

**Academic Senate**  
**MINUTES**  
Monday, April 12, 2021  
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.  
Via Zoom

<b>Executive Committee Members Present</b>					
x	Cathy Anderson	x	Kari Aranbul	x	Jim Bigelow
x	David Carico	x	Jim Crooks	x	Cheryl Cruse
x	Leslie Ellingson	x	Leo Fong	x	Lenore Frigo
	Scott Gordon	x	Chaz Kelley	x	Mindy Marlatt
x	Corrinne Minnard		Haley Mulvihill	x	Ray Nicholas
x	Johnathan Nuttall	x	Carie Palmer		Linda Thomas
x	Craig Thompson	x	Joanne Tippin	x	Michael Trujillo
x	Susan Westler				
x	Jennifer McCandless (N/V)	x	Frank Nigro (N/V)		Scott Yates (N/V)
<b>Other Faculty Present</b>					
x	Sara McCurry	x	Chris Rodriguez		
<b>Guests</b>					
x	Cheryl Aschenbach	x	Stacey Bartlett	x	Andy Fields
x	Ioanna Iatridis	x	Kate Mahar	x	Julie Oliver
x	Carlos Reyes	x	Marrienne Williams	x	Zack Zweigle

1. Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.
2. Approval of Minutes: None at this meeting; delayed until April 26<sup>th</sup> meeting.

3. Informational Reports from Guests and Executive Committee Members

None at this meeting

4. Standing Action Items from Our Subcommittees, The Office of Instruction, and The Office of the Superintendent/President

None at this meeting

5. Project-Based Discussion/Action Items

- These agenda items will vary to reflect the current projects that the Academic Senate is working on.
- a. Revision of Equivalency Procedure
  - Facilitator: Cathy Anderson
  - Purpose and Expected Outcome: Review and revise the Equivalency Procedure to eliminate any unintended barriers to qualified candidates.
  - Anticipated Completion: Spring 2022.

We (Shasta College Academic Senate) have requested support from ASCCC to help us prepare for this project. Julie Oliver from Los Rios Community College and Cheryl Aschenbach from Lassen College will share their understanding and experience with Equivalency Procedures, and lead us in a discussion to get us thinking.

Cathy introduced our guests, Julie Oliver from Cosumnes River College and Cheryl Aschenbach from Lassen College, and provided some background on our current project of revising the equivalency procedure here at Shasta College. She also noted that we do not have an equivalency procedure for administrators, so there will be a parallel effort underway for the administrative side. Both Julie and Cheryl introduced themselves and described their background and experiences with equivalency procedures. They used a PowerPoint that covered these main areas concerning equivalency: background, guiding principles, equivalency processes, equivalency committees, equivalency myths, marketing equivalency to candidates, determining equivalency to the Associate Degree, and a list of equivalency resources. They stated that they would share this PowerPoint with Cathy.

Julie and Cheryl started by noting that California Ed. Code (§87359) dictates that “every district must have an equivalency process, with process, standards and criteria.” There are 19 sections in CCR Title 5 that touch on equivalency (§53400-53430). ASCCC has a MQ (Minimum Qualifications) Handbook, with three categories for meeting equivalency, the third one involving professional experience, which is particularly important in CTE areas, so much so that ASCCC has a CTE Equivalency Toolkit available as a resource.

Guiding principles for equivalency include determining what specific evidence is needed to establish equivalency and the need for applicants to provide this evidence. The idea of “eminence,” having strong achievements within a field or profession, can also be considered.

For equivalency processes, these need to be fair, transparent and consistent, with everything documented and recommendations justifiable; applicants granted

equivalency and hired by a district retain qualified status for the duration of employment by the district. Julie and Cheryl emphasized that it is important to be proactive in establishing equivalencies.

For equivalency committees, there should be either a subcommittee of the academic senate or a separate committee with membership determined by the academic senate; the key is consistency of membership. ASCCC has argued that hiring committees should not be responsible for determining equivalency. Faculty within a discipline and related disciplines are needed to determine discipline-specific equivalency criteria, but this should be done through a dedicated equivalency committee. Even though equivalency is under the purview of faculty, there should also be a liaison from HR. Ultimately, the role of the committee should be to ensure that the process is applied fairly and consistently. The committee should meet regularly and be available during peak hiring seasons. Also, all faculty should be regularly trained in equivalency.

As for myths about equivalency, the biggest three are: 1) Conditional or provision equivalencies can be created as part of the local process; 2) HR offices should not be involved in the equivalency process; 3) Single course equivalencies are permitted. None of these are accurate.

For marketing equivalency to candidates, it is important that a standard equivalency application should be available to all candidates, and this includes an explanation of equivalency that would be clear to external applicants; it is also a good practice to provide examples of completed equivalency applications along with supporting evidence. When applicants do not have a completed degree, they should be provided an opportunity to provide evidence and justification for equivalency, and it is important to consider all aspects of a degree when considering equivalency to a degree.

Important questions to consider for an equivalency committee: How big of a committee? Who will spearhead the effort? How will discipline expertise be included and relied upon? How will HR be involved? How will you ensure fairness and consistency? A primary goal of such a committee is to ensure that qualified candidates are able to enter the applicant pool.

Recommended resources from ASCCC include the MQ Handbook, CTE Equivalency Toolkit, as well as several papers and articles published by ASCCC on the topic of equivalency. Julie and Cheryl recommended looking at the equivalency procedures used by these colleges: College of the Canyons, Rio Hondo College, Santa Rosa Junior College, and Mira Costa College.

During the Q & A section, Cathy asked about the logistics for such a committee; Julie and Cheryl stated that it varies depending on the size of the college and the amount of hiring regularly done. Frank Nigro inquired about how to get faculty involved during periods when faculty are typically off-contract. Cheryl stated that at her college, academic senate oversees this, with an MQ chair being the point-person; Julie recommended that we consider all possible scenarios and create plans for these. Frank also asked about when to determine equivalency, whether before the screening process or after it. Cheryl stated that this can take place either way, but she favored determining

equivalency early on because this can prevent the time lag between a hiring committee making recommendations on which applicants to invite for an interview and the equivalency committee making its determinations on equivalency for the applicants who request it. Julie also recommended determining equivalency first, before the screening process, and this necessitates a clear, transparent procedure already in place. This gets more complicated with part-time faculty applicants because these positions are considered on an as-needed basis. Cheryl also noted that employment application software that a college uses for the hiring process can be a factor. Cheryl then asked us how many faculty would be necessary for an equivalency committee here at Shasta College. Stacey Bartlett suggested between 6 and 10, based either on the number of divisions or the number of meta-majors, with one faculty member representing each division or meta-major/interest area. Frank Nigro pointed out that representation on the committee should also be based on the volume of equivalency applications that need to be processed so that disciplines where there are more such applications should have greater representation; because there are more equivalency applications in the CTE areas, Frank suggested that an equivalency committee could be comprised of a mixture of faculty from GE and CTE areas but with greater and more robust CTE representation. In wrapping up the Q & A portion, Julie recommended that we reach out to academic senates at other colleges to see how they handle equivalency. Cheryl shared an example of an MQ equivalency chart used by Rio Hondo College. Cathy thanked Julie and Cheryl for their help, and both offered to return and speak with us again after we have made more progress with developing our equivalency procedure.

6. Standing Reports from Subcommittees and Joint Committees

None at this meeting

7. Other

- Facilitator: Cathy Anderson
- Purpose and Expected Outcome: This agenda item is for members to bring up topics not on the agenda. This is also an opportunity to determine interest in a possible future agenda item topic. No action will be taken under this agenda item.
- a. Stacey Bartlett announced that the Program Review Committee will be sending out a survey to all faculty later this week.

8. Opportunity for Public Comment

- Facilitator: Cathy Anderson
- Purpose and Expected Outcome: This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Executive Committee on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken under this agenda item. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

9. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

10. Next Meeting: Monday, April 26, 2021, at 3:00 p.m.

**The Shasta-Tehama Trinity Joint Community College District ("Shasta College") does not discriminate against any person on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religious preference, age, disability (physical and mental), pregnancy (including pregnancy, childbirth, and medical conditions related to pregnancy or childbirth), gender identity, sexual orientation, genetics, military or veteran status or any other characteristic protected by applicable law in admission and access to, or treatment in employment, educational programs or activities at any of its campuses. Shasta College also prohibits harassment on any of these bases, including sexual harassment, as well as sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.**