

SBVC ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes

AS/SS 207 3:00 PM – DATE: 4.4.18

Topic	Discussion	Action
1. Call to Order and Roll Call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m. • Roll call via sign-in sheet 	
2. Public Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	
3. Senate President's Report C. Huston	<p>*See attachment to these minutes for a copy of the president's written report. The president or other senators made additional comments about the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Thanks: Thanks to R. Hamdy for covering the last 2 meetings [applause]. • District Employee Climate Survey: Came out earlier this week. Responses are anonymous and you don't have to answer every question. • Non-Credit Institute: May 3 – 5, 2018; some faculty are going down at a later time. If you cannot go because of classes on Thursday this may be an option. • AB 705: [see yellow handout] Please read AB 705 fully. We can meet to discuss this as a group later if that is needed. • Guided Pathways Plan: Did include reassign time for coordinators. We don't have a working job description yet, but I'm hoping to get one out to this body as soon as possible. • Guided Pathways Regional Meeting: Free event at Pasadena City College, usually with lunch provided! • BPs/APs: Why are we covering so many BPs/APs? We need an Ed Policy Chair. We want a formal process of documenting that we are looking at policies. Next year there are 72 APs/BPs that are up for review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Copeland: It was a recommendation that the District have a review procedure? ○ C. Huston: Our 2410 policy asks that the Senates review as part of the process. I would rather be safe than sorry right now. It's the first time I've seen an ACCJC recommendation like this to an institution. Any AP/BP in 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>3. Senate President's Report, continued C. Huston</p>	<p>the 4000s and 5000s falls under the Senate's purview. Changes in language should also come to us.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R. Hamdy: Does it have to come to the full Senate? ○ C. Huston: I'm open to that, but we would need more representation on Executive Senate and some documentation, maybe minutes, to show that we looked at it. I would rather we didn't have to do this all of next year, but we don't have an Ed Policy chair at the moment to help. ○ D. Burns-Peters: Are you currently looking for an Ed Policy Chair? ○ C. Huston: Yes. I asked for volunteers when he left. We will be recruiting for next year's chair positions soon. The Ed Policy Chair can hand out a written report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reminders: Deadline for the Program Review & Honors Chair letters of interest will be extended to April 11, 2018. I'll send an email. • District Budget Committee: There are several items coming up and it would be great to have faculty attend in support. Discussions may include drop-for-no-payment recommendation, the new funding formula, and potentially a different resource allocation model. J. Torres presented on the KVCR money and funding for the colleges (something like \$10 million). Originally this money came to the District Budget Committee as a 50-50 split between SBVC and Crafton. After a lively discussion, there was a motion made by Crafton to follow the current resource allocation model even though it does not benefit them as much as the 50-50. This was passed as a first read as written at the last Board of Trustees meeting. If you are interested in speaking about this agenda item at the Board meeting and supporting the current resource allocation model consider attending the meeting. This could be brought up during public comments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: KVCR just presented a different funding formula. 	
<p>4. Committee Reports</p>	<p>a. Ed Policy [vacant]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently looking to fill this position 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>4. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<p>b. Personnel Policy [J. Notarangelo]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [see handout] List of Advancement in Rank positions-100% success rate, congratulations! [applause] <p>c. Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report. <p>d. Career/Tech [S. Meyer]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report. <p>e. Equity/Diversity [K. Melancon]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report., <p>f. Elections [M. Worsley]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report <p>g. Curriculum [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See the email from earlier today reminding faculty that the semester is coming to a close, but the October 1st deadline for curriculum changes arrives quickly after the fall semester begins. Now is a great time to get started. Help is available. You can respond to my email if you have any questions. Remember that CurricUNET closes down over the summer in that it doesn't move through the approval process. <p>h. Program Review [P. Ferri-Milligan]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report. <p>i. Accreditation & SLOs [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are working on an SLO handbook. The ACCJC annual report was completed and submitted. <p>j. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One more meeting on April 16th. We will review summer conference requests up through August. Those need to get to us ASAP. We don't always meet until September, so if you have a conference in late August or early September you may not have time in the fall. Flex Day is Tuesday, April 10, 2018. I want to highlight the accessibility workshop. There are 2 duplicate sessions. The trainer is from De Anza College. Accessibility affects everyone and you want to make sure you know how to make your documents accessible. I hear that this trainer is really good. I want you to bring your syllabus or handouts 	

Topic	Discussion.	Action
<p>4. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<p>that you usually use and they will show you how to make them accessible. I heard that the presenter is amazing.</p>	
<p>5. Additional Reports</p>	<p>a. SBCCD-CTA [A. Avelar]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ballots for the Executive Board have closed. They are counting ballots right now. The announcement of who was elected will be made on Friday, April 6, 2018. • Thanks to those who attended the Board Meeting, I know the time was weird. We had really good representation. I think it did resonate with the Board. We would like faculty to attend the next meeting. It is at Crafton Hills College in the LRC auditorium at 4:00 p.m. You don't have to say anything, unless you want to during public comments, but we just ask that you hold a sign. • On March 23rd we had a negotiations meeting. I think the pressure of seeing so many faculty at the meeting made a difference. We had several counter-proposals: wages, health and welfare, benefits, workload, and faculty chairs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R. Hamdy: What about calendar? ○ A. Avelar: We have a TA on the calendar. It wasn't the appropriate time to talk about calendar. We will give counter-proposals on March 30th. We had 2 counters for Article 13; one is for the behemoth of that article and one is for the calendar. It dawned on us that it will go into effect on July 1, if ratified. • The District's proposals were "not insulting," but it was not consistent with our study. Our proposal will get us closer to the median in the next couple of years. We are hoping to be +/- 5% of the median. We also argued that we are using Fall 2017 data, which means it is outdated. We are hoping that it allows us to have a multi-year compensation plan so we can focus on other articles as well. The counters we got from the District weren't the median but they weren't what we proposed. • We gave a counter for health and welfare. • The workload article is a "behemoth." It is a large article. Please take the time to read it because it is important. Green means we both agree with the language changes. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>5. Additional Reports, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty chairs: we have an agreement with the job description but not on the compensation. A lot of you saw the job description that went around. We have seen an increase in duties. We did not get faculty leave from them, but we did get other parts. We are also waiting for the lecture/lab parity. Our next negotiations meetings are on April 13th and April 20th. I am hopeful that we will get things accomplished on April 13th because April 20th is the latest date so we can get everything formatted correctly to vote. The online voting is really easy, but the behind the scenes part is a lot of work. 	
<p>5. Additional Reports, continued</p>	<p>b. District Assembly [A. Avelar]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please fill out the District Employee Campus Climate Survey sent out by B. Barron. Please fill it out even if you have neutral feelings or if you skip parts. • The Crafton Hills College presidential search timeline is out. They are going to start the process in May. They are hoping to have someone in place by January 1, 2019. The AP titled Educational Administrators is not ready to go forward yet. They only sent part f forward. The makeup of the hiring committee needs to include an additional CSCA member. • The calendar looks much better [see handout]. We did ask that it be made ADA compliant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: There was a study done on the local school districts and their spring breaks. We pushed ours back one week to account for that. We want to be considerate of both faculty and students with kids in local districts. A lot of them also have 2 weeks off, so that is something to think about moving forward. ○ A. Avelar: They also have a week for Thanksgiving. ○ K. Melancon: Having spring break be really different from the high schools affects concurrent enrollment because students go on vacations. ○ R. Hamdy: We did talk about that at Calendar Committee. We will be able to fix it if we go to a 16-week semester. That will help. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
Note:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to time constraints, D. Dusick requested to be moved earlier into the agenda. Details from her presentation can be found under New Business. 	Friendly change to the agenda: Approved: unanimously
6. Consent Agenda	<p>a. Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approve minutes from 3/21/2018 <p>b. BP's and AP's (6)</p> <p>i. BP/AP 5050: Student Success and Support Programs</p> <p>ii. BP/AP 5110: Counseling</p>	<p>Motion to approve the BP/APs. 1st: A. Agilar-Kitibutr 2nd: D. Smith</p> <p>Amendment: Friendly amendment to include minutes (A. Avelar) Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: C. Jones</p>
7. Old Business	<p>a. BP's and AP's (6) 2nd Read [C. Huston]</p> <p>i. AP/BP 3175: Intellectual Property</p> <p>ii. BP/AP 4225: Course Repetition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> D. Smith: students can have 3 tries plus an appeal for a fourth try if they are sick or something. A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: It has to be for very stringent reasons with provided documentations. Otherwise you have to take it at another college in another district. D. Smith: How is that policed? A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: The Scholastic Standards committee has a meeting and they discuss it. M. Copeland: My understanding is that very few requests are approved anyway. A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Yes, that is correct. <p>iii. AP 4235: Credit by Examination</p> <p>iv. AP 4236: Advanced Placement Credit</p> <p>v. BP 4060: Delineation of Functions Agreements</p> <p>b. AP 2510: Governance Handbook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I know that you discussed this at the last meeting, but I need some sort of direction to take this back to District Assembly. After the Area D meeting, we were advised to shore up our local governances. AP 2510 is our campus' local process. The change recommended by us to District Assembly is to delete our local shared governance process out of the AP and move to a shared governance 	<p>Motion to approve items i - v. 1st: J. Notarangelo 2nd: D. Burns-Peters</p> <p>Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: none</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. Old Business, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • handbook that is currently incomplete. I would like a motion to leave AP 2510 alone and keep it without amendment and either move ahead with a governance handbook or not. We have an unfinished one from 2014. It would need to be fully vetted before approval. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L. Lopez: Wouldn't the governance handbook need to be consistent with the policy? ○ C. Huston: Yes, but we don't want to do away with the policy until we have the handbook. ○ R. Hamdy: Crafton does all of this with a handbook. ○ C. Huston: [referencing the policy] Previously the red wording is our collegial process of how we do business, all of our committees, stating we work together with College Council, etc. The idea is we would do away with everything and move to a handbook that is 3 years old and unapproved. ○ D. Smith: Why do we need a motion? ○ C. Huston: District Assembly referred this to us and asked for an action. Crafton motioned that they will do what we do. • C. Huston was directed to work on updating the governance handbook. <p>c. Equivalency [R. Hamdy and D. Burns-Peters]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [See pink handout] The proposed AP/BP on Equivalency discussed at the last meeting. • R. Hamdy: This is basically the process. This is district-wide. Crafton supports it. • C. Huston: The main thing is that this separates equivalency from the hiring AP. It is more explicit on equivalency is granted. Right now CHC and SBVC follow this differently. Whomever they approve is also approved here and vice-versa. We want to better align this. That is why we are looking at this joint committee. • A. Avelar: Also consider the rehire rights for part-timers. So there will be a seniority list. • D. Burns-Peters: There is still no consistent meeting day/time? 	<p>Motion to maintain AP 2510 as-is for now until such a time as we have a governance handbook. 1st: R. Hamdy 2nd: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. Old Business, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: That is something we can work out once it gets approved. We also want to make sure we are using the same forms in the same way. • Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: This minimum qualifications gets updated. So if we just say, “See publication,” is that enough? Do we need to add “current” or “most current” because things are updated? ○ A. Avelar: That is a good friendly amendment. ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: It is not updated on a consistent timeline. ○ T. Long: Last page says, “may do say,” and should say, “may do so.” 	<p>Motion to approve with friendly amendments. 1st: J. Notarangelo 2nd: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None</p>
<p>8. New Business</p>	<p>a. Media Academy Update (4, 8, 10) [D. Dusick]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at 3:40 p.m. because she had to leave. • Back at the opening meeting 7 years ago. Over the years we have been able to grow. We have 4 paid interns working on some projects for the foundation right now. The 7th annual film festival, our biggest one yet, is coming soon: May 4th, 5th, 6th. It is an international film festival. We have close to 50 films submitted with 2 weeks left to go before the deadline. It’s going to be huge. • In the past year when we found out KVCR was going to bring in a lot of money, the Chancellor said he wanted to include CHC in the media academy. I’ve been working with K. Weiss, D. Rodriguez, and KVCR to come up with some plans. We want to open up the media academy to other relevant areas like Graphic Arts, English, Journalism, Theater, and Communication Studies. Then we would have additional paid internships at KVCR. • They are also going to implement a news program that will be done in part by faculty and students in the media academy. At this point no money has been established. I think that because we will bring in all these areas, there should be an administrator in the media academy to help coordinate the programs and create relevant 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>degree/certificate programs. We want to make sure that students have practical training and experience when they leave here so that they can get high-level jobs. My plan is to have a full-time director, a half-time producer, and a half-time faculty member. Those are the plans at this point. Faculty have been meeting and coming up with ideas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: One reason I invited Diane here is to show that faculty are present in these decisions. There has been a lot of talk about the KVCR money. ○ D. Dusick: The Chancellor wants to support this academy. A lot of it exists: classes, faculty, etc. We just want it under one umbrella and we want to establish funding for the internships and the new faculty/producer at KVCR. ○ C. Huston: The job announcements are out for Diane's position and Crafton's position. At the Board meeting the impression was given that the Board is involved in curriculum. ○ D. Dusick: That is not the case. Curriculum is done by faculty and our dean is supporting that. ○ Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ J. Notarangelo: How would faculty show their support? ▪ D. Dusick: First of all, the Senate can support it. Then when the Board discusses it. Also encourage President Rodriguez to support the director position. I already worked on a job description with K. Weiss and I would be happy to share that with you. ▪ R. Hamdy: Does your position change at all since you're retired? ▪ D. Dusick: I'm not sure. I was given 50% release time. If that director position doesn't go through, then someone will need to stay at 50% release time. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ D. Rodriguez: Ideally, we would have a 100% faculty member because we need that position and a director to oversee all of the moving parts. D. Dusick has built this incredible foundation for us to build on and that's exactly what we want to do. This is the time to do it because we won't see this type of funding again. ▪ A. Avelar: The media academy is a small drop in the bucket as far as funding. There are other things with KVCR that are not media-academy related. ▪ D. Dusick: KVCR is working very closely with the RTVF department. I've been here for 29 years and this is the first time I've seen that many students working over at KVCR. A third of their staff are my graduates. Opportunities are opening up. A significant chunk of money will be for hiring students. Another chunk of the money is for equipment for [KVCR] and our students. ▪ A. Avelar: There was also concern with students paying employee fees. There is a lot of regulation on what kind of fees we can charge. The presentation was on the Board's website. ▪ D. Dusick: We want to make sure that faculty are in control of that. ▪ C. Huston: Can we say that D. Dusick presented to the Senate and we support it? [general consensus] We will move forward and say that we support this "as presented." <p>b. AB 798 (4, 10) (Action Item) [R. Pires]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see handout] • I'm here to give the final report on AB 798. It is up to the Senate if we want to reapply for another round of funding. We have to propose the same amount of sections as last time (31). I saw about 14 sections in the summer where faculty will be using OER. Remember that ZTC classes mean faculty are committed to saving students at least 30%. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the last 2 years we've been working hard on this. We did a great job. We have embraced this movement. We went from a commitment of 13 sections to 113 sections. That's just the data I'm able to collect. I'm sure there is more that we are doing than what is being reported. I added up the cost of the original textbooks (brand-new) and it was \$413,000 and then looked at the ZTC costs and we saved 89%. 30% was the minimum and we were at 89%, so that is incredible. In the 113 sections we saved students about \$366,000. I calculated based on the amount of sections at Census date. • If you are happy with all of this, AB 798 is exclusively under the purview of the Academic Senate. As the coordinator for this I work under the Senate. The ad hoc committee has now transitioned into a workgroup to help implement the ZTC degree. • There is a list of money we cannot use. This is basically an outreach grant to spread the word. • If you want to move forward I would take the work plan and move forward. I would look for 31 sections to submit. Ask your colleagues to email me if they are going to adopt OER. Then C. Huston would sign off on the workplan. The deadline is June 30th. There does have to be collegial consultation and discussion. The Associated Student Government has been working with us and it will go to College Council at some point for a vote. All they are looking for is an updated workplan. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R. Hamdy: I think this is an awesome program. I do want to say that even though this is under the purview of the Senate, the grants office has to be involved somehow because they weren't last time. ○ R. Pires: Yeah. I loved working on this. We were told that whoever the coordinator is, that is where the grant lived. So it was living in the Social Science division. It was a lot to put on the division. R. Hamdy is saying that this should be under the grants office. 	<p>Motion to move forward in conjunction with the grants office. 1st: R. Hamdy 2nd: D. Smith</p> <p>Comments: R. Pires: I would ask that C. Huston take this to College Council and state that this needs to move forward with the grants office. C. Huston: Shall do.</p> <p>Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>c. Area D Meeting Report (6) [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a lot of talk about a general lack of collegial consultation. The Statewide Academic Senate did not support the online college at all and they are moving forward anyway. The Board of Trustees for the online college will be the Board of Directors. The funding formula, again, the ASCCC has asked to be part of the discussion and have not been granted a seat at the table. They are told to forward their ideas. • AB 705: Read the bill. The letters from the CCC office are guidance and not the only way to meet the compliance. It's just how they think we should be in compliance. We are encouraged to read the documents and think for ourselves. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ [see tan handout] There is a resolution related to the math portion of AB 705. I received an email that asked us to support this resolution. I would like to know how the Senate wants me to vote. ○ AB 705 infringes on academic purview. ○ The Chancellor's office is not relying primarily on the statewide Academic Senate for advisement on how this should be implemented even though it is an academic and professional matter. ○ The state chancellor has only met with the ASCCC leadership once since taking office. They are trying to schedule another meeting with him. "They" meaning our very own J. Stanskas. • Shoring up our local governance process- we did that by keeping AP 2510 whole while we work on a governance handbook. We are going to need to watch what's going on at the state. • We cannot afford to be "nice" as academic senates when dealing with academic statewide issues. • They said there are a number of ways to consider acting in support of the ASCCC. For example, we could decide not to sign the Guided Pathways proposal. The Senate Executive members decided to wait to see what action is 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
	<p>taken by other senates before we take action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASCCC Spring Plenary Resolutions: • There might be a vote of no confidence brought to the statewide academic senate to the chancellor's office. • Should a motion come forward- what is your feeling on how I should vote representing you? I don't want to presume to move in favor of a vote of no confidence without knowing the body's will. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: How long has the Chancellor been in office? ○ T. Long: Dec 9, 2016. ○ A. Avelar: And he only met with the Senate once? ○ C. Huston: Yes. We've been closed out of a number of things, including the statewide funding model. ○ M. Copeland: We can discuss this, but my thinking on directing you to vote would be after listening to the discussion [at Plenary] and listening to the majority of the body, if most of the colleges are in favor of that and it seems to be a unified decision I would think we should go along with that. ○ L. Lopez: I would just add that if the chancellor isn't meeting with the group then the group couldn't do their job. That's a good reason not to have confidence. ○ C. Huston: The discussion from the Area D meeting and the reason why I'm not sure a vote of no confidence will go forward, is someone said we should put the resolution out there and even if it fails then at least the Chancellor will know about it. J. Stanskas countered and said that if it fails it is consent to continue business as usual. There may be other resolutions that come in to support the statewide Academic Senate. ○ M. Copeland: There will probably be one about supporting the collegial process. ○ C. Huston: There is a whole section here on consultation. In the directory, you can see under the 7.0 Resolutions there is nothing about a vote of no confidence. There is nothing that's really controversial, 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
	<p>only 9.02 where they solicited our support. I will send this to senators and the campus and solicit input. If you or anyone in your area has feedback, let me know.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: 6.02 is opposition to the online community college. ○ R. Hamdy: I heard that the online college is the current governor's pet project, can we wait for him to leave? ○ C. Huston: Yes. The new funding model is also his project. I will await feedback and vote my conscience. 	
9. SBVC President's Report D. Rodriguez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. 	
10. Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	
11. Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. 	

Academic Senate Sign-In Sheet April 4, 2018

	SENATOR	INITIAL
A	Aguilar-Kitibutr, Ailsa	AK
	Avelar, Amy	AA
B	Barnett, Kellie	
	Beebe, Yvonne	YB
	Burnham, Lorrie [Rania Hamdy, proxy]	LB
	Burns-Peters, Davena	
C	Calderon, Colleen	
	Copeland, Mary	MC
D	Demsky, Jeffrey	
F	Ferri-Milligan, Paula	FM
	Fozouni, Daihim	DF
G	Gilbert, Jeremiah [Vicente Avarez, proxy]	VG
H	Huston, Celia	
J	Jennings, Amy	JA
	Jones, Carol	JC
	Jones, EJ	
	Jones, Patricia	
K	Kafela, Kathy	
L	Lopez, Leonard	LL
M	Massad, Sana	
	Melancon, Kenny	
	Mestas, Marie [Patti Wall, proxy]	

	Meyer, Stacy	
	Moeung, Botra	
	Murillo, Joan [Todd Heibel, proxy]	TBH for J. Murillo
N	Notarangelo, Joseph	
R	Rosales, David	
S	Slusser, Michael	MS
	Smith, David	DS
T	Tasaka, Bethany	BT
V	Vasquez, Mary Lou	
	Vasquez, Tatiana [Soha Sobhanian, proxy]	SS
W	Worsley, Margaret	

FREQUENT VISITORS	
Briggs, Stephanie	
Quach, Patty	
Rodriguez, Diana	
Thayer, Scott	
Torres, Jose	
Weiss, Kay	

VISITORS (Print Name)	INITIAL
Lycretia Tmy	LT
Diane Dusick	DD
Tamara Pires	TP
Romana Pires	RP

See back if more sign-in space is needed



SBVC ACADEMIC SENATE
Agenda
Wednesday, April 4, 2018
3:00-4:30 PM AD/SS 207

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1. Call to Order and Roll Call (Sign-In) | 3:00 pm |
| 2. Public Comments | 3:05 pm |
| 3. Senate President's Report | 3:10 pm |
| 4. Committee Reports | 3:15 pm |
| a. Ed. Policy - | |
| b. Personnel Policy – Joe Notarangelo | |
| c. Student Services – Ailsa Aguilar-Kitibutr | |
| d. Career/Tech - Stacy Meyer | |
| e. Equity/Diversity – Kenny Melancon | |
| f. Elections – Margaret Worsley | |
| g. Curriculum – Mary Copeland | |
| h. Program Review – Paula Ferri-Milligan | |
| i. Accreditation & SLOs – Celia Huston | |
| j. Professional Development – Rania Handy | |
| 5. Additional Reports | 3:20 pm |
| a. SBCCD-CTA – Amy Avelar | |
| b. District Assembly | |
| 6. Consent Agenda | 3:25 pm |
| a. Minutes 3/21/18 | |
| b. BP's and AP's (6) | |
| i. AP/BP 5050 Student Success and Support Programs | |
| ii. BP/AP 5110 Counseling | |
| 7. Old Business | 3:30 pm |
| a. BP's and AP's (6) 2 nd Read | |
| i. AP/BP 3175 Intellectual Property | |
| ii. BP/AP 4225-Course Repetition | |
| iii. AP 4235-Credit by Examination | |
| iv. AP 4236-Advanced Placement Credit | |
| v. BP 4060-Delineation of Functions Agreements | |
| b. AP 2510/Governance Handbook (6) | |
| c. Equivalency (5) | |
| 8. New Business | 3:35 pm |
| a. Media Academy Update 4, 8, 10) – D. Dusick | |
| b. AB798 (4, 10) – R. Pires (Action Item) | |
| c. AREA D Meeting Report (6) | |
| i. AB705 | |
| ii. ASCCC Spring Plenary Resolutions | |
| 9. SBVC President's Report | 4:20 pm |
| 10. Announcements | 4:25 pm |
| 11. Adjournment | 4:30 pm |

Commonly known as the "Ten Plus One," (as articulated in Title 5 of the Administrative Code of California, Sections 53200) the following define "Academic and Professional matters."

1. Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and places courses within disciplines 2. Degree and certificate requirements 3. Grading policies 4. Educational program development 5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success 6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles	7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports 8. Policies for faculty professional development activities 9. Processes for program review 10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development 11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the senate
---	---

Academic Senate Meeting Dates Spring 2018: ~~1/17/18, 2/7/18, 2/21/18, 3/7/18, 3/21/18, 4/4/18, 4/18/18, 5/2/18, 5/16/18~~



SBVC ACADEMIC SENATE
President's Report
Wednesday, April 4, 2018

Be on the lookout for the **District Employee Climate Survey**. District offices are collecting data to help examine how well we are providing services to employees district wide. The survey takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. All of your responses are anonymous and answering each question is optional

Non-Credit Institute: Last call for faculty interested in attending the Career and Non-Credit Education Institute on May 3-5, 2017 in Costa Mesa.

AB 705: At the Area D Meeting for the ASCCC, it was recommended that in addition to the recommendations from the CCCCO office, that faculty review the full-text of AB 705. There are many ways for an institution to meet the letter of the law, and some institutions have found that they are already in compliance.

Guided Pathways: The Guided Pathways plan approved by the Senate on 3/21/18 included reassign time for a Guided Pathways Coordinator(s). The workgroup discussed splitting the reassign time between instructional and non-instructional faculty.

Guided Pathways Regional Meeting: Friday, May 11 2018 @ Pasadena City College. This ASCCC sponsored event is free and includes lunch.

BPs/APs: Why are they on our agenda all the time? Two reasons, the Senate does not currently have an Educational Policy Chair, and a recent ACCJC Recommendation for Compliance to another institution stated that District should develop a "formal process for documenting the review of policies in which no revision was made". Placing BPs/APs that are not academic and professional matters on our agenda as consent or information items, and having a 1st and 2nd read for BPs/APs that are academic and professional matters serves to document that BPs/APs are being reviewed. I am open to suggestions. There are 72 BPs/APs up for review next year.

Reminders: Outstanding Professor Nominations, Program Review and Honor Chair Letters of Interest are due 4/6/18. Division committee assignment and new Senator assignments should be forwarded ASAP.

District Budget Committee meets on 4/5/2018 at the District in PDC 104 at 2 pm. Items on interest on the Agenda are the Drop for Non-Payment recommendation and new funding formula.

Save the Date

2018 Spring Plenary, April 12-14, 2018, San Mateo (Celia)
Career and Non-Credit Institute, May 3-5, 2018, Costa Mesa
Guided Pathways Regional Meeting, May 11, 2018 (Pasadena)
Curriculum Regional Meeting, May 19, 2018, (Cerritos) – AB705 will be a major topic
Faculty Leadership Institute, June 14-16, 2018, San Diego (Rania)
Curriculum Institute, July 11-14, 2018 Southern California



The California Acceleration Project
Supporting the State's 114 Community Colleges
To Transform Remediation and
Increase Student Completion and Equity

April 3, 2018

Dear Academic Senate President,

At the upcoming plenary, the ASCCC is asking for your endorsement of Resolution 9.2, which includes math pathways options developed by the Math and Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (MQRTF) and described as a response to AB 705. However, these recommendations promulgate a serious misunderstanding of the law and encourage faculty to invest time and energy on a potentially untenable response to the law's requirements.

We encourage you to vote to table these recommendations at the upcoming plenary until the CCCCO provides clearer instructions about math placement under AB 705.

If my college adopts the MQRTF math pathways will we be AB 705 compliant?

No. The MQRTF math options are a two-semester sequence that starts with a pre-transfer-level course, and that is the problem. Two-semester math pathways are not, in and of themselves, AB 705-compliant. Under the law, it is very difficult to place students into pre-transfer-level math courses.

If my college wants to adopt the MQRTF math pathways, what would be required of us under AB 705?

If a college adopts the ASCCC Math Pathways Options (or a similar two-semester pathway that starts with pre-transfer-level coursework), the college would not be AB 705 compliant UNLESS the college provided the placement research described in AB 705 to justify placing a student into a pre-transfer-level course.

Specifically, under AB 705, a student cannot be placed into remediation that lengthens time to degree unless placement research involving high school grades shows: (1) the student is highly unlikely to succeed if placed directly into transfer-level coursework for their program AND (2) the student has a higher probability of completing transfer-level course work in one year if (s)he begins in a course below transfer-level.

But surely some students will need remediation, and that makes the MQRTF options viable, right?

The question is whether AB 705 guidelines will allow a college to place students into pre-transfer-level math, and if so, whom?

In her recent memo, CCCC Executive Vice Chancellor Laura Hope wrote,

Statewide MMAP data modeling suggests that when compared to the attrition of traditional sequences, students are more likely to succeed in transfer-level English and mathematics if they begin there. Compelling evidence from within California and nationally further suggests that students across all levels of preparation are more likely to complete transfer-level coursework when placed directly into it, especially when they experience appropriate support.

In that memo she indicated that all students with transfer-intent should be directly placed into transfer-level English, with concurrent support provided to specified groups with lower predicted pass rates.

Additional guidance from the CCCC about AB 705 math placement is forthcoming and is likely to show that all students should have direct access to transfer-level Statistics. See the research presented to the CCCC AB 705 Implementation Team and posted on the CCCC website under Assessment and Placement on the AB 705 page. For this reason, it's unlikely that colleges could populate the math pathways options described in the MQRTF, particularly the Fundamentals of Algebra for Statistics or Liberal Arts. The ASCCC should not guide faculty to spend time developing pathways that are untenable.

If my college wants to get started now, are there models we can review that are clearly AB 705 compliant?

Yes, many states have moved to corequisite models, where students deemed underprepared enroll in transfer-level courses and receive additional support to be successful there. These models are clearly AB 705 compliant. In fact, AB 705 explicitly allows us to require students to enroll in additional concurrent support during the same semester that they are enrolled in a transfer-level math course. The only caveat is that the support must increase their likelihood of passing the transfer-level course; this encourages a better alignment between remediation and the transfer-level course in a student's program of study. The California Acceleration Project's website, accelerationproject.org, gives an introduction to some of these models.

Will AB 705 lead to improved transfer-math completion rates?

According to the CCCC Score Card, only 17% of California community college students complete transfer-level math within a year of their first math enrollment. In states that have replaced traditional developmental math sequences with corequisite support at the transfer-level, such as Georgia, Indiana, Tennessee, and West Virginia, over 60% of the students identified as needing support complete transfer math requirements in a year. This is nearly three times the national average¹ and over 3.5 times the California state average.

In California, Cuyamaca College has similarly transformed their math program, replacing remedial sequences with corequisite courses at the transfer-level. With the move to corequisites, one-year completion of transfer-level math for “underprepared” students jumped from 10% to 67%, with impressive gains for students of color. Among African-American students taking transfer-level courses with support, one-year completion of transfer-level math is nearly seven times the state average (55% vs. 8%). For Latinx students it is nearly six times the state average (65% vs. 11%). Among students placed into Elementary Algebra – those who traditionally would have taken a year of remedial courses – 60% pass transfer-level Business and STEM courses with support, and 70% pass Statistics with support.

Who is the California Acceleration Project (CAP)?

The California Acceleration Project is a CCC faculty-led professional development network that supports the state’s 114 community colleges to transform remediation to increase student completion and equity. Since its creation in 2010, CAP has focused on one primary outcome: increasing the number of students from all demographic groups who go on to complete transferable gateway courses in English and math, a critical early momentum point toward longer term degree and transfer outcomes.

Sincerely,

Katie Hern, Executive Director and Co-Founder California Acceleration Project,
Chabot College English instructor

Myra Snell, Co-Founder California Acceleration Project, Los Medanos College math
professor

¹ <http://completecollege.org/spanningthedivide/#the-bridge-builders>

9.02 S18 Pathways to Meet General Education Requirements of Quantitative Reasoning

Whereas, The California State University (CSU), through CSU Executive Order 1100 no longer requires that a course included in CSU General Education Breadth Area B4, Quantitative Reasoning, has an explicit prerequisite of intermediate algebra;

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) requires that “a community college district or college shall maximize the probability that a student will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in... mathematics within a one-year timeframe” and “for students who seek a goal other than transfer, and who are in certificate or degree programs with specific requirements that are not met with transfer-level coursework, a community college district or college maximizes the probability that a student will enter and complete the required college-level coursework in...mathematics within a one-year timeframe” and mathematics is a required component of all quantitative reasoning courses;

Whereas, Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites, degree and certificate requirements, educational program development, and standards or policies regarding student preparation and success fall under the purview of local academic senates as academic and professional matters as per the “10+1” in Title 5 §53200, and, as such, administrators should defer to the expertise of the academic senate to develop curricular pathways and placement models that serve the needs of students while complying with all legal requirements; and

Whereas, In fall 2017, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC), the California Mathematics Council of Community Colleges (CMC3) and the California Mathematics Council of Community Colleges-South (CMC3-South) joined together and formed a task force to address math and quantitative reasoning education in California community colleges and has provided the California Community Colleges Math and Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Recommendations – Part I12 as options for colleges to consider in moving toward compliance with AB 705 (Irwin, 2017);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognize multiple pathways for students to achieve transfer-level competency in math and quantitative reasoning; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse the California Community Colleges Math and Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Recommendations – Part I as one option that colleges may consider as they implement changes related to AB 705 (Irwin, 2017).

4/4/18

SBVC Academic Senate Report

AB 798 Textbook Affordability Grant \$31,000 Phase One

Grant Requirements: Faculty will save students at least 30% savings on textbooks from one semester to the next by exclusively or partially incorporating open educational resources. Grant award is \$1,000 per section (minimum \$10,000 to maximum \$50,000).

SBVC Award \$31,000 for 31 sections

Actual Savings - \$366,350 or 89% savings

Students Impacted - \$3,158 students (based on total students enrolled at census)

Total Section – 113 sections

Fund Expenditures

Textbook Affordability Campus Coordinator Stipend

College OER Website Curation Stipend

Intellus OER Curation Software

RTVF Student OER Video

Professional Development Activities

Conference Attendance

AB 798 Textbook Affordability Grant \$31,000 Phase Two – New Textbook Affordability Plan is Due 6/30 and must be approved by academic senate or representative and include collegial consultation. Need to identify 31 new sections in which faculty will save students at least 30% savings on textbooks from one semester to the next by exclusively or partially incorporating open educational resources. Grant award is \$1,000 per section.

The following items cannot be funded with the awards allocated.

- a. Direct compensation for faculty members who adopt open educational resources, except as provided to compensate for professional development.
- b. The development of MOOC's or online courses that include non-matriculated students.
- c. The creation of new OER materials.
- d. The purchase of new equipment.
- e. Past curricular conversions to OER materials



San Bernardino
Valley College

April 4, 2018

To: Academic Senate

From: The Advancement in Rank Committee: Todd Heibel, Marianne Klingstrand, Joel Lamore, Michael Slusser, Patty Wall, Joe Notarangelo.

Re: Advancement in Rank

The Academic Advancement in Rank ad hoc committee met on March 28, 2018 to consider candidates for advancement in rank.

After due consideration of the nomination letters in accordance with AP 7210, the committee is pleased to recommend the following advancements in rank:

Mandi Batalo, advancement to **Professor**

Jeffrey Demsky, advancement to **Associate Professor**

Edward Jones, advancement to **Associate Professor**

Susan Mattson, advancement to **Associate Professor**

David B. Smith, advancement to **Associate Professor**

Tatiana Vásquez, advancement to **Associate Professor**

Diane Dusick, advancement to **Professor Emeritus**

Laura M. Gomez, advancement to **Professor Emeritus**

BP 7211 Faculty Service Areas, Minimum Qualifications, and Equivalencies

Reference: Education Code Sections 87355-87359.5; 86360

Title 5 California Code of Regulations Sections 53410 – 53417

The San Bernardino Community College District shall establish procedures for determining faculty service areas that adhere to collective bargaining agreements.

In addition, the District will establish procedures to determine minimum qualifications and equivalencies for minimum qualifications for hiring faculty that are compliant with relevant sections of the Education Code and Title 5 regulations and include reasonable procedures to ensure that the Governing Board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate to determine that each individual employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are "at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications" per Education Code Section 87359(b). These procedures will ensure the hiring of highly qualified faculty who are experts in their subject matter areas, who are skilled in teaching and serving the needs of a varied student population, who can foster overall college effectiveness, and who are sensitive to and themselves represent the racial and cultural diversity of the College District community.

AP 7211 Faculty Service Areas, Minimum Qualifications, and Equivalencies

Reference: Education Code Sections 87001, 87003, 87355-87359.5; 86360, 87743.2

Title 5 California Code of Regulations Sections 53406, 53410 – 53417

Faculty Service Areas

Faculty service areas shall be established after negotiation and consultation as required by law with the appropriate faculty representatives.

Minimum Qualifications

The goal of the San Bernardino Community College District is to provide a faculty of highly qualified professional educators who are experts in their fields, skilled in teaching, and serve the needs of a varied student population. The District also seeks those who can promote overall college effectiveness and who are sensitive to the diversity of the District community. The San Bernardino College District shall employ faculty who possess the minimum qualifications, as established by the California State Chancellor's Office (see publication, "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges").

Faculty are responsible for including a minimum qualification on all new curriculum or as part of a curriculum review process. All curriculum should be placed within a discipline that is identified as having a minimum qualification. It is best practice to place curriculum in the discipline that best matches the course content and for which the minimum qualifications of faculty best match the course content.

For departments that include courses with dual designators, deans and chairs from all relevant programs will collaborate to ensure the most qualified faculty teach these courses and minimum qualifications are met.

The Role of Human Resources

The role of the Human Resources office is to collect, date-stamp, and forward applications and other pertinent information to the appropriate discipline selection committee (full-time) or department chair and dean (part-time).

In addition, Human Resources ensures that the established minimum qualifications for the position will be listed in the job description/announcement. The District criteria for equivalency will be available at the Human Resources Department. A statement will be included in the application materials requiring all

candidates who do not possess minimum qualifications to indicate in the application material how they meet the equivalent qualifications for the position and to provide supporting documentation. The burden of proof for minimum qualifications and equivalency is on the applicant.

Human Resources staff will verify that applicants have the appropriate credential, or that applicants claiming the required minimum qualifications show the appropriate degrees on their transcript. If there is an experience requirement, College District Human Resource staff will verify that the applicant has the required number years of experience, but will not judge if the experience is appropriate.

If the applicant claims to possess the minimum qualifications, but the degree titles are significantly different from those listed in the "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges," that application shall be considered under the equivalency process even if the applicant did not claim equivalency. Human Resources will rely primarily on the Academic Senate, in consultation with administration, to determine equivalency of degree titles based on an examination of an applicant's transcripts.

Human Resources forwards all applications which satisfy the credentials requirement, satisfy the minimum qualifications requirement, or are deemed to be equivalent to the college selection committee (full-time) or to the dean and chair in that department (part-time).

Supplemental Equivalency Application

Human Resources is responsible for maintaining a "Supplemental Equivalency Application." If a potential employee applies for a position and wishes to complete a "Supplemental Equivalency Application for Academic Employment", the following information should be provided:

Degree for which the applicant claims equivalency.

The educational preparation on which the applicant bases this claim for the major of the minimum degree.

The educational preparation on which the applicant bases this claim for the general education requirement of the minimum degree.

The relevant courses the applicant has taken or other evidence that the applicant has the equivalent of the General Education portion of the minimum degree.

An official transcript and copies of the appropriate pages from the catalog of the institution that granted the degree upon which the applicant bases a claim of equivalency.

Publications or other work products that support a claim of equivalency.

A detailed description of work experience which the applicant believes establishes equivalency to the minimum qualifications. If the applicant is using work products or other items which cannot be submitted, provide detailed information from an objective source about the nature of this work product or experience.

Equivalency

All community college faculty should exemplify the qualities of a college educated person.

Pursuant to Education Code Section 87359, the equivalency process "shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the Governing Board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate to determine that each individual employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications." Equivalency may be recognized in three major ways: course work, work experience, and eminence in the field or a combination of the three.

Joint Equivalency Committee

The Dual College Equivalency Committee is comprised of the Academic Senate Presidents from each college, four faculty members, two from CHC and two from SBVC as appointed by their respective

Academic Senate president's and two administrators' one from CHC and one from SBVC as designated by the respective college VPI who are advisory to the process.

Process for Determination of Equivalency

In order to determine when an applicant for a faculty position who lacks the specific degree or experience specified in the "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges" Handbook possesses qualifications that are equivalent, the following process has been established:

1. When Human Resources stipulates that a determination of equivalency is needed, the Equivalency Committee will be called to meet as soon as possible. Human Resources will provide the Equivalency Committee with the necessary information to determine equivalency no less than three working days prior to the meeting.
2. The dean, discipline faculty, and applicant may address the committee and provide additional information prior to the committee making a decision.
3. Determination of equivalency to the minimum qualifications for hire shall be decided, by majority vote in the Equivalency Committee and is final. The Equivalency Committee will document their determination in writing and send it to Human Resources within 5 working days.
4. If new information becomes available, a new request for equivalency may be submitted.
5. Human Resources will forward the written rationale from the Equivalency Committee explaining the equivalency decision to the applicant and dean.
6. The results of the Equivalency Committee decision shall be documented by Human Resources and records kept of all decisions. Individual voting by Committee members will not be recorded.
7. Education Code §87359(a) requires that the governing board take action on the equivalency before hiring occurs. Equivalencies shall be forwarded to the Office of the Chancellor to be placed on a Governing Board agenda.

Standards and Criteria Applicable for Determining Equivalency

The following standards and criteria apply when determining equivalency:

1. Minimum qualifications in a discipline—and, by extension, equivalency—are the same whether the position is for a full-time or part-time faculty member.
2. Equivalency is determined for an entire discipline, not on a course-by-course basis, per legal opinion I 03-28. The granting of equivalency is on a case-by-case basis and does not set precedence for future hires.
3. Past equivalency decisions in the discipline will be made available as needed to the Equivalency Committee or to the dean and chair in that department to aid in their deliberations and can be considered when determining equivalency, though they do not establish precedence.
4. Should an equivalency be granted, that decision shall not give the applicant any more or any less consideration than other applicants. In addition, granting an equivalency neither guarantees an interview nor a job.
5. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide all documentation in support of equivalency and to be available for questions. Applicants wishing to establish equivalency through work experience should provide objective, detailed information about those work experiences. Any applicant who fails to provide evidence to support his/her claim of a credential, or of minimum qualifications, or of equivalency may be eliminated from the applicant pool.

6. Various occupational experiences may be combined to total the required number of years established by the minimum qualifications; all experience must have taken place within the ten years preceding the date of application with at least one year of qualified experience occurring within the three years immediately preceding the date of application.
7. No candidate for a full-time position shall be invited to interview without meeting the minimum qualifications or having been verified as meeting the equivalency.
8. No candidate for part-time employment shall be hired without either meeting the minimum qualifications or having been verified as meeting equivalency per these procedures.

Provisional Equivalency

The Equivalency Committee shall not grant "provisional" or "temporary" equivalency. All faculty hires must possess the minimum qualifications or be determined to possess equivalency to the minimum qualifications to be employed by the college district.

Additional Criteria for the Equivalency Committee

In all cases in which equivalency is granted or denied, an officially signed form shall be filed with the Office of Human Resources and the Office of Academic Affairs. This form shall include a complete description of the Equivalency Committee's reasons for determining that a candidate does or does not have the equivalent of the minimum qualifications for the position. The Human Resources Office is responsible for creating and maintaining this documentation.

Minimum Standards for Consideration of Equivalency to Minimum

Qualifications in Disciplines Requiring a Master's Degree

In order to be considered for equivalency, in the case of disciplines normally requiring a Master's degree, the minimum standard shall be any one of the following:

1. A Master's degree in a discipline which is not specifically named in "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges" for the particular discipline in question, but which, when courses (and course descriptions) are carefully reviewed, clearly constitutes parallel and/or closely related coursework to the discipline which is specifically listed in "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges".
2. In specific disciplines as named by the "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges", a bachelor's degree in the discipline, plus licensure by an appropriate state agency, plus at least two years of professional experience, verified in writing.

Minimum Standards for Consideration of Equivalency to Minimum

Qualifications in Disciplines That Do Not Require a Master's Degree

In order to be considered for equivalency in the case of disciplines not normally requiring a Master's degree, the minimum standards shall be one of the following:

1. An Associate degree plus six years of related experience
2. Bachelor's degree plus two years of related experience,

3. Associate degree plus graduation from an institution specific to that field, plus two years of professional experience in the discipline, verified in writing, plus appropriate certification to practice or licensure, if applicable.
4. The MQs for Credit ESL, English, and Reading will be used when evaluating Equivalency for Noncredit ESL, Noncredit Basic Skills Writing and Noncredit Basic Skills Reading.
5. Pursuant to Title 5 § 53406, all degrees and coursework must be from colleges/universities accredited by one of the intersegmental accrediting agencies: Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, New England Association of Schools and Colleges, North Central Associations of Colleges and Schools, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges.

Qualifications Established by Degrees and Coursework from Educational Institutions Outside of the United States

Applicants wishing to be granted equivalency based on coursework completed at an educational institution outside of the United States must provide the following:

1. A transcript assessment by a third party degree assessment service.
2. Proof that the institution is accredited in its country of operation or in the United States.

Local Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies

Disciplines wishing to add "local" qualifications for hiring to their discipline beyond the minimum qualifications established by the "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges") may do so with approval of the Academic Senate with a recommendation from the Equivalency Committee. Local requirements may not be added on a course-by-course basis. Equivalency for the local requirement will be determined through the equivalency process.

Eminence

Although no legal definition of eminence exists, eminence shall mean that qualifications which, as evidenced by prominence and celebrity, is established by the specific industry and/or community at large and may be deemed equivalent to minimum qualifications. This may include appropriate local, state, national and/or international associations, trade unions, guilds or communities comprised of experts, who are themselves renowned in the specific field, and who can attest, in writing, to the prominence and celebrity of the applicant.

Eminence alone is not sufficient to grant equivalency. An application of equivalency based on eminence must be accompanied by conclusive evidence that the applicant exemplifies qualities of a college educated person and brings to the college district the knowledge and ability to expected at the college level. The applicant must provide documentation supporting the status of eminence

Relevant Education Code References

1. Assembly Bill 1725, Section 4 (p) (1) "The laws, regulations, directives, or guidelines should help the community colleges ensure that the faculty and administrators they hire and retain are people who are sympathetic and sensitive to the racial and cultural diversity in the colleges, are themselves representative of that diversity, and are well prepared by training and temperament to respond effectively to the educational needs of all the special populations served by community colleges."
2. Assembly Bill 1725, Section 4 (s) (2) "The governing board of a community college district derives its authority from statute and from its status as the entity holding the institution in trust for the benefit of the public. As a result, the governing board and the administrators it appoints have the principal legal and public responsibility for ensuring an effective hiring process."
3. Education Code, Section 87359 "No one may be hired to serve as a community college faculty member, instructional administrator, or student services administrator under the authority granted by the regulations unless the governing board determines that he or she possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications specified in regulations of the board adopted pursuant to Section 87356. The criteria used by the governing board in making the determination shall be reflected in the governing board's actions employing the individual. The process, as well as criteria and standards by which the governing board reaches its determinations, shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board. The agreed upon process shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate to determine that each individual employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualification specified in regulations adopted by the board of governors. The process shall further require that the governing board provide the academic senate with an opportunity to present its views to the governing board before the board makes a determination; and that the written record of the decision, including the views of the academic senate, shall be available for review pursuant to Section 87358."
4. Education Code, Section 87359(a) "No one may be hired to serve as a community college faculty member or educational administrator under the authority granted by the regulations unless the governing board determines that he or she possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications specified in regulations of the board of governors adopted pursuant to Section 87356. The criteria used by the governing board in making the determination shall be reflected in the governing board's action employing the individual."
5. Assembly Bill 1725, Section 4 (s) (3) "Faculty members derive their authority from their expertise as teachers and subject matter specialists and from their status as professionals. As a result, the faculty has an inherent professional responsibility in the development and implementation of policies and procedures governing the hiring process."
6. Assembly Bill 1725, Section 4 (t) "While the precise nature of the hiring process for faculty should be subject to local definition and control, each community college should in a way that is appropriate to its circumstances, establish a hiring process that ensures that (1) Emphasis is placed on the responsibility of the faculty to ensure the quality of their faculty peers."

Aug 2019						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Sep 2019						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

Oct 2019						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

Nov 2019						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

Dec 2019						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

Jan 2020						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

Feb 2020						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29

Mar 2020						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

Apr 2020						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

May 2020						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

Jun 2020						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

Jul 2020						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

LEGEND

Flex Days	Aug 15, Sep 27, Jan 9, Apr 8		
In-Service Days	Aug 16, Jan 10, May 22 (Commencement)		
Term Start Days	Aug 19 (Fall) and Jan 13 (Spring)		
Final Exam Weeks	Dec 14 – 20 (Fall) and May 15 – 21 (Spring)		
Spring Recess	March 16 – 21		
Holidays	Sep 2 (Labor Day)	Nov 11 (Veteran's Day)	Nov 28 – 30 (Thanksgiving)
	Dec 25 – Jan 1 (Winter Break)	Jan 20 (MLK Day)	Feb 7 (Lincoln's Bday)
	Feb 17 (Washington's Bday)	May 25 (Labor Day)	Jul 3 (Independence Day Obs.)

This side is for quick reference only (see reverse for the Official SBCCD Academic Calendar)

San Bernardino Community College District

2019-2020 Academic Year

Fall Semester 2019:

Flex Day (no classes in session)	August 15
Faculty In-Service Day	August 16
Instruction Begins	August 19
Labor Day	September 2
Fall Census Day	September 9
Flex Day (no classes in session)	September 27
Veterans Day	November 11
Thanksgiving Recess	November 28-30
Final Exams/Saturday Classes	December 14
Final Exams	December 16-20
Fall Semester Ends	December 20
Fall Semester Grades Due	December 27
Campus Closed	December 25-January 1

Spring Semester 2020:

Flex Day (no classes in session)	January 9
Faculty In-Service Day	January 10
Instruction Begins	January 13
Martin Luther King Day	January 20
Spring Census Day	February 3
Lincoln's Birthday	February 7
Washington's Birthday	February 17
Spring Recess	March 16-21
Flex Day (no classes in session)	April 8
Final Exams	May 15-21
Final Exams/Saturday Classes	May 16
Spring Semester Ends	May 21
CHC & SBVC Campus Graduation	May 22
Faculty In-Service Day	May 22
Memorial Day	May 25
Spring Semester Grades Due	May 28

Short Term Courses Grades due 7 calendar days after last day of class
 Flex Days 4 days of Required Flex to be completed by contract faculty

2019-2020 Census Days

Fall Census Day - September 9
 Spring Census Day - February 3

Assembly Bill No. 705

CHAPTER 745

An act to amend Section 78213 of the Education Code, relating to community colleges.

[Approved by Governor October 13, 2017. Filed with Secretary of State October 13, 2017.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 705, Irwin. Seymour-Campbell Student Success Act of 2012: matriculation: assessment.

(1) Existing law establishes the California Community Colleges, under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, as one of the segments of public postsecondary education in this state. Existing law, the Seymour-Campbell Student Success Act of 2012, provides that the purpose of the act is to increase California community college student access and success by providing effective core matriculation services of orientation, assessment and placement, counseling, and other education planning services, and academic interventions. Existing law prohibits a community college district or college from using any assessment instrument for the purposes of these provisions without the authorization of the board of governors.

This bill would require a community college district or college to maximize the probability that the student will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe, and use, in the placement of students into English and mathematics courses in order to achieve this goal, one or more of the following: high school coursework, high school grades, and high school grade point average. The bill would authorize the board of governors to establish regulations governing the use of measures, instruments, and placement models to ensure that these measures, instruments, and placement models achieve the goal of maximizing the probability that a student will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe, and that a student enrolled in English-as-a-second-language (ESL) instruction will enter and complete degree and transfer requirements in English within a timeframe of 3 years. The bill would also authorize the board of governors to establish regulations that ensure that, for students who seek a goal other than transfer, and who are in certificate or degree programs with specific requirements that are not met with transfer-level coursework, a community college maximizes the probability that a student will enter and complete the required college-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe.

The bill would prohibit a community college district or college from requiring students to enroll in remedial English or mathematics coursework that lengthens their time to complete a degree unless placement research that includes consideration of high school grade point average and coursework shows that those students are highly unlikely to succeed in transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics. The bill would authorize a community college district or college to require students to enroll in additional concurrent support, including additional language support for ESL students, during the same semester that they take the transfer-level English or mathematics course, but only if it is determined that the support will increase their likelihood of passing the transfer-level English or mathematics course.

To the extent the bill would impose additional duties on community college districts and colleges, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

(2) The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to the statutory provisions noted above.

DIGEST KEY

Vote: MAJORITY Appropriation: NO Fiscal Committee: YES Local Program: YES

BILL TEXT

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1.

(a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

- (1) The California community college system is the nation's largest system of higher education, and a critical entry point to higher education and opportunities for upward mobility.
- (2) California's community colleges identify more than 75 percent of its students as underprepared, and refer this overwhelming majority of students to remedial courses.
- (3) The choice of assessment instruments and placement policies has serious implications for equity, since students of color are more likely to be placed into remedial courses.
- (4) There are serious adverse consequences to a college incorrectly assigning a prepared student to remediation. These adverse consequences include discouraging some students from pursuing a postsecondary education, as well as burdening other students with higher educational costs and delaying their degree plans.
- (5) Students placed into remediation are much less likely to reach their educational goals. According to the Student Success Scorecard, just 40 percent go on to complete a degree, certificate, or transfer outcome in six years, compared to 70 percent for students allowed to enroll directly in college-level courses.
- (6) Numerous reputable studies suggest that community colleges are placing too many students into remediation and that many more students would complete transfer requirements in math and English if allowed to bypass remedial prerequisite courses and enroll directly in transfer-level English and math courses.
- (7) Instruction in English as a second language (ESL) is distinct from remediation in English. Students enrolled in ESL credit coursework are foreign language learners who require additional language training in English, require support to successfully complete degree and transfer requirements in English, or require both of the above.
- (8) The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges has established rules to protect students from being excluded from courses in which they can be successful. This was in response to a Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund lawsuit that was settled in 1991 and was driven by concerns that assessment tests disproportionately placed Latino students into remedial prerequisite courses.
- (9) Community colleges are prohibited from requiring students to take a prerequisite course unless they are highly unlikely to succeed in a higher-level course without it pursuant to Section 55003 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, but this policy is not followed in practice. In math, broad exceptions allow community colleges to block students from courses in which they can be successful in the service of four-year university transfer policies.
- (10) Colleges are also required to use multiple measures in determining course placement pursuant to Section 55522 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, but Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations does not provide enough guidance in the use of multiple measures to ensure that students are not excluded from courses in which they can be successful.
- (11) A 2016 report by the Public Policy Institute of California found that California community colleges still use placement tests extensively, and that the use of other student achievement measures for placement was sparse and unsystematic.
- (12) There is evidence that when used as the primary criterion for placement, these tests tend to underplace students—leading colleges to assign students to remedial courses when those students could have succeeded in college-level courses. The reliance of test scores as the determinant factor for high-stakes placement decisions runs contrary to testing industry norms.

(13) Research shows that a student's high school performance is a much stronger predictor of success in transfer-level courses than standardized placement tests.

(14) The community college system is in a good position to improve placement practices. The system's Multiple Measures Assessment Project and Common Assessment Initiative have conducted deep and research-driven work on the use of high school performance to greatly improve the accuracy of the placement process.

(15) The Legislature has made significant investments to improve student assessment and placement. These investments most recently include the Community College Basic Skills and Student Outcomes Transformation Program grants, which are providing selected colleges with funding to redesign remedial assessment and placement, as well as curriculum and career pathways.

(16) The goal of this act is to ensure that students are not placed into remedial courses that may delay or deter their educational progress unless evidence suggests they are highly unlikely to succeed in the college-level course.

(b) It is the intent of the Legislature that the State Department of Education and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges work collaboratively to ensure timely access to data regarding high school performance for purposes of community college student placement.

SEC. 2.

Section 78213 of the Education Code is amended to read:

78213.

(a) No community college district or college may use any assessment instrument for the purposes of this article without the authorization of the board of governors. The board of governors may adopt a list of authorized assessment instruments pursuant to the policies and procedures developed pursuant to this section and the intent of this article. The board of governors may waive this requirement as to any assessment instrument pending evaluation.

(b) The board of governors shall review all assessment instruments to ensure that they meet all of the following requirements:

(1) Assessment instruments shall be sensitive to cultural and language differences between students, and shall be adapted as necessary to accommodate students with disabilities.

(2) Assessment instruments shall be used as an advisory tool to assist students in the selection of appropriate courses.

(3) Assessment instruments shall not be used to exclude students from admission to community colleges.

(c) The board of governors shall establish an advisory committee to review and make recommendations concerning all assessment instruments used by districts and colleges pursuant to this article.

(d) (1) (A) A community college district or college shall maximize the probability that a student will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe, and use, in the placement of students into English and mathematics courses in order to achieve this goal, one or more of the following measures:

(i) High school coursework.

(ii) High school grades.

(iii) High school grade point average.

(B) Colleges shall use evidence-based multiple measures for placing students into English-as-a-second-language (ESL) coursework. For those students placed into credit ESL coursework, their placement should maximize the probability that they will complete degree and transfer requirements in English within three years.

(C) Multiple measures shall apply in the placement of all students in such a manner so that either of the following may occur:

(i) Low performance on one measure may be offset by high performance on another measure.

(ii) The student can demonstrate preparedness and thus bypass remediation based on any one measure.

(D) When high school transcript data is difficult to obtain, logistically problematic to use, or not available, a community college district or community college may use self-reported high school information or guided placement, including self-placement for students.

(E) The board of governors may establish regulations governing the use of these and other measures, instruments, and placement models to ensure that the measures, instruments, and placement models selected by a community college demonstrate that they guide English and mathematics placements to achieve the goal of maximizing the probability that a student will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe and credit ESL students will complete transfer-level coursework in English within a timeframe of three years. The regulations should ensure that, for students who seek a goal other than transfer, and who are in certificate or degree programs with specific requirements that are not met with transfer-level coursework, a community college district or college maximizes the probability that a student will enter and complete the required college-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe.

(2) Notwithstanding Section 78218 or any other law, a community college district or college shall not require students to enroll in remedial English or mathematics coursework that lengthens their time to complete a degree unless placement research that includes consideration of high school grade point average and coursework shows that those students are highly unlikely to succeed in transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics. A community college district or college may require students to enroll in additional concurrent support, including additional language support for ESL students, during the same semester that they take a transfer-level English or mathematics course, but only if it is determined that the support will increase their likelihood of passing the transfer-level English or mathematics course. The community college district or college shall minimize the impact on student financial aid and unit requirements for the degree by exploring embedded support and low or noncredit support options.

(e) For purposes of this section, "assessment" means the process of gathering information about a student regarding the student's study skills, English language proficiency, computational skills, aptitudes, goals, learning skills, career aspirations, academic performance, and need for special services. Assessment methods may include, but not necessarily be limited to, interviews, standardized tests, attitude surveys, vocational or career aptitude and interest inventories, high school or postsecondary transcripts, specialized certificates or licenses, educational histories, and other measures of performance.

SEC. 3.

If the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE**

1102 Q STREET, SUITE 4400
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811-6549
(916) 322-4005
<http://www.cccco.edu>



DATE: March 22, 2018

TO: AB 705 Implementation Advisory Committee

FROM: Laura Hope
Executive Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Support

SUBJECT: ASSEMBLY BILL 705 INITIAL GUIDANCE LANGUAGE

In preparation for the implementation of Assembly Bill (AB) 705, please review the following guidance on the bill's intent and steps that colleges can take to begin to move toward compliance. The Chancellor's Office intends to incorporate these recommendations into a regulations package for consideration by the Board of Governors at a future date. To that end, colleges are strongly encouraged to begin the following:

- Planning for substantial increases in transfer-level offerings to accommodate many more students in transfer-level English and mathematics
- Developing and/or increasing support systems to accelerate skills development of increasing numbers of students who will be placed into transfer-level English and mathematics
- Discussing pedagogical implications resulting from these changes
- Activating the existing function in CCCApply to allow students to self-report their high school performance data

The Chancellor's Office has been working with the AB 705 Implementation Advisory Committee and the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP) research team to help interpret the standards of the bill and provide guidance to the field. Fundamentally, the bill mandates the use of high school performance data for assessment and placement, citing the predictive validity of that preparation for course success. Further, the bill notes that colleges must "maximize the probability that students will enter and complete transfer-level English and mathematics coursework in one year and that a student enrolled in ESL will enter and complete degree and transfer requirements in English within 3 years." The Chancellor's Office intends to propose regulations to the Board of Governors that would define the one-year time frame as two primary terms or three quarters (as applicable) for English and mathematics, and the three-year time frame as six primary terms or nine quarters (as applicable) as it relates to English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction.

Under AB 705, students can only be placed into remedial coursework (credit or noncredit courses that are part of a sequence) when they are “highly unlikely to succeed” in the transfer-level course and when placement into the remedial coursework increases the probability of completing transfer-level coursework relative to the probability of completion if the student were directly placed into transfer-level. Statewide MMAP data modeling suggests that when compared to the attrition of traditional sequences, students are more likely to succeed in transfer-level English and mathematics if they begin there. Compelling evidence from within California and nationally further suggests that students across all levels of preparation are more likely to complete transfer-level coursework when placed directly into it, especially when they experience appropriate support. Research to date also demonstrates that high school performance has meaningful predictive validity for assessment and placement.

As a result of careful review of data and the language of the law, the Chancellor’s Office believes that all students whose program of study requires transfer-level coursework, for whom transfer is the goal, with high school performance records within ten years of graduation, should be placed into transfer-level English. Further, AB 705 requires that students should be placed below transfer-level only if a college can demonstrate that students are highly unlikely to succeed in the transfer course, **and** they would be more likely to complete the transfer-level course successfully via the alternative path. The information and table below illustrate the evidence that informed the parameters outlined in this memo.

Table 1. Chancellor’s Office AB 705 Compliant Multiple Measures Decision Rules: Transfer-level English

High School Performance	Average Success Rate Students Enrolling Directly in Transfer-Level	One-Year Completion of Transfer-Level Students Enrolling One Level Below Transfer	AB 705-Compliant Placement
High School GPA \geq 2.6	80%	40%	Transfer-Level English Composition No change in level of support required
High School GPA 1.9-2.6	59%	22%	Transfer-Level English Composition Additional academic and co-requisite support should be considered to improve success rates
High School GPA $<$ 1.9	43%	12%	Transfer-Level English Composition Additional academic and co-requisite support should be provided to improve success rates

As shown in Table 1, direct placement into transfer-level English is estimated to double or triple completion of transfer-level English within one year. Thus, under the requirement that colleges use high school performance data to maximize the probability of transfer-level English completion within one year, students should not be denied direct access to the gateway transfer-level English composition course. Note that even students with low high school performance histories are still more likely to succeed when placed directly into transfer-level English than students who are placed only one level below.

The Chancellor's Office, in conjunction with the AB 705 Implementation Advisory Committee, has developed the following recommendations, built from the statewide [MMAAP Phase II rule set](#) and the broader analysis on which those placement recommendations were based on studies exploring [multiple measures decision trees](#) and [improving placement accuracy](#).

Clearly, with the incorporation of these changes into California Code of Regulations, title 5, colleges will be placing almost all of their students into transfer-level English courses, and many students will likely require additional support services in order to further improve their likelihood of success. Services may include but are not limited to academic support, English language acquisition support, time management and study skills training, affective development, financial planning, and accommodations as needed. Across the state, this has been accomplished in a variety of ways: co-requisite support courses; learning support centers; supplemental instruction; or a combination of these. Among these strategies, co-requisite support has been mostly widely studied in its capacity to amplify student success. Additionally, two bills are currently under review to make it possible for colleges to collect apportionment for tutoring in college-level courses. It is important to note research indicates that placement changes alone will not help maximize student success. Changes in instructional methodology and strong support infrastructure are also essential to optimize student achievement. Faculty who have been on the cutting edge of these reforms note that these elements are equally important for student success.

While this guidance is a first step for colleges to begin planning, other questions remain, and the Implementation Advisory Committee continues to sort through these issues. Some of those include questions around how to address the implications of AB 705 for ESL students, and a subcommittee is working on those answers. Questions also remain about the implementation for transfer-level math and statistics, and that guidance will be forthcoming this spring. Other concerns the committee is working to address include how to establish effective practices for returning students without transcript data such as self-reported data and guided self-placement, the fate of placement skills instruments, the need to revise CB-21 coding, and review graduation competency considerations. The Chancellor's Office intends to incorporate all guidance and recommendations issued by the Implementation Advisory Committee into a regulatory proposal for consideration by the Board of Governors at a future date.

To further clarify the importance of making these changes, it is also worthwhile to note that funding for both AB 19 and Guided Pathways are contingent upon compliance with AB 705, which is expected by fall of 2019 in accordance with the previously published timeline found on the [website](#).

Look for additional guidance in the next two months and for opportunities to learn from peers about how some of these changes have already been implemented at some colleges in the state. Plans to provide professional learning and research support are already underway with more details to come. Both the RP Group and the California Acceleration Project are hosting separate upcoming events, and the Chancellor's Office plans on hosting future events. Additionally, faculty will also be receiving a survey in order to map current and emerging practices and provide professional development in the future. Finally, the Chancellor's Office urges colleges to activate the function in CCCApply to allow students to self-report their GPA data so that colleges can begin to collect that information. In order to do so, please email John Hadad at jhadad@ccctechcenter.org. The Chancellor's Office is working on a high school data agreement to support the logistics, and self-reported data will be just one element of that effort.

This is going to be an iterative process that, despite its challenges, represents a significant step forward for building our students' capacity to achieve their goals and addressing many of the equity gaps that begin at the point of assessment and placement. Stay informed by checking the Chancellor's Office Assessment and Placement webpage.