
Members Absent: Tracy Rickman, Rudy Rios, Shelly Spencer, Irma Valdivia, George Wheeler

Ad hoc members present: Elizabeth Ramirez

GUESTS: Kevin Smith

I. Call to Order: 1:03 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes: March 19, 2019 approved with minor corrections

III. Public Comment – No public comment

IV. President’s Report
   A. Senator Homework Reminder: All current senators should study the new AP 7211 document and garner feedback from their respective divisions and bring back any recommendations to senate by the April 16th meeting (see Addendum A and Addendum B, along with Bean’s email on March 22 for additional background info, Title V, Ed Code, and other definitions).
      a) Bean provided 2017 handbook of minimum qualifications and disciplines. (http://www.californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Reports/2017-Minimum-Qualifications-Handbook-r1-ADA.pdf), Bean did a demonstration of how to read the document and what we are legally required to do for equivalency which includes having a process in the books. We have a Board Policy (BP) but we don’t have an Administrative Procedure (AP). Our former HR director Emerson and Bethel started the process, but did not finalize anything. When issues were brought up again, Bean realized the importance of having a process in place especially with accreditation coming soon.
      b) Bean passed out a survey to senators to collect data on familiarity with terms. Asked senators to mark the box next to terms that senators are not familiar with so that she understands where everyone is at in terms of knowledge and so she can do a better job of educating everyone. This survey was anonymous.
      c) Standard 3 of accreditation clearly asks for an HR process and it is the senate’s purview to look at equivalencies and to be compliant.
      d) Disciplines are established at the state level in conjunction with ASCCC, so when a new discipline needs to be added, it goes through the plenary process. A faculty member from AJ asked about adding Homeland Security to
the Disciplines/Minimum Qualifications Handbook, and it will be going to a vote for approval at the ASCCC spring plenary.

e) Bean provided the example of RHC having a division called communications and languages but on the disciplines list, there is no discipline called communications and languages. It is a division at RHC, but not a discipline per ASCCC/CCCCO Disciplines/Minimum Qualifications Handbook.

f) When we are aligning courses to disciplines, we are not assigning them to divisions, we are assigning them to a discipline from the Minimum Qualifications Handbook. Check to see what disciplines are in your discipline, not in your division. For example, English is assigned to the English discipline, not the division on our campus.

g) The Math, Science and Engineering division is the first to submit the form to assign courses to disciplines and will be on the curriculum agenda for the meeting tomorrow. Bean will consult with Pilati to check if there is a deadline to submit the form to curriculum and get back to senate. Lynch was under the impression that this is to be done every time your course needs to be revised, this will be clarified with Pilati.

h) On the plenary website for spring, there is a PowerPoint from legal council that has to do with hiring, compliance, and minimum qualifications. Bean will provide that PowerPoint information. Bean shared that senators should not complain if they did not read the documents she has sent and instead decided to hit the delete button. Bean informed senators that if they are not willing to do the work to represent their division, they should reconsider their position. Liu asked for recommendations on how she should present this to her division.

i) Bean shared that she is baffled when this body charges a committee or taskforce with something but then does not take the recommendations from that group. Your charge as a senator is to take all the information you know about min qualifications, educate your division and get feedback. Lynch shared that in order for them to be be able to get sensible feedback, they need a clean copy for the AP because the copy provided has notations that are internal from the taskforce. Lynch shared that the notated copy is not easy to read. It is the responsibility of this body to ask questions and believes it is fair not to take recommendations that may be muddy. Bean clarified that she is not asking for a rubberstamp and affirmed that questions are always good. Bean is comfortable sharing the clean copy and the draft. The initial language came from a previous HR recommendation, senate exec recommendations are in purple. Lynch would like the word DRAFT on the clean document. Cummings brought up the legality about the statement regarding pre-determined language and if we were doing something illegal by removing what is already there. Erin posed clarification about the items that needed to go back to the divisions first, what are equivalencies?, and 2nd is who is considered equivalent? Bean clarified that the AP is about the equivalency process. It is up to the discipline faculty to decide who is equivalent through the application process (Discipline Equivalency Committee in AP 7211) and what that equivalency is.
We are only talking about AP 7211 to make sure we are in compliance if ACCJC happens to review this standard. Feedback should be about looking at the actual process because that is what came from the taskforce. They looked at what other schools did and spent a lot of time researching.

j) Montiel asked if April 16 is a hard and fast deadline or if it could be pushed back to May because the Math, Science and Engineering division will not be meeting this month. Bethel shared this will take more than one meeting. Bean asked for approval of the senate to add this as a new business item.

k) Lynch clarified that what was voted down was to simply urge human resources to remove the Rio Hondo Community College District Master List of MQ's and Equivalencies from the college website.

B. Equivalency Taskforce Update – Meeting April 4th in the small boardroom at 2:15pm. All are welcome and encouraged to ask detailed questions. Bean offered to create a zoom call so that more faculty can participate this Thursday. Lynch urged that those who are concerned should consider showing up.

C. Bylaws/Constitution Taskforce Update - Pichardo-Diaz shared that the taskforce met and reviewed a running list of items that have come up in the last couple of years. The taskforce has divided the items between the members to research best practices and bring back their HW to discuss and adopt language. Next meeting will be April 30th.

D. Board of Governors Applications—All materials must be received by the Academic Senate Office by 11:59 p.m. on, June 30, 2019: https://www.judgify.me/cccboardofgovernorsnominations2019

   a) Wetsman asked if this request is to be a member of the CCC board of governors? There is another seat open and Bean is encouraging all faculty to review and consider applying. Dejean clarified that this is to encourage faculty to nominate.

V. Vice Presidents’ Reports
A. 1st Vice President -
   a) More information with May revise, biggest thing is slight updates to the funding formula. April, May and June is when there are more updates and changes. Undocumented students are unable to apply for apprenticeship programs since they do not have social security numbers. A bill sponsored by Assembly member José Medina (a former community college professor) would allow them to use an individual taxpayer identification number to be part of an apprentice program. Lynch asked what the changes are for the funding formula, Wetsman shared that it is unknown at the moment. Senate has been pushing to equalize ADTs and local degree funding. Bean shared that she believes this is an important time when faculty need to use their voice and that the best way to get the details on that is the John Stanskas’s presidential update on leveling the points for degrees, keeping the performance matrix at 10%, and only highest achievement once per year per student-see March Newsletter at http://createsend.com/t/y-1A9E4BCCBD501913 . Bean shared that they’re expecting a giant shortfall in property taxes which in turn can affect districts, but won’t know until the May revise. Bean explained that there are often
surveys through ASCCC and we have leverage right now, so she asked that you fill out surveys because our voices do matter.

B. 2nd Vice President -
   a) Graduation will be on May 23rd at 530pm
   b) This Friday April 5th is the last day to petition for associate degrees, there are labs in LR 130, please refer students
   c) Maggie has been sharing information on activities going on such as RioOlympics. Heard that there will only be lip singing, so will not ask for participants.

VI. Unfinished Business
A. Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) Major Course Substitutions
   Executive Motion: To expand ADT major course substitutions for course other than the required courses that are permissible by the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) with internal courses to increase the number of students who receive the transfer guarantee to a California State University (CSU) campus.
   Rationale:
   a) Ensures that all students, who by the TMC are eligible for an ADT, would be guaranteed admission to a CSU campus
   b) Increases transfer admission rates at a time when impaction is growing in our local CSUs
   c) Allows students to follow a common set of major preparation instead of being evaluated for admission using different campus specific major criteria (i.e., CSULA, CSULB)
      a. Ramirez presented updated language that was updated by Pilati to read as follows: To expand ADT major courses substitutions FOR COURSES OTHER THAN THE REQUIRED COURSES that are permissible by the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) with internal courses to increase the number of students who receive the transfer guarantee to a California State University (CSU) campus.
      b. Smith expressed that this will be different for every major in the different disciplines and encouraged faculty to look at their respective degrees. Curington clarified that previous discussions highlighted that this motion will impact few students at the end of their time at RHC, Ramirez confirmed that this is true.
      c. Huinquez asked everyone to consider that not completing the ADT could hold a student back from transferring and that this motion will impact few students that may be scrambling last minute to complete their degree and transfer.
      d. Dejean agreed with Huinquez and shared his experience working with evening students who have limited access to courses and often have to go to other community colleges to complete their degrees.
e. Wetsman would like to make a substitute motion, to expand ADT major courses substitutions FOR COURSES OTHER THAN THE REQUIRED COURSES that are permissible by the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) with internal courses to increase the number of students who receive the transfer guarantee to a California State University (CSU) campus. Rhodes 2nd the motion

1. Motion to amend executive motion passes unanimously

f. Lieu asked if she could have some time to go back to her faculty who will be impacted by this motion, Lynch agreed with Liu.

g. Wetsman asked if we can have a better motion on the table and then we can bring it back to our divisions.

h. Motion to postpone discussion item 6A to the last meeting in May to allow senators more time to confer with their division by Lynch, no second; motion died.

i. Dejean asked if historically the last meeting of the spring semester has been canceled? Lieu questioned why it has to be at the last meeting? Cummings shared that her division meeting will not be until May.

j. Motion for a friendly amendment by Lynch to discuss this in August or September to allow time for senators to confer with colleagues, 2nd by Wetsman.

i. Motion passes unanimously

B. Student Non-Participation

a) Cummings shared that she has noticed students not participating in class and is concerned that they are taking up a seat of a student that may need the class. She has heard students say they need class for athletic eligibility or financial aid. Wants to know if other faculty are experiencing something similar. Cummings is concerned because she is turning away students who want the class for students who have priority registration and are doing it without any intention of completing the class. Wetsman shared that there are students that show up but don’t do any work at all. This needs to be explored with a taskforce who can look at title 5 and ed code.

b) O’Brien shared that it is difficult to discern and that there is a natural consequence with financial aid. O’Brien asked that we be careful because there are already a lot of natural consequences. Lynch shared that at least students are being honest about it. Rhodes suggested that there be a conversation with the student and shared that she has a non-participation policy. Cummings has statements as well in her syllabus but wants to know if this body wants to make a collective statement. Bethel shared that the consequence is that they have already taken up a seat.

c) After a lot of discussion, Bean expressed that this is why she was recommending a motion and it is not trying to be mean but it is her job to move business items along. Bean shared that with students like that, we need to work collegially and
reach out to coaches so that we can work together for the needs of the diverse student population.

d) Rhodes believes this is an issue with priority registration. Those students who are given priority registration and don’t participate can lose priority registration if they don’t participate.
e) Motion to create a taskforce to evaluate the severity of this issue by Dejean, 2nd by Wetsman
   a) Yes 7, No 14, motion fails
   b) Bean will bring this item back as unfinished business

VII. New Business
   a) If there are any concerns about any resolution, please inform Bean and Montiel
B. Motion to delay equivalency discussion items until the May meeting by Montiel, 2nd by Brutlag
   a) 1 opposed, Motion passes
C. Motion to move the last meeting from May 21st to May 14th
   a) 5 opposed, Motion passes

VIII. Committee Reports: No Reports

IX. Senate Committees:
   • Academic Rank
   • Curriculum
   • Guided Pathways Steering (GPS)
   • Instructional Technology (ITC)
   • Online Education (OEC)—see Addendum C
   • Open Educational Resources (OER)
   • Staff Dev./Flex
   • Outcomes

Planning & Fiscal Council Committees:
   • Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)
   • Program Review
   • Safety

Other Committees:
   • Basic Skills
   • Bookstore
   • Enterprise Systems Advisory
   • Online Education Initiative (OEI)
   • Student Equity
   • Student Success and Support Program (SSSP)

X. Announcements: None
XI. Adjournment: 2:18pm Addendum A: Equivalency Background Info

Equivalency - An Overview Submitted M. Pilati

The concept of an applicant for a position being hired on the basis of being “equivalent” is established in California law. Specifically, in Education Code (emphasis added):

87359.
The board of governors shall adopt regulations setting forth a process authorizing local governing boards to employ faculty members and educational administrators who do not meet the applicable minimum qualifications specified in the regulations adopted by the board of governors pursuant to Section 87356. Unless and until amended pursuant to the process described in Section 87357, the regulations shall require all of the following:

(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.

(b) The process, as well as criteria and standards by which the governing board reaches its determinations regarding faculty members, shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board. 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 faculty member employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications 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.

(c) Until a joint agreement is reached and approved pursuant to subdivision (b), the district process in existence on January 1, 1989, shall remain in effect.

The phrase “The criteria used by the governing board in making the determination shall be reflected in the governing board’s action employing the individual.” is noteworthy in that it requires that the basis for the equivalency be clearly and publicly documented. Legal Opinion L 02-28 makes this explicit:

At a minimum, the criteria relied upon must be included in the board action. Because a district may establish criteria which permit demonstrating equivalency in various ways, the governing board’s employment action must reflect the particular way in which the criteria were satisfied in a given case. For example, if a person claims the educational equivalency for a particular degree, he/she might be required to provide a transcript to demonstrate that he/she took courses equal to those needed for the major for that degree. Whatever the criteria used to establish the equivalency, that criteria must be reflected in the board action. Nothing in the statute or regulation indicates the specificity of information that is necessary, but it is reasonable to assume that the board action would at least indicate that the person met minimum qualifications through equivalent coursework, for example.
Consistent with Education Code, Title 5 § 53430 states that “No one may be hired to serve as a community college faculty or educational administrator unless the governing board determines that he or she possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications...” The equivalency process is not a means of bypassing or lowering the state-defined minimum qualifications (MQs), it is a means of recognizing when an applicant has met - or exceeded - the MQs by some mechanism other than the pre-defined criteria in the MQs. It allows colleges, for example, to deem someone “equivalent” when the degree they were granted does not carry one of the names specified in the MQs or when they have completed coursework equivalent to a specific degree but were not conferred a degree with that specific name.

Rio Hondo College’s current equivalency practice has resulted in:

1. qualified faculty being removed from applicant pools.
2. the adoption of MQs that are not equivalent.

Examples:

1. Qualified Faculty Removed from Applicant Pools
   a. Applicants who hold a degree not specified in the MQs or the equivalency have been “screened out” by Human Resources. Example: At UCI, psychology is housed in social ecology. Someone with a degree in social ecology historically was removed from the applicant pool.
   b. Applicants who have academic preparation equivalent to the required preparation but do not hold a degree specified in the MQs are not considered.

2. Non-Equivalent Equivalencies Adopted

(The following are from the “List of Equivalencies” posted at https://www.riohondo.edu/hr/academic-employee-minimum-qualifications-equivalencies/ and dated 8/28/2018) Modifications have been made to decrease length. These are examples of existing equivalencies that may or may not be problematic. The Disciplines List (the formal document that lists all available MQs) historically was divided into two parts to differentiate those disciplines for which a master’s degree is required as a precondition for employment, from those for which it is not. The following disciplines are included in the Master’s List.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>MQs</th>
<th>Equivalency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>Master’s in CD, ECE, human development, home economics/family and</td>
<td>A Master’s in education AND/OR special education with 24 units in child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CD)</td>
<td>consumer studies with a specialization in CD/ECE, or educational</td>
<td>development PLUS experience working with children in a group setting for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>psych with a specialization in CD/ECE OR Bachelor’s in any of the</td>
<td>(3) three consecutive years with at least two (2) years with children birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>above AND Master’s in social work, educational supervision,</td>
<td>to age 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elementary ed, special ed, psych, bilingual/bicultural education,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>life management/home economics, family life studies, or family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and consumer studies OR the equivalency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Master’s in education OR the equivalency.</td>
<td>Any Master’s with 24 units in Child Development PLUS experience working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with children in a group setting for three (3) consecutive years with at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>least two (2) years with children birth to age twelve (12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>A Master's in business or a related area; OR a Bachelor's degree in business or related area AND a combination of successfully completed coursework, totaling at least twelve (12) units at the upper division level AND twelve (12) units at the graduate level in the area in which the equivalency is requested AND evidence of experience in a business or related area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Master's in political science, government, or international relations OR Bachelor’s in any of the above AND Master’s in economics, history, public administration, social science, sociology, any ethnic studies, J.D., or LL.B OR the equivalent. A Master's in international relations, comparative politics, public administration, political theory, philosophy, public policy, or US government.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Courses in aspects of law for application to a particular discipline may be classified, for minimum qualifications purposes in the discipline of the application OR the equivalent. (In other words, a business law course could appropriately be assigned to the business discipline.)*

Proposed changes to the college’s equivalency policy would allow all applicants a chance to demonstrate their equivalency - ensuring faculty are determining whether or not an applicant should be removed from the pool. And a committee would be established that would review all pre-determined equivalencies.

**Proposed Immediate Actions:**

Move to suspend all existing equivalencies until they been reviewed and approved according to the policy being developed.

Move to direct Human Resources to remove the document containing the suspended equivalencies.

The proposed immediate actions were recently delayed as a consequence of interest in continued discussion regarding an indirectly related matter - the language to be used regarding equivalency during the application process. At the last senate meeting, concern was expressed regarding the implementation of an explicit recognition of our willingness to consider applicants who believe they are equivalent - in addition to, or in lieu of, meeting a pre-determined equivalency. Our “equivalencies” vary in nature, some establish criteria to be used to determine of someone is equivalent and others include additional degree titles that would be deemed equivalent.

Presently, all applicants are provided with the ability to indicate an “equivalency”, even when it has been stated that there is “none”. As all of the state’s MQs indicate “or equivalent”, our practice of not incorporating this option into our hiring practices may be problematic for the reasons already noted.

In order to get a sense of the practices of other colleges, job flyers and applications from 3 representative colleges were examined. In addition, a query was posted to a senate list serv.
Information from Job Flyers and Applications

Mt. SAC

No predetermined equivalencies provided on the website. A link is provided to the Disciplines List which specifies “or equivalent” as an element of every MQ.

Equivalency reference in the application: 7. Equivalency Determination Supplemental Form: All candidates not holding the stated minimum qualifications who are requesting consideration based on an equivalency, must complete this form to be considered. (This language appears to be standard for all faculty positions.)

Cerritos

“Disciplines with local standards”

https://www.cerritos.edu/hr/_includes/docs/Forms/MinQualsLocalStandardsNov2018.pdf

Examples:

English - Master’s degree or MFA or PhD. or ABD in English, literature, comparative literature, or composition; OR Bachelor’s in any of the above AND Master’s in linguistics or creative writing; OR the equivalent.

Psychology - Master’s or PhD in psychology OR the equivalent.

All non-CTE Master’s List disciplines indicate “or the equivalent”.

NOTE: Any discipline not included on this list follows the State Minimum Qualifications.

All job postings indicate “or equivalent”.

Reference in the application: Do you possess a Master’s degree in sociology OR Bachelor’s degree in sociology AND Master’s degree in anthropology, any ethnic studies, social work, or psychology OR the equivalent? If you answered NO above but believe your degree/coursework completed may be equivalent, you should complete the Applicant Request for Equivalency form on the next page.

Santa Monica

All disciplines requiring a masters indicate “or equivalent”.

Equivalency Statement - The Santa Monica Community College District, in its desire to select outstanding faculty members from the largest possible pool of qualified applicants, recognizes the fact that candidates may attain expertise in a discipline through a variety of means. Certain combinations of education, experience and other accomplishments in the field may be judged by the District as equal to the stated minimum qualifications for this position. Candidates who feel they possess such equivalent qualifications are encouraged to apply and provide appropriate documentation of their qualifications. For further details regarding equivalency criteria, please download the Equivalency Application Statement Form available at

https://jobs.smc.edu/applicants/static/customers/655/EquivalencyStatementPDF.pdf (Download PDF reader)
E-Mail and Responses

The message sent out (slightly edited):

Subject Line: Nope, no equivalent. Is that an option?

RHC has a practice of pre-determining what is equivalent. A discipline can specify what is equivalent or they can just say "none". In discussing this with a colleague, he proposed that a college could forego the "or equivalent" as our obligation is to apply the MQs - we can choose to be more restrictive. I’m feeling some discomfort over a practice that is intentionally restrictive - solely in order to be restrictive. If a college has deemed that a certain degree in the MQs are not good preparation of teaching in the discipline, removing those degrees from the local MQs would be warranted - it is restriction with a reason. Let’s call it a justified restriction.

In looking at 3 colleges - Mt. SAC, Cerritos, and SMC - it appears that they all have "or equivalent" for at least all non-CTE disciplines requiring a Masters. At one college, some disciplines are more restrictive with respect to what Masters they will consider - but they still take the equivalent.

Is it standard practice at your college to indicate "or equivalent" at the end of the qualifications for a position (just as it appears in the Disciplines List) and then permit applicants to demonstrate how they are equivalent?

I could make a number of arguments explaining why doing what your colleague is suggesting would be a very bad practice. But practical reasons aside, there is a very important political issue at stake. There are a number of people at the state level who have argued that our MQs are too restrictive and that they inhibit hiring, specifically the hiring of non-traditional and underrepresented candidates. People who attended the Building Diversity Workshops sponsored by the IEPI last year heard the lawyer on the panel make exactly this argument—that all of our MQs needed to be revisited to open them up for more candidates. Our response has been that the MQs are not truly too restrictive because we can always use equivalency to include a broader range of candidates. If colleges start making it clear we are not willing to use equivalency, we are inviting outside forces to get involved and force a change to our MQ system. If we want to keep MQs in the hands of the Academic Senate, which I assume we all do, then we really do not want to dismiss the idea of equivalency.

David W. Morse, PhD
Professor of English, Long Beach City College

At the RCCD we put the "or equivalent" at the end of the qualifications and then an equivalency committee evaluates the applicants petition to see if the equivalency is granted. But as a matter of fact, this coming Monday we have this exact topic as an agenda item to discuss at our District Academic Senate meeting because Mark Sellick, the senate president from RCC has requested to discuss equivalencies because there have been some problems granting equivalencies from his college/senates’ perspective. I will find out Monday what those problems, or hiccups, as he mentioned in his email to me were.

Hope that makes sense and goes to your question, specifically.

Warm regards,

Peggy Campo
Associate Professor, Anatomy and Physiology
Science and Kinesiology Department Co-chair
Academic Senate President
Norco College, Riverside Community College District
At CCSF, all our certificated job announcements include "or the equivalent" in the min quals.
--Fred

It is standard practice at Glendale Community College to have “or equivalent” as you describe: at the end of the qualifications for a position (just as it appears in the Disciplines List) and then permit applicants to demonstrate how they are equivalent.
Petitions by applicants to be granted equivalency are evaluated by the Senate Equivalency Committee at GCC.
Be well.
Piper

It seems to me that the practices you describe below are not in line with the intent of the discipline list. I don’t think it should be an option unless the field agrees to it. I would suspect this would be an equity issue, and one that opens up the college to a discrimination lawsuit.
-Katrina
Katrina Keating, M.A., Ed.D.
Mathematics Professor
Diablo Valley College
Addendum B: Proposed New AP for Equivalency Process

Background Info: RHC currently has a BP 7211 with no accompanying AP. Title 5 and Ed Code require all community colleges to have an equivalency process. The process at RHC has been based on past practice with nothing currently codified. Senate agreed to the creation of an Equivalency Taskforce and sought volunteers in fall 2018. The Equivalency Taskforce worked to build the proposed AP started with HR and senate years ago (the black font in document below). The additions consented by the Taskforce are written in green and suggestions from Senate Executive members are noted in purple.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</th>
<th>Administrative Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS, EQUIVALENCIES, AND FACULTY SERVICE AREAS</td>
<td>AP No. 7211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Reviewed:</td>
<td>Page 1 of 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies

Faculty shall meet the minimum qualifications established by the Board of Governors or shall possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications set out in the regulations of the Board of Governors.

According to Education Code § 87359 individuals who do not possess the minimum qualifications for service may be hired as faculty members, if they possess “qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications.”

Minimum Qualifications

Minimum qualifications (*min quals* or MQs) are the criteria by which faculty (Title 5, § 53402) are able to be hired in order to teach in the state of California (Title 5, § 53405). The state sets the MQs via a process facilitated by the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges; the MQs for all disciplines are maintained by the state Disciplines List (Title 5, § 53407). Local districts may apply additional MQs as they deem necessary, but local MQs may not be lower than the state standard. All faculty who teach in any discipline, whether full-time or part-time, must meet the MQs for their discipline prior to teaching; if faculty do not meet MQs, the units for the course that is taught are not valid (Title 5, § 53406). Not-for-credit (corporate and/or community education) instruction does not require MQs for hiring.

Equivalency

The Equivalency process is not intended to raise or lower MQs and exists to recognize alternate methods to become qualified. Upon determining Equivalency, the individual is deemed qualified to teach in the discipline for which Equivalency was granted. A determination of equivalency does not guarantee an interview, employment, or reassignment. The determination of equivalency establishes that the individual meets the MQs for the position and does not bestow rights to any position or process. The granting of an equivalency is on a case-by-case basis and does not establish precedent for future applicants. (*Note - this is not consistent with our current practice, it appears that we currently implement a stated equivalency so that we can then deem an individual equivalent, I base this on the odd inclusion of philosophy in the political science "equivalency".*)

Any process developed to determine equivalencies shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advise and judgment of the academic senate to determine that each individual faculty member employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the
II. Faculty Service Area

A Faculty Service Area (FSA), as defined by California Education Code §87743.1, is "a service or instructional subject area or group of related services or instructional subject areas performed by faculty and established by a community college district." Per Board Policy 7211 "Faculty Service Areas for which an academic employee is qualified for shall be registered with the Office of Human Resources upon hire, or upon qualifying for it. After initial employment, a faculty member may apply to the district to add faculty service areas for which the faculty member qualifies." This should be done prior to January 15 of any academic year in order to be considered in any proceeding during the academic year in which the application is received.

At least one month prior to December 15 of each academic year, the Human Resources Office will notify faculty of the opportunity to apply for an additional FSA. If the FSA is denied, faculty may refer to the grievance process in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

III. An Academic Senate Equivalency Oversight Committee shall be established to:

- Recommend all established equivalencies to the Board of Trustees.
- Clarify criteria to be used for determining equivalency.
- Work with disciplines to review all established equivalencies for currency and accuracy every four years. (Form 2222)
- Periodically review equivalency procedures and recommend necessary changes to the Academic Senate and Board of Trustees.

The committee shall consist of seven members: the Academic Senate President, four faculty appointed by the Academic Senate President, one Academic Dean appointed by the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and one non-voting representative from Human Resources appointed by the Executive Director of Human Resources. This committee shall be convened as needed to conduct a review of established equivalencies or when issues arise regarding the equivalency process.

IV. Determination of Equivalencies for Applicants:

The following procedure is to be used to determine when an applicant for a faculty position, although lacking the exact degree or experience specified in
the Disciplines List or an established equivalency, of the Board of Governors that establishes the minimum qualifications for hire, nonetheless does possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to those required by the Disciplines List. The procedure is intended to ensure a fair and objective process for determining when an applicant has the equivalent qualifications. It is not intended to grant waivers for lack of the required qualifications.

A. All faculty position announcements will state the required qualifications as specified by the Disciplines List, including the possibility of meeting the equivalent of the required degree or experience, and any established equivalencies.

B. The District employment application for faculty positions will ask applicants to state how they meet the minimum qualifications of the Disciplines List. Those claiming equivalency will be asked to demonstrate how they meet the stated equivalency. It will be the responsibility of the applicant to supply all evidence and documentation for the claim of equivalency at the time of application.

V. The Human Resources Department will first screen all applicants. Those claiming equivalency will have their claims examined and approved by the Discipline Equivalency Committee. The Discipline Equivalency Committee may be convened by the Human Resources Department at the start of the hiring process as needed in collaboration with the Senate and the administration in the discipline area. This committee shall be convened as needed and consist of at least two full-time faculty in the discipline area unless two are not available because of a single-person department (in which case, two full-time faculty in a related discipline may serve if there are fewer than two full-time faculty in the discipline), the division Dean of the discipline area, one academic senator from another discipline area, and the academic senate president. Each of the discipline faculty will independently review the equivalency applications and make a determination. If the determinations made by the discipline faculty are consistent, the academic senate president will confirm the determinations made and the equivalencies granted or denied. If the determinations are not consistent, the committee will be convened for the purpose of achieving a consensus. If a consensus cannot be achieved, the committee shall review documentation to determine if the applicants meet criteria established by the matter will be forward to the Equivalency Oversight Committee for determining equivalency. Only applicants who are found to meet provisions of the equivalency shall be forwarded to the selection committee.

Reference: Title 5 Section 53400 et seq, Education Code Sections 87001,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</th>
<th>Administrative Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS, EQUIVALENCIES, AND FACULTY SERVICE AREAS</td>
<td>AP No. 7211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Reviewed:  

87003, 87356, 87359
Addendum C: Online Education Committee Report

Online Education
Senate and PFC report
March 2019
Submitted by Dr. Jodi Senk

- A Motion was made to change the name of the Online Education Committee (OEC) to the Distance Education Committee (DEC). This follows suit with other colleges, our contracts and documents which refer to DE (not OE) as well as using the title of Distance Education Coordinator (DECO is the state designated term). It was approved by the committee with one abstention.

- A CTE Pathways grant was submitted for up to $500,000 for online ed and CTE development of full online programs. A motion was made and it was voted that the Dean, incoming coordinator, and two instructional assistants attend the upcoming information session in NorCal. There will be a need for increasing resources to meet the goals of the grant.

- Jill Pfieffer was elected as new Coordinator for 2019-21
ADDENDUM D:

Academic Senate
APRIL 2, 2019

President’s Report
• Approval of Minutes: March 19, 2019
• Public Comment

President’s Report

President’s Report

1st VP Report
Adjournment
May wisdom be poured out on you by a spirit of truth to provide you with a deep sense of peace and education that’s beyond mere knowledge.