

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHIEF INSTRUCTIONAL OFFICERS EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING**

Minutes

**Wednesday, January 24, 2007
9:00 am – 3:00 p.m.
Room 4000-01, Chancellor's Office
1102 Q Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-6511**

Present: Randy Lawson, Claire Biancalana, Wilma Owens, Ron Manzoni, Lori Gaskin, Jim Matthews, Michael Kasler, Barry Russell, Lori Gaskin, Leige Henderson, Pam Eddinger, Dave Bolt, Vice Chancellor Carol Bogue Feinour, Academic Senate VP Mark Wade. **Via CCCConfer:** Pam Deegan, Gari Browning, Ed Buckley, Allan Hoffman.

- I. **Call to Order**
By President Randy Lawson at 9:15 a.m

- II. **Agenda Additions and Modifications**
Addition of Report from TTEC (Attachment) **Barry Russell**

- III. **Consent Agenda**
 - a. **Minutes of November, 2006 Meeting (Attachment) – Alice Murillo**
 - b. **Treasurer's Report (Attachment) – Michael Kasler**
Conference proceeds (including some due payment): ~\$35,000
Conference expenses: ~\$20,000

Dues: Projected @ \$27,000, Current @ \$23,000. Additional checks to be deposited. Financial status is stable and healthy.
Treasurer's Report was accepted with a note that financial status is stable and healthy.

- IV. **President's Reports – Randy Lawson**
 - a. **November Consultation Council Meeting/December Consultation Council Teleconference**

 - b. **January Board of Governors Meeting**

 - c. **New Emergency Regulations for Enhanced Noncredit Funding (Attachment)**

The emergency regulations for enhanced non-credit funding (as part of SB361) emerged as the key issue at the November BOG meeting. DOF raised objections to the System Office's submission regarding sequencing of courses for certificates of completion and competency, and other issues such as high school program exclusion. The agenda item was pulled from this November meeting. The submission has since undergone revision.

SO is currently preparing applications for colleges on enhanced non-credit funding in compliance with BOG regulations approved in their January meeting. The application should be disseminated to the field within the next week.

Other items discussed: Pros and cons on crafting spot legislation to remediate SB361 in light of the lack of funding in the governor's budget for non-credit.

Directions for CIOs?

A number of colleges have begun to develop or bolster non-credit programs in anticipation of SB361 implementation and funding. With the funding falling through, a suggestion was made to host a workshop at the CIO/CSO Spring conference to address and clarify the impact of the unfavorable budget, the application process, and other related topics.

Other issues at Consultation Council: At the November meeting, faculty group sought clarification on the administration FON vis a vis AB1725. Clarified interpretation is: FON follows the rise and fall of FTES and restoration.

d. Governor's Budget:

Randy note that, in actual dollars, the current CC budget is 11% over Prop 98 level. It is a healthy budget, with 4% cola and 2% growth, CTE funding is again funded. There will likely be unhappiness from the K-12 sector since their funding is less robust in the Governor's budget proposal.

No other faculty initiatives were funded.

Key Points of Interest:

Expected funding of \$30mm for non-credit. Did not materialize.

Basic Skills Overcap. System Office proposal to permanently divert \$33mm not supported. An issue of timing and not able to show results for this year's work to validate and support need for funding. Funds diverted to other initiatives: \$14mm to matriculation. \$19.1mm to counseling/tutoring and student support program for workforce development area. Possible strategy to support the basic skills agenda: Requesting Student Services funds be tied to Basic Skills.

e. Basic Skills APG and Basic Skills Initiative Steering Committee –Pam DeeganSteering Meeting:

Pam noted the "Breathtaking" visionary work and outstanding collaboration that took place at this venue. High level of participation from faculty.

Mt. SAC oversaw the research/planning project, funded by a \$50,000 grant. The planning results will be presented at the March CIO/CSSO Conference, the Teaching Institute and the Curriculum Institute. CIOs were represented by Randy Lawson, John Nixon and Pam Deegan.

Key elements of the plan:

Changing pedagogy.

Self-assessment strategies (four-part process: description of practices, evidence of practices, barriers and limitations in teaching basic skills, how to advance best practices).

10 colleges to pilot self-assessment in March 07.

10 "teams of experts" to be trained as trainers late spring/summer 07. (Each team will have one CIO representative.)

Faculty professional development Fall 07.

The pilot work will be grant-funded and coordinated by Foothill College. Timeline has been modified (extended) from initial planning. Project is taking more time than first planned.

- f. **Memo on Basic Skills** (Attachment)
- g. **Selection of ten CIOs to participate on “teams of experts” for the Basic Skills Initiative professional development effort**

Randy asked that each regional chair nominate one CIO from his/her region to serve. No estimate of time commitment is available yet, but training and travel will be grant-supported.

Bob Gabriner (Center for Student Success) and John Nixon (Mt. Sac) are seeking 5 colleges (with varying profiles) to participate in piloting the basic skills self-assessment too. Volunteers are: St. Jacinto, Moorpark, Siskiyou, San Diego City, Mt. SAC, LA Southwest, and Diablo.

- h. **2006-2008 Priorities Suggestions from Membership** (Attachment)

Subcommittee established to further refine information presented in the attachment: Lori Gaskin, Mike Kasler, Ron Manzoni. Group will forward results to Randy and Claire for presentation the business meeting during the Spring Conference.

V. **Carter Doran Leadership Award**

Nominations are in. Exec Committee will review. Award presentation at the Spring Conference.

VI. **Executive Secretary Report – Claire Biancalana**

- a. **Membership** (Attachment)

85 members to date. Please review list and urge non-payers to step up.

VII. **Conference Reports**

- a. **2006 Fall Conference Report and Evaluation** (Attachment)

A very successful Fall conference, as evidenced by good evaluations and robust attendance.

- b. **2006 CCLC Conference Report – Randy Lawson and Pam Deegan**

CIOs played a prominent role and presented multiple on multiple topics. Sessions included: Basic Skills (full attendance), Administrator Retention and Recruitment (again a full house), Retreat rights and the Impact of 1725.

Randy urged members to attend future CCLC conference, citing the value of diverse perspectives presented at this venue, including that of trustees, chancellors, presidents, and faculty. A high visibility, high impact event; an advantageous venue for the CIO organization to have a central voice.

- c. 2007 Spring Joint Conference with CSSOs (March 21, 22, 23, Sir Francis Drake Hotel, San Francisco)

Program put together with CSSO. 40 CIO registrations to date.

Key speakers: John Roueche (Community College Leadership Program at the University of Texas, Austin), Bob Gabriner (Center for Student Success), two funders (The Hewlett Foundation, and one other), Ian Walton (Academic Senate President), Watson Scott Swale (Educational Policy Institute), Rocky Young (farewell appearance as LA Chancellor)

Breakouts:

Curriculum Updates (taking requests on topics....email Randy or Claire)

Negotiations

Non-credit

Other Sessions, Events of Interest

Honoring Retirees

Carter Doran Award

System Office Presentation

Mary Dowel from the Law Office of Leibert, Cassidy, and Whitmore

Thursday Night Reception

- d. **2007 Fall Conference**

October 30 – November 1 Monterey Beach Resort

- e. **Teacher Prep Pipeline Proposal**

System Office seeking CIO to volunteer to review applications. Contact Randy if interested.

VIII. Members' Reports and Issues

- a. **SACC Report** – *Lori Gaskin and Randy Lawson*

Retreat last week focused on revision of *Program and Course Approval Handbook*. Conducted a close reading and review, will integrate non-credit in the new edition. Completion in May, ready to be distributed by new fiscal year.

Key Discussions at SACC:

S.O. legal opinion of what constitutes a degree (18-unit core). Senate position – No support for transfer-oriented degree, reiterate 18-unit core of discipline and discipline-related courses. There is also some movement towards acknowledging terminal, non-transfer associate degrees that are not occupational in nature.

CRCC project: Deadline of phase 2 is Feb 2nd. Urge colleges to update and upload changes. Phase 3 starts mid-Feb.

SACC Subcommittee Title-5 Review with Ralph Black. Intention to open up curriculum and instruction areas in for review, and reorganization. Need to group like-items together for easy search and access. Questions and concerns from the field included: 1) Course repetition – credit and non-credit, 2) Withdrawal policy and limits.

Timeline: Revised regulations to BOG in May for July implementation. (Intent is to include all enhanced non-credit legislation in T-5 during this revision process.)

- b. **Academic Senate Curriculum Committee** 11/10 and 12/9 Report – *Pam Eddinger* (Attachment)
- c. **Proposed Title 5 Changes regarding Work Experience** – *Pam Eddinger* (Attachments)

Agreed with the change to allow flexibility in supervision and communication with students via alternative means as proposed.

Does not agree that academic unit requirements be detached completely from work experience. While there is no particular allegiance to the current Parallel and Alternative Program structure, the group suggested that there be some appropriate link between the subject matter of the academic units and the goal of the work experience.

- d. **TTAC (Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Committee) report:** *Barry Russell* (attachment)

BCP updates (connectivity to offsite center, disaster recovery, wireless campuses, e-curriculum submission)

Reconfiguration of committee structure: DETAC with dual reporting structure to TTAC and SACC to encourage synergy. Seeking one CIO representative to serve for the remainder of the Spring.

Other Items: Statewide 24/7 student help desk – current 10-college pilot with Prism; common course management system; CCCApply webpage review; CENIC – wireless backbone system used by public schools;

Events:

Online Teaching Conference at Ohlone College in June
Retreat in April – Tech III Plan

IX. Chancellor's Office Report – Vice Chancellor Carole Bogue-Feinour

a. SB 361 Update

Draft of instructions and criteria for application for SB361 non-credit enhanced funding. Will go live this week.

Consultation Council tomorrow: will present draft application and instructions; will engage in discussion regarding the advisability of spot legislation for SB361.

b. ESL/Basic Skills and the 07-08 budget

BCP for \$32mm did not make the Governor's budget. Increased lobbying efforts underway by the System Office: Will supply LAO and DOE information about current activities, impact on student population, and scale of implementation. Specific information being sent are: Gabriner's lit review and the assessment tool; data showing FTES for ESL/Math -- ¼ of the 400,000 in basic skills in non-credit; student demographics.

c. Strategy B2: Review of Literature and Best Practices Inquiry Tool with Foothill College

Ready for review. To be finalized by end of month. Hardcopies to be distributed to colleges. Assessment tool will take a few more weeks; will have 6 colleges pilot (see **IV, e** above).

d. Associate Degree Title 5 Changes

System Office will research catalogs for degrees that do not have an 18-unit core in order to assess the number of “general education” degree in currently in practice. Also will examine AA degrees that have an 18-unit focus, are non-transferable, and terminal. Will not research degrees modeled after IGETC or CSU Breadth – those will have to be fixed to accommodate definitions of 18-unit core. (see also **VIII, a** above)

X. Academic Senate Report – Mark Lieu 2:00 p.m.

Institutes:

Jan 5-6 Accreditation Institute, 100 participants (*Planned One-Day Student Learning Outcome workshop*)

Feb 16-18 Teaching Institute in San Francisco

March 8-10 Grant to sponsor Vocational Faculty Institute in Palm Springs

April 17-18 Basic Skills Training (same location as Plenary below)

April 19-21 Plenary Session in San Francisco

June 14-16 Leadership Institute in San Jose

July 12-14 Curriculum Institute in San Diego

Fall Plenary Session:

3 papers approved and going through final edits, will be posted.

1) Non-credit, 2) Minors on campus, 3) Establishing equivalencies.

Resolutions:

System revisit patterns available for apportionment in non-credit.

Edumetry: outsourcing of grading to India in distance education. Resolution opposing this type of arrangements.

Common assessment test: Encouraging colleges to use common assessment tools from other colleges with minor local modifications.

Odds and Ends:

Ad hoc subcommittee on non-credit

Associate degree task force – whitepaper on creating an associate degree with area of emphasis

New liaison to exec committee – supporting/representing the part-time faculty (CPFA)

XI. Budget Report – Fred Harris, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Policy

Unable to attend. See budget information as presented President’s Report

XII. Liaison Reports

a. ACCE – Lynda Lee

Plans for SF conference in Feb, focusing on the nuts and bolts of starting a new program, curriculum development, and writing a course of study.

b. CCL – Jim Matthews

Deans and Directors Meeting March 2nd in Sacramento. Topics: Tech III; library homepages and college homepages; sabbatical reports on blogs and assort electronic communications; 24/7 reference; annual data survey with analyst to interpret data.

Workshop in Ontario April 27. Topics: technology update, instructional design, CMS update.

Advisory committee meeting – concerns about information competency (Mark Lieu referenced Los Rios sabbatical on Information Competency.)

c. CCCAOE – Wilma Owens

Conference March 14, 15, 16 in Sacramento. Topics: Development and implementation of the state plan. Perkins mandate. Community College collaboration with WIBs.

Would like to explore possible conference collaboration with CIOs and/or CSSOs

XIII. Adjournment 2:30 P.M.

Next CCCCIO Executive Board Meeting is Wednesday, March 21, 2007

CIO Report

January 24, 2007

Submitted by Barry Russell

TTAC Meeting
Wednesday, November 15, 2006

Issues Discussed:

- CRCC – an update on the background of the process
- 2007-2008 BCP Update – a BCP is being developed the will respond to the following state-wide issues
 - Redundant circuits for colleges to improve connectivity
 - Connectivity to offsite centers
 - Online student services
 - Automated curriculum tracking and submission
 - Centralized GIS
 - Disaster recovery and security virtualization pilot
 - Wireless campus
 - System-hosted course management system (CMS)
 - Statewide 24 x 7 student and faculty help desk for CMS
 - Electronic library resources for vocational education
 - Staff development and system wide training

- Improved field communications
- Electronic transcripts
- CCCApply – update on the use of the system and system changes
- TTAC Retreat to Discuss Tech III Plan – April 25-26, 2006
- CENIC Update – discussion about how TTAC and CCCs could make a case of their inclusion in statewide programs funding infrastructure development
- Distance Education Update – there will be a restructuring of DETAC and TTAC and SACC; 2007 Online Teaching Conference is set for June 11-12, 2007 at Ohlone College in Fremont, CA
- Systemwide Architecture Committee – discussion of disaster recovery and other disaster situations

EMERGENCY REGULATIONS

Proposed Regulations Related to Enhanced Funding for Noncredit Programs

1. Section 55002 of article 1 of subchapter 1 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55002. Standards and Criteria for Courses and Classes.

(a) Associate Degree Credit Course. An associate degree credit course is a course which has been designated as appropriate to the associate degree in accordance with the requirements of section 55805.5, and which has been recommended by the college and/or district curriculum committee and approved by the district governing board as a collegiate course meeting the needs of the students eligible for admission.

(1) Curriculum Committee. The college and/or district curriculum committee recommending the course shall be established by the mutual agreement of the college and/or district administration and the academic senate. The committee shall be either a committee of the academic senate or a committee that includes faculty and is otherwise comprised in a way that is mutually agreeable to the college and/or district administration and the academic senate.

(2) Standards for Approval. The college and/or district curriculum committee shall recommend approval of the course for associate degree credit if it meets the following standards:

(A) Grading Policy. The course provides for measurement of student performance in terms of the stated course objectives and culminates in a formal, permanently recorded grade based upon uniform standards in accordance with section 55758. The grade is based on demonstrated proficiency in subject matter and the ability to demonstrate that proficiency, at least in part, by means of essays, or, in courses where the curriculum committee deems them to be appropriate, by problem solving exercises or skills demonstrations by students.

(B) Units. The course grants units of credit based upon a relationship specified by the governing board between the number of units assigned to the course and the number of lecture and/or laboratory hours or performance criteria specified in the course outline. The course also requires a minimum of three hours of work per week, including class time for each unit of credit, prorated for short-term, laboratory and activity courses.

(C) Intensity. The course treats subject matter with a scope and intensity that requires students to study independently outside of class time.

(D) Prerequisites and Corequisites. When the college and/or district curriculum committee determines, based on a review of the course outline of record, that a student would be highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade unless the student has knowledge or skills not taught in the course, then the course shall require prerequisites or corequisites that are established, reviewed, and applied in accordance with the requirements of article 2.5 (commencing with section 55200) of this subchapter.

(E) Basic Skills Requirements. If success in the course is dependent upon communication or computation skills, then the course shall require, consistent with the provisions of article 2.5 (commencing with section 55200) of this subchapter, as prerequisites or corequisites eligibility for enrollment in associate degree credit courses in English and/or mathematics, respectively.

(F) Difficulty. The course work calls for critical thinking and the understanding and application of concepts determined by the curriculum committee to be at college level.

(G) Level. The course requires learning skills and a vocabulary that the curriculum committee deems appropriate for a college course.

(3) Course Outline of Record. The course is described in a course outline of record that shall be maintained in the official college files and made available to each instructor. The course outline of record shall specify the unit value, scope, objectives, and content in terms of a specific body of knowledge. The course outline shall also specify types or provide examples of required reading and writing assignments, other outside-of-class assignments, instructional methodology, and methods of evaluation for determining whether the stated objectives have been met by students.

(4) Conduct of Course. Each section of the course is to be taught by a qualified instructor in accordance with a set of objectives and with other specifications defined in the course outline of record.

(5) Repetition. Repeated enrollment is allowed only in accordance with provisions of sections 51002, 55761-55763 and 58161.

(b) Nondegree Credit Course. A credit course designated by the governing board as not applicable to the associate degree is a course which, at a minimum, is recommended by the college and/or district curriculum committee (the committee described and established under subdivision (a)(1) of this section) and is approved by the district governing board and falls within one of the following categories.

(1) Types of Courses. Nondegree applicable credit courses are:

(A) precollegiate basic skills courses as defined in section 55502(d);

(B) courses designed to enable students to succeed in college-level work (including, but not limited to, college orientation and guidance courses, and discipline-specific preparatory courses such as biology, history, or electronics) that integrate basic skills instruction throughout and assign grades partly upon the demonstrated mastery of those skills;

(C) precollegiate occupational preparation courses designed to provide foundation skills for students preparing for entry into college-level occupational courses or programs;

(D) essential occupational instruction for which meeting the standards of section 55002(a) is neither necessary nor required.

(2) Standards for Approval. The college and/or district curriculum committee shall recommend approval of the course on the basis of the standards which follow. In order to be eligible for state apportionment, such courses must be approved (as courses not part of programs) by the Chancellor's Office as provided by section 55100.

(A) Grading Policy. The course provides for measurement of student performance in terms of the stated course objectives and culminates in a formal, permanently recorded grade based upon uniform standards in accordance with section 55758. The grade is based on demonstrated proficiency in the subject matter and the ability to demonstrate that proficiency, at least in part, by means of written expression that may include essays, or, in courses where the curriculum committee deems them to be appropriate, by problem solving exercises or skills demonstrations by students.

(B) Units. The course grants units of credit based upon a relationship specified by the governing board between the number of units assigned to the course and the number of lecture and/or laboratory hours or performance criteria specified in the course outline. The course requires a minimum of three hours of student work per week, per unit, including class time and/or demonstrated competency, for each unit of credit, prorated for short-term, laboratory, and activity courses.

(C) Intensity. The course provides instruction in critical thinking and generally treats subject matter with a scope and intensity that prepares students to study independently outside of class time and includes reading and writing assignments and homework. In particular, the assignments will be sufficiently rigorous that students completing each such course successfully will have acquired the skills necessary to successfully complete college-level work upon completion of the required sequence of such courses.

(D) Prerequisites and corequisites. When the college and/or district curriculum committee deems appropriate, the course may require prerequisites or corequisites for the course that are established, reviewed, and applied in accordance with article 2.5 (commencing with section 55200) of this subchapter.

(3) Course Outline of Record. The course is described in a course outline of record that shall be maintained in the official college files and made available to each instructor. The course outline of record shall specify the unit value, scope, objectives, and content in terms of a specific body of knowledge. The course outline shall also specify types or provide examples of required reading and

writing assignments, other outside-of-class assignments, instructional methodology, and methods of evaluation for determining whether the stated objectives have been met by students. Taken together, these course specifications shall be such as to typically enable any student who successfully completes all of the assigned work prescribed in the outline of record to successfully meet the course objectives.

(4) Conduct of Course. All sections of the course are to be taught by a qualified instructor in accordance with a set of objectives and with other specifications defined in the course outline of record.

(5) Repetition. Repeated enrollment is allowed only in accordance with provisions of sections 51002, 55761-55763 and 58161.

(c) Noncredit Course. A noncredit course is a course which, at a minimum, is recommended by the college and/or district curriculum committee (the committee described and established under subdivision (a)(1) of this section) and approved by the district governing board as a course meeting the needs of enrolled students.

(1) Standards for Approval. The college and/or district curriculum committee shall recommend approval of the course if the course treats subject matter and uses resource materials, teaching methods, and standards of attendance and achievement that the committee deems appropriate for the enrolled students. In order to be eligible for state apportionment, such courses ~~are limited to the categories of instruction listed in Education Code section 84757 and~~ must be approved by the Chancellor's Office pursuant to article 2.2 (commencing with section 55150) and satisfy the requirements of section 58160 and other applicable provisions of chapter 9 (commencing with section 58000) of this division.

(2) Course Outline of Record. The course is described in a course outline of record that shall be maintained in the official college files and made available to each instructor. The course outline of record shall specify the scope, objectives, contents, instructional methodology, and methods of evaluation for determining whether the stated objectives have been met.

(3) Conduct of Course. All sections of the course are to be taught by a qualified instructor in accordance with the set of objectives and other specifications defined in the course outline of record.

(d) Community Services Class. A community services class is a class that meets the following minimum requirements:

- (1) is approved by the local district governing board;
- (2) is designed for the physical, mental, moral, economic, or civic development of persons enrolled therein;
- (3) provides subject matter content, resource materials, and teaching methods which the district governing board deems appropriate for the enrolled students;
- (4) is conducted in accordance with a predetermined strategy or plan;
- (5) is open to all members of the community; and
- (6) may not be claimed for apportionment purposes.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700 and 70901, Education Code.
Reference: Section 70901, Education Code.

2. The heading for a new article 2.2 (commencing with existing section 55150) is added to subchapter 1 of chapter 6 division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations to read:

Article 2.2 Approval of Noncredit Courses and Programs

3. Section 55150 of article 2.2 of subchapter 1 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is amended to read:

§ 55150. Approval of Noncredit Courses and Programs.

(a) Courses or programs offered for noncredit shall be approved by the Chancellor in accordance with this article and section 55100 on forms provided by the Chancellor's Office.

(b) Course outlines for all noncredit courses shall be on file in the community college offering the course.

(c) Authorities of each community college maintaining noncredit courses shall keep such current records and reports as may be required by the Chancellor.

(d) In order to be eligible for enhanced funding pursuant to Education Code sections 84750.5 and 84760.5, a career development or college preparation noncredit course must be part of a program or sequence of courses approved by the Chancellor pursuant to section 55151.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700, ~~and~~ 70901, 78401 and 84760.5, Education Code. Reference: Sections 70901, 70902, ~~and~~ 78401, 84750.5 and 84760.5, Education Code.

4. Section 55151 is added to article 2.2 of subchapter 1 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations to read:

§ 55151. Career Development and College Preparation Noncredit Courses.

A noncredit course involving career development or college preparation will be eligible for enhanced funding pursuant to Education Code sections 84750.5 and 84760.5 if it satisfies the requirements set forth in subdivisions (a), (b) and (c) below.

(a) The course is approved by the college curriculum committee and the district governing board pursuant to subdivision (c) of section 55002 and by the Chancellor's Office pursuant to section 55150 and is part of either:

(1) A short-term vocational program which The Chancellor, in consultation with the Employment Development Department, has determined to have high employment potential. In making this determination, the Chancellor shall utilize job demand data provided by the Employment Development Department. If current job demand data in the relevant field is not available from the

Employment Development Department, the Chancellor and the Employment Development Department may rely upon other data submitted by the college.

(2) A sequence of courses involving:

(A) Courses in elementary and secondary basic skills;

(B) Workforce preparation courses in the basic skills of speaking, listening, reading, writing, mathematics, decision-making, and problem solving skills that are necessary to participate in job-specific technical training; or

(C) Courses in English as a second language and vocational English as a second language.

(b) The program or sequence of courses is designed to result in either:

(1) A noncredit certificate of completion leading to improved employability or job opportunities; or

(2) A noncredit certificate of competency in a recognized career field articulated with degree-applicable coursework, completion of an associate degree or transfer to a baccalaureate institution. A certificate of competency in a recognized career field may be articulated with degree-applicable coursework, an associate degree, or transfer to a baccalaureate institution by means of nondegree-applicable coursework which may be completed prior to or taken concurrently with degree-applicable or transferable coursework.

(c) Each program or sequence of courses must be submitted to and approved by the Chancellor. Each application for approval shall include a list of required courses to be included in the program or sequence of courses, course outlines for each course, and an explanation of how the program or sequence of courses is designed to lead students to one of the outcomes described in subdivision (b). For short-term vocational programs, the application shall also include an analysis of labor market need or job availability.

(d) The Chancellor shall develop forms and procedures for electronic submission of applications for approval.

(e) Notwithstanding section 55100, if the Chancellor approves a sequence of courses or a short-term vocational program pursuant to this section, the sequence of courses or program may not be subsequently modified by the inclusion of additional courses unless the course or courses to be added are of one of the types listed in subdivision (a) and have themselves been individually approved by the Chancellor pursuant to section 55150.

(f) Under no circumstances may a district separate an existing noncredit course which provides less than one hundred and ten (110) hours of instruction into two or more courses for the purpose of forming a sequence of courses to satisfy the requirements of this section.

(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent a particular student from taking additional degree-applicable coursework, pursuing an associate degree, or pursuing transfer to a baccalaureate institution in addition to or instead of seeking immediate employment.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700, 70901, 78401 and 84760.5, Education Code. Reference: Sections 70901, 70902, 78401, 84750.5 and 84760.5, Education Code.

5. Section 55151.5 is added to article 2.2 of subchapter 1 of chapter 6 of division 6 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations to read:

§ 55151.5. Additional Requirements.

(a) The purpose of the emergency regulations set forth in this article is to take the steps minimally necessary to implement Education Code sections 84750.5 and 84760.5 as expeditiously as possible for the 2006-07 fiscal year. It is the intent of the Board of Governors to adopt final regulations in May 2007 to establish requirements which will apply to noncredit courses and programs for future fiscal years. These final regulations may address, among other matters:

(1) Standards for approval of short-term vocational programs providing 288 hours or more of instruction;

(2) The development of policies on repetition of noncredit courses; and

(3) Other standards appropriate for noncredit courses and programs.

(b) In developing a proposed set of final regulations to address the matters described in subdivision (a), the Chancellor shall consult with the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges, the Chief Instructional Officers and other appropriate groups.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700, 70901, 78401 and 84760.5, Education Code. Reference: Sections 70901, 70902, 78401, 84750.5 and 84760.5, Education Code.

December 14, 2006

To: Chancellor Drummond and Vice Chancellors
From: Research and policy organizations supportive of the Basic Skills Initiative
Re: Recommendations for successful statewide BSI implementation

We commend the Chancellor's Office, the Board of Governors, the Academic Senate, and the many stakeholders within the system for their commitment to strengthening basic skills instruction, a critical factor in ensuring both access and success for California community college students. The vision behind this initiative is encouraging to many of us who have been working at and with colleges to strengthen basic skills. Because of that work, we are fully aware of the significant challenges involved in the deployment of this initiative, in particular the use of one-time funds to address a multi-year problem that requires the development of local capacity. Balancing the need for local flexibility against the goal of improving student outcomes to ensure continued state investment is another inherent challenge.

Most importantly, we are impressed by the imperative nature of this initiative: For our increasingly diverse population of students to succeed and for California's economy to prosper, the Basic Skills Initiative *must* succeed. Indeed, success in the initial year may be essential to ensuring sustained support by internal and external stakeholders, including state policymakers and others who seek evidence of effectiveness in addition to effort. We are hopeful that the more than \$60 million that we understand will be invested will build confidence within the system and from without that ultimately will help sustain successful efforts. With that long-term goal in mind, we appreciate the opportunity to have a discussion about how the initiative can be most effectively implemented and how our own projects can be partners in the effort.

We'd like to frame the conversation around the following points:

1) TIMELINE AND SUSTAINABILITY: The current timeline presents a challenge for maximizing the potential for college – and thus student – success. If this is to be the first year of a sustained effort, launching it properly will be critical to future success. Spending the first half of 2007 on dissemination of major findings as well as technical assistance to support colleges in conducting assessments and fleshing out plans will help ensure successful efforts. Paying special attention to the self-assessment, basic skills planning, and goal-setting process as well as preliminary implementation will be key to producing measurable change. To do so, we recommend that you consider developing a three-year strategy incorporating goals and targets, communicating that strategy to colleges, and encouraging college and district plans to aim for specific one-year improvements

while outlining longer-term plans that can be implemented should funding become available.

2) STUDENT OUTCOMES - EVIDENCE & EQUITY: Improving outcomes for students is clearly at the heart of the Basic Skills Initiative. Critical to improving outcomes is the use of evidence of student progress as feedback both for state-level decision-makers as well as for college-based practitioners seeking to understand how students learn most effectively. Because basic skills courses are a critical gateway to the full community college curriculum and better life opportunities, the stakes are especially high for underrepresented and low-income students, so disaggregating data is important for addressing equity gaps.

Many ongoing projects to support community colleges, including Strengthening Pre-Collegiate Education in Community Colleges, Equity for All, Campus Change Network, Student Support Partnership Integrating Resources and Education, and Cal-PASS have developed models to assist colleges in evidence-based inquiry. For the basic skills initiative, it would be important for such an analysis to look at the entire basic skills population, as well as students in specific programs, and to disaggregate students according to characteristics including race, ethnicity, and part/full-time status. Critical measures include completion of basic skills courses and success in subsequent collegiate-level coursework. We are confident that these ideas will echo the findings of the research phase as well as the goals of the technical assistance phase that will begin early next year. We believe this can be done most effectively if:

- colleges use a self-assessment tool to understand their current practices and outcomes in basic skills, establish benchmarks for student outcomes, and set measurable goals for increased student outcomes appropriate to their local context
- colleges disaggregate data by race and ethnicity as part of their ongoing self-assessment and have plans to achieve equity goals
- districts record in their MIS system individual student level data related to participation in basic skills interventions
- the system reports system-wide data on outcomes and lessons learned against clearly defined, consistent outcome benchmarks

3) EFFECTIVE PRACTICES AND INNOVATION: We are hopeful that the Initiative's investment in a research phase and a technical assistance arm can be leveraged so that district and college plans reflect principles of effective research-based practices. In keeping with the principle of evidence-based improvement, we recommend efforts to integrate that understanding into the design and operations of basic skills classroom instruction, curriculum design, and in the interaction of basic skills with other college functions, such as academic support services, institutional research, student services, financial aid,

and workforce development (where the advantage of contextualized learning is quite clear). The technical assistance may prove helpful in reaching this goal. Where colleges choose to test innovations that are not yet supported by evidence, the ongoing self-assessment process will be essential to guide the colleges in following student outcomes in order to determine whether to continue, improve, or abandon the experiment, whichever aligns with the goal of increased student success.

4) CAPACITY-BUILDING AND LOCAL KNOWLEDGE: Because colleges may differ in their capacity to rigorously assess their outcomes, another challenge will be ensuring that the technical assistance help equip those responsible for designing and delivering instruction with the support they need to assess their efforts and the capacity to continue the assessment. Collaboration across colleges is also important for developing local knowledge, and sharing expertise of better-resourced colleges with their neighbors. Our experience indicates that the initiative will benefit from encouraging regional collaboration, with technical assistance providers offering tools, guidance, and venues for educators to fully own, embrace, and lead the change process. Another important form of collaboration involves organizations based in California who have been working with colleges to develop strategies to improve basic skills instruction and institutional effectiveness. In sum, opportunities for capacity-building can be maximized by:

- providing strong models and tools that can be used statewide to address local contexts
- facilitating cross-college technical assistance and planning sessions
- involving outside experts as advisors to the initiative overall as well as the technical assistance arm and providing other opportunities for feedback from internal and outside stakeholders

5) POLICY CHANGE: It is important that the learning from the initiative include implications for regulatory and policy change with a focus on eliminating barriers to successful implementation of strategies known to be effective in improving student success. A thorough review by an outside expert of current legislative and regulatory requirements, including recommended changes, would aid in this process. We envision that there may be a combination of actual and perceived barriers, as in the case of the widespread confusion over the proper interpretation of the MALDEF litigation. In the case of perceived barriers, clarifying and communicating actual legal requirements would be important to ensure transparency and offer colleges maximum latitude within the constraints of current policies.

SUMMARY

We share these principles as partners in the effort to ensure that the Basic Skills Initiative will be a critical strategic lever for improving access and success in California Community Colleges. We hope to support the Basic Skills Initiative both as advisors and partners to the effort itself as well as advocates to external constituencies. Demonstrating effective use of the funds in the first year will be the best evidence for sustained support by the state legislature and Governor. Because it takes time for educational improvement to take hold, an important challenge in the first year will be to show policymakers rigor and commitment in measuring and demonstrating outcomes.

The broad themes contained in this memo first surfaced in conversations at the Hewlett Foundation's Symposium on Strengthening California Community Colleges. They were subsequently refined in two follow-up conference calls and a series of email exchanges. As we are confident that they align with your own vision for the Basic Skills Initiative, we look forward to a productive conversation with you about ways of making the initiative as successful as possible and how we can be helpful in that effort. On the following page you can see a list of individuals who participated in one or more steps of the discussions that helped inform this memo.

PARTICIPANTS

Though there has been no official process for signing this document, those participating in this discussion, either at the Hewlett meeting or in subsequent conference calls that led to this summary memo, include the following (the names listed below do not imply endorsement of one or all of the elements of the memo, they are included only to show the range of interest and participation in the dialogue):

Rose Asera, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
 Estela Bensimon, University of Southern California-Center for Urban Education
 Andrea Bueschel, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
 Dona Boatright, Acting Vice President, Mission College
 Pamela Burdman, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
 Linda Collins, Career Ladders Project
 Marcia Cosgrove, Campaign for College Opportunity
 Bob Gabriner, City College of San Francisco, Research & Planning Group
 Bruce Hamlett, Assembly Higher Education Committee
 Barbara Illowsky, DeAnza College, Academic Senate
 Mark Wade Lieu, Academic Senate
 Ruben Lizardo, California Tomorrow
 David Longanecker, Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education
 Rock Pfothauer, Cabrillo College
 Nancy Shulock, Sacramento State Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy
 Abdi Soltani, Campaign for College Opportunity
 Bob Shireman, Institute for College Access and Success
 John Spevak, Merced College
 Andrea Venezia, WestEd

We also consulted with Steve Boilard and Paul Steenhausen at the LAO.

**Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Meeting:
A Summary Report for the CCCIO Board**

Submitted by Pam Eddinger
November 10, 2006

Venue and Attendees:

November 10, 2006
8:00 am to 10:00 am
CCCConfer

Mark Wade Lieu, Chair; Pat Mosteller (SDCCD Continuing Education), Karen Kunimura (Sacramento City), Pam Eddinger (CIO), Kathy O'Connor (SBCC). Absent: Sid Burks (Chaffey),

Key Agenda and Discussion Items:

- Emergency Regulations for SB361 to BOG 11/13.
Mainly addresses funding; System Office interested in addressing additional issues, including repeatability, attendance accounting methods and other Non-Credit quality issues in the Spring (by March for May BOG meeting).
- General Curricular Review in SACC: Title 5: Chapter 6, Sections 55100 to 55809, and 55150.5 non-credit
- To be address in Dec ASCCC meeting: Clarification of associate degree applicability of courses in 55805.5
- To be address in Dec or future ASCCC meeting this year: Removal of repeatability restriction language for ESL
- Curriculum Website: offering information on various curriculum software currently in use in CA.
Lead: K. O'Connor and P. Eddinger
- Revision of ASCCC papers: *Components of a Model Course Outline* and *Stylistic Considerations*
- Discussion of ASCCC Resolution regarding compressed courses and Curriculum Committee review:
P. Eddinger outlined the various concerns voiced at the CIO Conference regarding this resolution
- 4-year-Old Issue of Not-for-Credit course offering duplicating Credit offerings: M. Lieu to investigate whether this is still a concern, or if it is a localized problem
- Curriculum Institute planning: key breakout sessions identified

Dates of Interest:

- Future Curriculum Committee Meetings
 - Dec 8 (Chaffey College)
 - Feb 2 (Sacramento)
 - May 4 (San Diego City College)
 - Accreditation Institute: Jan 5-6, 2007 San Francisco Westin
 - Teaching Institute: Feb 16-18, 2007 San Francisco
 - Vocational/Leadership Institute: Palm Springs Hotel Zoso
 - Leadership Institute: Jun 14-16, 2007 Hays San Jose
 - Curriculum Institute: Jul 12-14, 2007 San Diego Coronado Bay Resort

Submitted by Pam Eddinger
January 5, 2007

Venue and Attendees:

December 9, 2006
 10:00 am to 3:00 pm
 Chaffey College

Mark Wade Lieu (chair), Sid Burks, Janet Fulks, Karen Kunimura, Pat Mosteller, Kathy O'Connor (CCCConfer), Pam Eddinger (CIO Representative)

Dates of Interest:

- Future Curriculum Committee Meetings
 - Jan 19 (CCCConfer)
 - Feb 2 (Sacramento)
 - May 4 (San Diego City College)
 - Teaching Institute: Feb 16-18, 2007 San Francisco
 - Vocational/Leadership Institute: Palm Springs Hotel Zoso
 - Leadership Institute: Jun 14-16, 2007 Hays San Jose
 - Curriculum Institute: Jul 12-14, 2007 San Diego Coronado Bay Resort

Items of Note:

- SACC Title 5 Review - update given by Mark Lieu. Note the aggressive timeline for the proposed work, outlined in the attached draft minutes by Chair M. Lieu
- Curriculum Institute planning - this took up most of the meeting. Key sessions:
 - SACC Training: Tutoring/ Supplemental Instruction, Stand Alone Approval, Non-credit
 - Basic Skills
 - System Office Structure/Function/Personnel
 - Mock Curriculum Meeting for New Chairs
 - Review of Goals from Fall 2006 -- Please review this section of Chair Lieu's notes. Some key resolutions pending are:
 - 9.01 Academic Integrity in Courses Offered in Shortened Time Frames
 - 9.03 Reaffirm the Need for Information Competency
 - 11.02 High Instructional Standards in all Instructional Modalities
 - 14.01 Minimum Grade Requirement for Associate Degree Courses
 - 18.03 Honoring the Assessment Scores of Other Community Colleges

Attachment:

Unapproved Meeting Minutes (and goals) of the ASCCC, as drafted by Chair Mark Wade Lieu.

ASCCC Curriculum Committee
 Friday, December 8, 2006 – 10:00a to 3:00p
 Chaffey College
DRAFT Meeting Notes

Participants: Mark Wade Lieu (chair), Sid Burks, Janet Fulks, Karen Kunimura, Pat Mosteller, Kathy O'Connor (CCCConfer), Pam Eddinger (CIO Representative)

Thanks to Sid and Chaffey College for hosting today's meeting.

SACC Title 5 Review

Mark updated the committee on the current review of curricular sections of Title 5 being conducted by SACC. The timeline is very aggressive because Ralph Black wants to coordinate the revision with the permanent Title 5 language needed for SB361. Ralph's hope is to have the draft language completed by April for the May BOG meeting, with final approval by the BOG in July. Concern was expressed by several committee members about the lack of time for input from the field on such an important matter.

**There should be a breakout on these proposed changes at the 2007 Spring Plenary.

**Members are encouraged to forward to Mark concerns and suggestions for the Title 5 revisions. **Pat will email Mark the sections of Title 5 related to distance education and noncredit for consideration in the review process.

CMS Information for web site

Kathy contacted George Tamas and obtained information regarding colleges using Curricunet and the pricing structure. Pam will contact CMSi. **Mark will look into a possible product called WebCMS. Sid is in charge of reviewing homegrown efforts; these include Socrates (Los Rios), the system at Modesto (developed while Bill Scroggins was interim president), and Fiesta (which Karen believes is used at either Cabrillo or DeAnza). Kathy, Pam, and Sid will coordinate this, gathering information on each system, contact information, and developing a rubric of features which will allow for some comparison across the systems.

Not-for-credit survey

**Mark has not done anything with this yet, but he will.

Curriculum Institute 2007 Planning

Title/Theme: Curriculum Toolkit: Building Better Instruction

Binder contents: keep specific institute information, evidence toolkit (essentially Title 5, Education Code, and legal opinions/advisories – to be renamed), and curriculum course and program approval handbook; no need to include senate papers since available on website – will reduce binder to more manageable size; **Mark to talk to Julie about possibility of providing all the documentation, including papers, on a USB flash drive – maybe with senate logo?

General Program Schedule: vary length of breakout sessions to accommodate different levels of discussion; some more informative, some more interactive; no speakers during meals; role of committee members: facilitators – need to control presentations and Q&A; be ready to infuse noncredit perspective if not done by presenter – may also be presenters; given number of attendees last year, plan for five breakouts per slot instead of four - **Mark will check on this with Julie; **Mark will check with Julie about the idea of publishers tables who can provide curriculum resources – maybe sponsor a reception? Is this allowed under our grant? **Mark will check with Julie about budget for tchotchkes and speakers; **Mark will check with Julie if okay to ask hotel for complementary nights for possible raffle

- Thursday: opening general session – perhaps the review of proposed changes to Title 5, handbook, new forms – something very practical; preface with inspirational philosophy emphasizing the critical role of curriculum and the essential role of faculty in curriculum; one breakout session; conclude day with second general session – maybe for basic skills initiative?
- Friday: two-hour breakout session, followed by general session (maybe SACC and Stephanie Low to discuss the System Office and its relationship to local curriculum committees), followed by lunch; afternoon breakout session length undefined
- Saturday: two breakout sessions followed by closing (handout USB flash drives as incentive to stay?) – length undefined

Breakout Ideas

- Thursday: things that curriculum chairs need to know – relationship with senates, interaction with administrators, TOP codes, SAM codes, role of consortiums, Carnegie unit calculation, acronyms (LDTP, C-ID, IMPAC, IGETC, SciGETC, SACC)
- Curriculum software: two-hour session; **Mark to find out if @ONE can provide mobile computer lab again; invite Curricunet and CMSi to allow participants to run through each program to see differences – one hour each
- How to develop noncredit courses/programs
- Intersegmental issues, including working with four-years, high schools, and SB70 efforts
- Developing and assessing SLOS: two-hour session; Sid and Janet may have ideas from student services conference; draw on presentations at accreditation institute
- The five models of attendance accounting and which one to use when
- Distance Education Issues: two-hour session; includes guidelines and separate review
- Mock Curriculum Committee: two-hour session; maybe repeat; two versions – basic and advanced (triage); limit number to sit around table to act as curriculum committee with remainder as audience; provide simplified course outlines to focus on different issues such as repeatability, VERY compressed timeframe review, interdisciplinary discipline and the effect on minimum qualifications,
- Pre-requisites, co-requisites, and advisories – what are they and the role they play
- Accessibility Issues: how to do it, not just philosophy
- Transfer and ASSIST
- SACC training sessions
 - Tutoring and supplemental instruction
 - Standalone course approval
 - Noncredit
- Follow-up breakouts for basic skills initiative - **Mark to ask Julie and Ian about needs to support initiative
- Changes in Changes in the Associate Degree (requirements, IGETC/CSUGE, GPA, titles); **should also be at Spring Plenary Session
- Maybe FAQ session on Saturday, with questions in binder and answers in session

- Types of courses – which type to use when and where: credit, non-degree applicable credit, noncredit, community service; interaction with MIS

Components of a Model Course Outline of Record and Stylistic Considerations in Writing Course Outlines of Record Breakouts

The members gave Mark feedback on a first draft of an outline; **Mark will cobble together an initial draft for members to begin to flesh out

New Committee Goals from Fall 2006 Resolutions

The members reviewed resolutions assigned to the committee and discussed possible ways to address them.

- **4.02 Advanced Placement (AP) Credit Policies:** seems very localized – not even consistent between departments; may not be feasible
- **4.04 Transfer Curriculum Preparation:** since this is requesting a Title 5 change, **Mark will bring this forward to SACC as part of the Title 5 review underway
- **9.01 Academic Integrity in Courses Offered in Shortened Time Frames:** this concept will be incorporated into the revised Model Course Outline paper
- **9.02 Eliminate the word “Transfer” in Degree Titles:** contact curriculum chairs and senate presidents to encourage this practice; already shared with System Office
- **9.03 Reaffirm the Need for Information Competency:** would need to do survey of colleges; members also want to know HOW the requirement is being fulfilled, whether through components in a variety of courses or through a single course or through both methods
- **9.10 Student Record Currency:** currency requirements vary between fields; also impacted by catalog rights; unclear at this point how best to address this topic
- **11.02 High Instructional Standards in all Instructional Modalities:** this will be partly addressed by incorporation of broader applicability of DE review in revised Model Course Outline paper
- **14.01 Minimum Grade Requirement for Associate Degree Courses:** Mark has shared this with the System Office and it is being considered in tandem with the Title 5 review
- **18.03 Honoring the Assessment Scores of Other Community Colleges:** members questioned the feasibility of this given that colleges within districts do not honor each others scores; different situations involved including when colleges use the same tests and when they don’t, and the variability of cut scores; the committee will discuss this further at a future meeting

Next Meetings:

- CCCConfer: Friday, January 19, 2007, 1:00 to 3:00p
- In-Person: Friday, February 2, 2007 – ASCCC Office, Sacramento, 10:00a to 3:00p

INTRODUCTION TO PROPOSED TITLE 5 CHANGES

What follows are suggested changes to pertinent sections of Title V that, in the best judgment of the members of the Southern California Consortium of Tri-Regional Cooperative Work Experience Educators and the Chancellor’s Statewide Advisory Committee for Work-Based Learning and Employment Services, inhibit the full participation of students and employers in Cooperative Work Experience Education programs. It is significant to note that there will be neither system-wide nor district costs associated with implementing the proposed changes.

Inherent in the mission of the California community colleges is “to advance California’s economic growth and global competitiveness through education, training, and services that contribute to continuous workforce improvement” (www.cccco.edu). The above-referenced members of the Tri-Regional Consortium and the Statewide Advisory Committee who have reviewed sections 55250-55257, 58051, and 53416 agree that the current regulations do not effectively allow the California Community Colleges to meet this important aspect of our mission.

NOTE: The development and approval of a district plan for Cooperative Work Experience Education (CWEE) is mandated by Title V and remains of critical importance in administering and operating effective CWEE programs throughout the state. Each community college district’s CWEE Coordinator and Governing Board may, at their discretion, develop and impose stricter policies and procedures than are herein proposed and described.

Introduction

The changes recommended in this proposal will achieve the following outcomes:

- remove barriers to student access and student success,
- improve the retention of participating students by allowing them to maintain enrollment in their CWEE course, regardless of the number of units in which they are enrolled,
- allow students flexibility in choosing the most appropriate method of course delivery,
- involve students in real life situations and with educational experiences unobtainable in a classroom setting
- allow students flexibility in gaining meaningful applied education work experience opportunities,
- provide pathways for students to combine work and education,
- provide students the opportunity to acquire job skills and create an employment history,
- enable students to achieve their education and career goals,
- provide linkages between academic and career fields,
- provide instruction using twenty-first century pedagogical methodologies.

Ultimately, the recommendations that follow will improve the quality of the educational experience for both the cooperative work experience education students and the community colleges' employer-partners.

Today's college students demand flexibility. Daniel Yankelovich, author of "Ferment and Change: Higher Education in 2015" (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 11/25/05) and founder of Viewpoint Learning Inc., a company that develops specialized dialogues to resolve gridlocked public-policy issues, advises that today's college students are "stretching out their education. Three quarters of today's college students are nontraditional in some way ... Many are already working, and more than a quarter are parents. We are rapidly moving away from the rigid sequencing and separation of schooling and jobs toward a new pattern in which higher education spreads out over about a 12-year period and is more closely integrated with work."

Our working students face numerous demands on their time: the demands of their coursework, of their jobs and of meeting their CWEE learning objectives on their jobs, of their families, and of their communities. A primary reason students enroll in CWEE courses is because CWEE courses offer students the opportunity to earn college credit on their own time on their own terms.

It is incumbent upon the California community colleges to increase opportunities for students to learn in a variety of contexts through a variety of instructional methodologies. Adopting the following two recommendations will achieve greater flexibility by removing barriers for student enrollment and increased opportunities for employer participation.

Recommendation 1: Eliminate the Parallel and Alternate Formats

First, we propose eliminating the distinction between the two formats of parallel and alternate. These distinctions force students to decide whether they will enroll in seven or more units (including CWEE in the parallel format) or whether they will enroll in no more than one additional course (in the alternate format).

Among the limitations of the parallel format is the required withdrawal from CWEE if a student's total units fall below seven. Students experiencing difficulty in classes other than CWEE who withdraw from those courses are forced also to withdraw from CWEE, when their total course load falls below the required seven units. Students who are in this situation frequently find that the CWEE course is the only one in which they are experiencing success, earning a passing grade, and gaining a sense of competence and mastery. Forcing a student to withdraw from a course in which he or she is experiencing success is antithetical to student development and achievement. Requiring students to also withdraw from CWEE can and has led students also to withdraw from college. The parallel format inhibits and sometimes prohibits student success.

An additional restriction presented by the parallel format is the requirement that students enrolled in CWEE must also be enrolled in other courses. Aside from a CWEE course

offered in the current parallel format, there is no other community college course that requires a student to also be enrolled in a course from any other discipline, related or unrelated. It would be unthinkable to prohibit a student majoring in psychology, for example, from enrolling in Introduction to Psychology (or any subject) without also enrolling in an additional course or in additional units. Yet, this is the requirement we force upon CWEE students.

It has been suggested that the parallel format was developed to assure the academic progress of CWEE students. Academic progress by CWEE students is assured by the development and timely completion of their learning objectives, by the assignment of grades by their faculty members, and by restrictions on re-enrollment. There is no rationale for requiring a student to declare enrollment in the parallel format and to comply with its pedagogically unsound restrictions.

The alternate format is not only also restrictive, but also it inhibits students' academic progress. Community colleges promote student participation in coursework; through the completion of coursework students achieve their academic and career goals. Yet, the alternate format promotes non-participation in coursework. It restricts students' enrollment to only one or two courses per semester. Today's college students are achievement-oriented multi-taskers. If a student can complete a full course load and participate in CWEE successfully, Title V should not retard that students' progress by imposing participation in the alternate format of CWEE – a format that encourages students to interrupt their academic progress.

Perhaps at the time it was developed, in the early twentieth century, the alternate format provided students with an opportunity to apply their newly acquired skills to earn funds for college between semesters. As Yankelovich tells us, college students no longer make these distinctions between their working and academic lives. Yankelovich states that today's knowledge economy informs us that distinctions between education and the workplace "are artificial and inefficient." So, too, are the distinctions between alternate and parallel. It is time to eliminate them. Students should be allowed to enroll in CWEE and to work either concurrently or alternately as their individual circumstances allow. The antiquated distinction between the two formats serves neither the twenty-first century student nor the twenty-first century employer.

Recommendation 2: Personal On-Site Consultation Strongly Preferred, not Mandated

This is the digital age. Not only has our student population changed, but so have our methods of course delivery. There is a reason the courses most in demand on college campuses are the online courses: they offer students the flexibility of learning outside the traditional classroom. CWEE courses are in demand because they offer students the flexibility of learning outside the traditional classroom.

Not only are our students changing the way they achieve their educational goals, so too are our employers changing the way they achieve their organizational goals. Many of today's employers offer employees the opportunity to work remotely; they hire

consultants they've never met who frequently live in cities and states far from where the company is located.

Current Title V regulations do not consider the growing numbers of students demanding online instruction, nor do they reward our entrepreneurial and consulting students who may not work in a traditional corporate environment. To deny our most dedicated, independent, and creative students the opportunity to take advantage of distance education opportunities in CWEE when these opportunities are available in every other discipline at our community colleges is more than a disservice. It is evidence that the CWEE program, designed to be responsive to workforce development, is in this regard being unresponsive to its students and the companies at which they work.

Recommended Language Changes

The document that follows recommends changes to CA ADC subsections: 55252, 55253, 55254, 55255, 55256, and 55257. We thank you for your serious consideration of them.

