused on standardization to reduce costs—oh, so corporate.

p. 26 "These 'habits of mind' include a student's ability to organize their work and manage time, study effectively, and balance competing priorities successfully." We cannot make up for everything that has been lacking in the preparation of the student before he/she comes here. K-12 and the student's family

support system must bear some of the responsibility for this. Some students come to us barely literate and unable to do arithmetic. The reasons for this are complex, but they do not begin here at the community college. K-12 is broken, but no one wants to address that elephant in the room.

p. 32 I don't know a lot about fee waivers, but this text bothers me. What bothers me even more is the statement, "Implementation of this recommendation will result in substantial cost savings to the community college system…" Always the additional focus on cost savings…are we interested in providing access to students or finding out how to manipulate what policies and procedures are in place to save a buck?

P. 34 "Community colleges will provide students the opportunity to consider the benefits of full-time enrollment." The text on this page is just naïve or the writers are out of touch with real students. Students would generally love to go full-time. They can't. They know this. Again, the focus here is on efficiency. It's quite unrealistic.

p. 36 "...the California Community Colleges has grown to add many community interest classes at the expense of key basic skills, career and technical classes." Community interest classes offer members of the local community opportunities for life-long learning. These classes are, as I understand it, not subsidized by the state. They are often taught by qualified community members. Community interest classes have a place in the community college class offerings.

p. 39 "In California, basic skills students often are "traditional" students who have matriculated through the K-12 system and arrived at the community colleges unprepared for college-level work." So true. Why doesn't the task force spend some time trying to figure out why this is so? A great deal of money might be saved if students exited the K-12 system prepared for college.

p. 42 "We cannot simply place students into classes that use the same mode of instructional delivery that failed to work for them in high school." This begs the question. Why are they failing in high school, and why do the task force members think that implementing techniques such as learning communities, etc. will solve the problem? These are not new concepts, and some have been used in high schools for years.

p. 46. "Revitalize and Re-envision Professional Development". We can do this just fine at the local level. Besides, negotiations are involved. For some reason I get the impression that the task force members think faculty are not concerned about student success and must be reminded that it is important.

p. 52 "Need for a Stronger Community College System Office". Hmmm…this has come up before and failed. We do not need an autocratic, centralized power structure in Sacramento calling the shots for 112 community colleges. Colleges differ vastly in their needs and demographics. This is why local governance is so important. This really smacks of a power grab. I'm sorry, but it does.

p. 53 "While shared governance with local district control remains a bedrock principle of the CCC system, many of the colleges face common challenges that could be most efficiently addressed through more structured leadership from the Chancellor's Office. (…) Further recommendations contained in this

chapter call on districts and colleges to establish goal-setting processes and to align those goals with state and system-wide priorities. “ I question whether local shared governance could remain effective while being required to align with state and system goals.

p. 54 “California is at a critical economic juncture, and community colleges, through the recommendations contained in this report, are committed to reorienting themselves toward ensuring students succeed. Without more authority in the Chancellor’s Office to help colleges implement these recommendations and hold them accountable for positive change, the impact of the recommendations contained within this report will be substantially weakened.” Somehow our “critical economic juncture” is related to student success. It seems to be related to the fact that a strong CO could control the colleges—and perhaps their funds, as well.

P. 55 “Proposition 98 fund, to be taken from the community colleges share of the Proposition 98 guarantee…” Oh, yeah, just what we need to do, give money that could be used for improving the conditions in our colleges and give it to the CO so that it can tell us all what to do. There is no reason to use Prop 98 money to fund the CO. They talk about lack of funds and efficiency? Let’s start by using Prop 98 funds as they were intended.

p. 57 “Student success score card.” This is so corporate. We do not need a score card--the handmaiden of outcomes based funding.

p. 63. Leave the categoricals alone. No playing around with that money.