



Academic Senate
for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

Selected

47th SPRING SESSION RESOLUTIONS

FOR DISCUSSION AT

SENATE MEETING 3/19/15

Resolutions Committee 2014-2015

John Freitas, Los Angeles City College, Chair
Julie Adams, ASCCC, Executive Director
Randy Beach, Southwestern College, Area D
Kale Braden, Cosumnes River College, Area A
Debbie Klein, Gavilan College, Area B
Michelle Sampat, Mt. San Antonio College, Area C

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS

2.0 ACCREDITATION

*2.01 S15 Disaggregation of Learning Outcomes Data

Whereas, The revised accreditation standards adopted in June 2014¹ by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) state in Standard I, Institutional Mission and Effectiveness, the following:

- *Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery, (I.B.5) and*
- *The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies, (I.B.6); and*

Whereas, Concerns have been expressed from the field regarding how to meet the requirements for disaggregation of data and the extent to which such disaggregation is feasible to yield meaningful analysis;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges facilitate a conversation in the field, through breakout sessions, *Rostrum* articles, or other means deemed appropriate by the Executive Committee, regarding the disaggregation of learning outcomes data and the means by which colleges can meet or exceed the requirements of accreditation Standard I adopted by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges in June of 2014.

Contact: Michael Heumann, Imperial Valley College, Accreditation and Assessment Committee

6.0 STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

*6.01 S15 Oppose Expansion of Former CPEC Mission and Creation of a Higher Education ‘ Oversight Body That Does Not Contain Segmental Representation

Whereas, California law establishes the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) as the coordinating and planning agency for statewide postsecondary education, but CPEC was defunded by the governor in 2011 and its statutory functions did not include oversight of higher education;

Whereas, SB 42 (Liu, 2015, as of December 2, 2014), according to the Legislative Council’s Digest, “would change the composition of, and rename, CPEC as the California Commission on Higher Education Performance and Accountability, and would recast and revise its various functions and responsibilities,” significantly broadening the previous functions of CPEC;

Whereas, Among the functions assigned to the California Commission on Higher Education Performance and Accountability under SB 42 (Liu, 2015, as of December 2, 2014) is to “increase educational achievement in postsecondary educational institutions, close educational achievement gaps, and prepare citizens for the workforce,” which demonstrates the potentially intrusive and inappropriate new scope of the proposed commission charge; and

¹ The June 2014 standards are found at http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Accreditation_Standards_Adopted_June_2014.pdf

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS

Whereas, SB 42 (Liu, 2015, as of December 2, 2014) specifically excludes segmental representation on the California Commission on Higher Education Performance and Accountability, stating that “a person who is employed by any institution of public or private postsecondary education shall *not* be appointed to or serve on the commission, except that a person who is not a permanent, full-time employee and who has part-time teaching duties that do not exceed six hours per week may be appointed to and serve on the commission,” thus ensuring that a commission composed of individuals who may not have understanding of higher education will have an oversight role in California higher education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose SB 42 (Liu, 2015, as of December 2, 2014) and any further legislation that would seek to create an oversight body for California higher education that is not primarily composed of segmental representation; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose legislation that proposes to expand the former role of CPEC into areas that intrude on decisions properly made by representatives of the California higher education segments themselves.

Contact: Dan Crump, Executive Committee, Legislative and Advocacy Committee

***6.02 S15 Support Funding for Career Pathways and Coordination of Long Range Planning**
Whereas, Legislators have recognized the importance of improving student transitions from high school to community college, commonly referred to as career pathways, since 2005, which has led to local, regional, and state investments serving middle schools, high schools, and colleges (SB 70, 2005, Scott; SB1070, 2012, Steinberg; AB 86, 2013, Blumenfeld; and the California Pathways Trust Fund, 2013-2018);

Whereas, Funding streams have often been transient and short term, leading to cyclical disruption of establishing and sustaining career pathways and ultimately to disinvestment in many highly successful efforts across the state;

Whereas, Given the likelihood that funding will remain impermanent and episodic, long term coordination requirements must be mandatory and consistent elements of all future funding legislation supporting career pathways to assure long range continuity and consistency and to reduce duplication and unnecessary repetition of effort; and

Whereas, The current legislative intent expressed in SB 66 (Leyva, as of January 7, 2015) seeks to extend California’s investments in career pathways for another undefined short-term period;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support current and future public investments in California high school to community college career pathways; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with interested legislators to include long range requirements and resources for coordinating and investing in career pathways at the state level.

Contact: Shawn Carney, Solano College, CTE Leadership Committee

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS

7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

*7.01 S15 System Handbook on Guidelines and Effective Practices for Dealing with Student Academic Dishonesty

Whereas, Resolution 13.05 S13² called for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “reinitiate its effort to review and, where appropriate, draft language to revise Title 5 regulations to allow for the failure of students for egregious acts of academic dishonesty while also protecting all students’ rights to due process”;

Whereas, The rights and responsibilities of faculty and students when acts of academic dishonesty by students are observed and reported by faculty are not always clear or well-understood, which may result in faculty frustration and a reduced willingness to report such incidents out of concern for being involved in lengthy disciplinary proceedings that may be seen as unfair to the faculty, or out of fear of being sued by students;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has numerous publications, including Rostrum articles and the 2007 paper *Promoting and Sustaining an Institutional Climate of Academic Integrity*, that present effective practices for preventing acts of academic dishonesty and the status of Chancellor’s Office legal interpretations of what can and cannot be done by faculty with respect to assigning grades when students are caught engaging in egregious acts of academic dishonesty, but Academic Senate publications do not provide legal advice to faculty; and

Whereas, The Chancellor’s Office has developed handbooks on topics such as distance education, accessibility and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and repeatability, yet no such handbook currently exists that provides guidance to the field regarding student academic dishonesty;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office and other system partners to develop a handbook for the system that provides both legal guidance and effective practices for the prevention and effective handling of incidents of student academic dishonesty.

Contact: Cynthia Reiss, West Valley College, Educational Policies Committee

9.0 CURRICULUM

*9.01 S15 Curriculum Process and Effective Practices

Whereas, Colleges and districts have a variety of local curriculum processes, including timelines indicating when courses and programs are submitted to technical review committees, curriculum committees, academic senates, and governing boards;

Whereas, Timely curriculum processes are required for both career and technical education (CTE) and non-CTE disciplines;

Whereas, Resolution 09.01 F11 Responding to Industry Needs states:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the identification of ways to appropriately respond to the curricular needs of business and industry in a timely manner, including the identification of mechanisms to expedite local curricular

² Resolution 13.05 S13 is found at <http://www.asccc.org/resolutions/revisit-failing-students-egregious-act-cheating>

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS

processes and the use of not-for-credit contract education as a means of immediately implementing curriculum delivery; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges explore current practices, identify barriers, and promote effective practices in responding to the curricular needs of business and industry and present this information by the Fall 2012 Session; and

Whereas, Colleges would benefit from a paper outlining effective practices for local processes on curriculum approval;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges survey curriculum chairs on the timeliness of their local curriculum approval processes by Fall 2015 and develop a paper on effective practices for local curriculum approval and present it to the field for adoption at the Fall 2016 Plenary Session.

Contact: Ginni May, Sacramento City College, Curriculum Committee

***9.02 S15 Alternative Courses for Math Competency Requirements**

Whereas, The current English and math competency requirements for the associate degree were adopted by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in Spring 2005, approved by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors in September 2006, and required per Title 5 §55063 effective for all students admitted to a California community college for the Fall 2009 term or any term thereafter;

Whereas, Title 5 §55063 states, “The competency requirements for written expression and mathematics may also be met by obtaining a satisfactory grade in courses in English and mathematics taught in or on behalf of other departments and which, as determined by the local governing board, require entrance skills at a level equivalent to those necessary for Freshman Composition and Intermediate Algebra respectively”; and

Whereas, At the Fall 2012 Plenary Session, three resolutions brought forward asking the body to endorse a particular curriculum pathway in developmental mathematics were referred to the Executive Committee until such a time that the mathematics professional organizations could offer their opinions, indicating concern in the field that alternative courses for meeting the competency requirements be identified;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with C-ID to write model curriculum for (1) a non-STEM, “intermediate algebra level/math competency level” prerequisite course to statistics and (2) an “intermediate algebra level/math competency level” course for students who plan to earn an associate degree but do not plan to transfer.

Contact: Ginni May, Sacramento City College, Curriculum Committee

12.0 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

***12.01 S15 Faculty Recognition**

Whereas, Faculty continue to do exceptional work in teaching and learning, in instruction and program design, and in learning and student support services at their colleges in support and to the benefit of students and their communities;

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS

Whereas, While the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provides recognition awards to both part-time and full-time faculty, the opportunities for faculty to receive statewide awards is first and foremost in the hands of local academic senates;

Whereas, Local senate presidents are responsible for a vast number of tasks, many of which may require high priority attention, and new senate presidents may not be aware of all statewide awards; and

Whereas, Each award has its own timeline and criteria which can often be forgotten by local senate presidents while they are dealing with other local issues, causing some awards to go unclaimed due to lack of sufficient nominations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that local senates form awards committees, or otherwise appoint responsible individuals, to be charged with the primary task of ensuring that faculty from their colleges have the opportunity to be recognized statewide for their outstanding work; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that local senates establish local processes for nominating faculty and submitting their nominations for statewide awards in a timely manner that aligns with the timelines and deadlines for each award.

Contact: April Juarez, Long Beach City College, and Paul Setziol, De Anza College, Standards and Practices Committee

14.0 GRADING

*14.01 S15 Allowing Faculty to Submit the “Report Delayed” (RD) Symbol for Instances of Student Academic Dishonesty

Whereas, In 1995 the Chancellor’s Office rendered legal opinion L 95-31³, which was reaffirmed in 2007, stating that an instructor could fail a student on an assignment for cheating but that the student could not be given a course grade of ‘F’ for that incidence of cheating unless that assignment grade, taken together with the student’s performance on the other course assignments, resulted in a grade of ‘F,’ per the requirements of Title 5 §55002 and the basic requirements for due process;

Whereas, Resolution 13.05 S13⁴ called for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to revisit this matter, including proposing revisions to Title 5 as appropriate, but the Chancellor’s Office has not yet changed its position on its legal opinion L 95-31, and it is not clear what changes to Title 5 can be made to allow faculty to fail a student in a course for egregious acts of academic dishonesty without violating the student’s right to due process;

Whereas, Title 5 §55023 allows the symbol of RD (report delayed) to be recorded on student transcripts with the following requirements:

The “RD” symbol may be assigned by the registrar only. It is to be used when there is a delay in reporting the grade of a student due to circumstances beyond the control of the student. It is a temporary notation to be replaced by a permanent symbol as soon as possible. “RD” shall not be used in calculating grade point averages; and

³Legal opinion L 95-31 is found at <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/Legal/Ops/OpsArchive/95-31.pdf>

⁴ Resolution 13.05 S13 is found at <http://www.asccc.org/resolutions/revisit-failing-students-egregious-act-cheating>

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS

Whereas, Allowing districts to adopt policies and procedures to allow faculty to assign an RD to a student caught engaging in academic dishonesty when the outcome of disciplinary action is still pending or cannot be resolved before grades are due may make faculty more willing to report students for academic dishonesty by eliminating any concern over course grades being challenged following the conclusion of a student disciplinary process;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support changes to Title 5 §55023 that will permit districts, through collegial consultation with local senates, to adopt policies and procedures that allow faculty to submit the RD (report delayed) symbol for students who have been caught in instances of academic dishonesty that have not been resolved or may not be resolved before the end of an academic term.

Contact: Diana Hurlbut, Irvine Valley College, Educational Policies Committee

17.0 LOCAL SENATES

***17.02 S15 Establishing Local CTE Liaison Position**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges appoints career and technical education (CTE) faculty to numerous statewide initiatives, workgroups, committees, and task forces to ensure their interests are represented, but communicating this critical need to CTE faculty and recruiting adequate numbers of volunteers is often difficult;

Whereas, In November 2014 the Board of Governors commissioned the Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy to develop recommendations addressing system-wide policies and practices that may significantly affect career technical education programs, and CTE faculty must be appraised of and contribute to the work of the taskforce; and

Whereas, Information concerning CTE programs, faculty, and students may not always be disseminated to all CTE faculty at local colleges and districts, and therefore CTE faculty would benefit from the creation of a CTE liaison position to act as a conduit between the Academic Senate for Community Colleges and local CTE faculty;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to identify a CTE faculty member to act as a liaison to facilitate communication among local CTE faculty, the local academic senate, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.

Contact: Grant Goold, American River College, CTE Leadership Committee

***17.03 S15 Establishing Local Legislative Liaison Position**

Whereas, Local academic senates have the freedom to take and publish positions on proposed legislation after informed discussion and deliberation and to meet with legislators to express their views and positions regarding legislation;

Whereas, Some local senates have created a legislative liaison position so that a designated individual is responsible for tracking and reporting to the academic senate on legislation, and such a position may be a great benefit to an academic senate in providing current information on relevant legislation and enabling the senate to form positions upon which it may wish to act; and

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS

Whereas, The effectiveness of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in influencing legislation is contingent upon providing information and analysis to local senates and receiving in response feedback and direction for action;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to establish a Legislative Liaison position to facilitate communication between and among the ASCCC, local academic senates, and faculty.

Contact: Silvester Henderson, Los Medanos College, Legislative and Advocacy Committee