



**Selected Resolutions for Senate Info and
Discussion that will be presented at
46th FALL SESSION RESOLUTIONS
*FOR DISCUSSION***

Thursday, November 13, 2014

Disclaimer: The enclosed resolutions do not reflect the position of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, its Executive Committee, or standing committees. They are presented for the purpose of discussion by the field, and to be debated and voted on by academic senate delegates at the Academic Senate Fall Plenary Session held November 13-15, 2014, in Irvine.

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

2.0 ACCREDITATION

2.01 F14 Student Learning Outcomes and Faculty Evaluations

Whereas, Standard III A.6 of the Accreditation Standards¹ adopted in June 2014 by the Accrediting Commission for Colleges and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) states,

The evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning includes, as a component of that evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning;

Whereas, College personnel experience an inability to reach consensus regarding how to interpret Standard III A.6, which causes confusion about the impact on performance evaluations, including evaluations for faculty; and

Whereas, The assessment of student learning and professional development of faculty are academic and professional matters;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that Standard III A.6 of the Accreditation Standards, adopted in June 2014 by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), be interpreted for faculty as follows and disseminate this interpretation to local colleges, system partners, and the ACCJC:

Faculty are responsible for using the results of the assessment of student learning to participate in college processes to evaluate student achievement at the course, discipline, and college-wide scale as appropriate. Faculty should engage in professional growth and development that improves teaching and learning. The effective participation of faculty in these collegial processes may be a factor in the evaluation of faculty; however, the results of assessments of learning outcomes are not a basis for faculty evaluation.

¹http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Accreditation_Standards_Adopted_June_2014.pdf

Contact: John Stankas, Executive Committee, Accreditation and Assessment Committee

+2.01.01 F14 Amend 2.01 F14

Add new second whereas:

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in its 2004 paper *The 2002 Accreditation Standards: Implementation*², has stated its opposition to the use of student learning outcomes (SLOs) as a basis for faculty evaluation, noting the potentially negative impact on evaluation as a collegial peer process, on academic freedom, and on local bargaining authority, and further affirmed in Resolution 2.01 F08 *Opposition to Using SLOs in Faculty Evaluation* “That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges affirm its opposition to including the attainment of student learning outcomes as an aspect of individual faculty evaluations”³;

Amend the resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that Standard III A. 6 of the Accreditation Standards, adopted in June 2014 by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), be interpreted for faculty as follows and disseminate this interpretation to local colleges, system partners, and the ACCJC:

Faculty are responsible for using the results of the assessment of student learning to participate in college processes to evaluate student achievement at the course, discipline, and college-wide scale as appropriate. ~~Faculty should engage in professional growth and development that improves teaching and learning.~~ The effective participation of faculty in these collegial processes may be a factor in the evaluation of faculty; however, the results of assessments of learning outcomes are not a basis for faculty evaluation.

Contact: Stephanie Curry, Reedley College, Area A

² This paper is found at http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/AccreditationPaper_0.pdf

³This resolution is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/opposition-using-slos-faculty-evaluation>

2.02 F14 Accreditation Evaluation Teams and Commission Actions

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges values the peer review process as a mechanism for reflective evaluation and improvement⁴;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges believes the recommendations of an accreditation evaluation team, with appropriate faculty representation, should be the primary basis for evaluation; and

Whereas, The recent revelation reported in the August 28, 2014 edition of the *Los Angeles Times*⁵ that the 2012 action of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges to place City College of San Francisco (CCSF) on “show cause” status did not align with the recommendation of the evaluation team to place CCSF on probation;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges collaborate with its system partners to urge the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges to provide comprehensive training to its evaluation teams that is of such depth and scope that the recommendations of evaluation teams will normally serve as the primary basis for a college’s evaluation; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges collaborate with its system partners to urge the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges to provide transparent justifications for its actions when they are not congruent with the evaluation team’s recommendations.

Contact: ASCCC Executive Committee

7.01 F14 Restructure the FON to Include Noncredit Faculty

⁴ Resolution 2.01 F13: <http://www.asccc.org/resolutions/asccc-statement-accreditation>

⁵<http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-sf-city-college-20140822-story.html>

Whereas, Noncredit instruction is included in the mission of California Community Colleges because “The provision of noncredit adult education curricula in areas defined as being in the state’s interest is an essential and important function of the community colleges” (California Education Code §66010.4), and noncredit instruction serves some of the state’s most at-risk and needy students;

Whereas, 95% of noncredit instruction in California community colleges is taught by part-time faculty⁶ whose part-time status denies them full participation in college planning and governance discussions, and noncredit students are often deprived of full access to services such as instructor office hours, thereby negatively impacting their opportunities for academic success and advancement;

Whereas, The Faculty Obligation Number (FON) omits the inclusion of full-time noncredit instructional faculty, thus creating a disincentive to hiring full-time noncredit faculty, yet simply adding full-time noncredit faculty to the FON without further recalculation would have a negative effect on hiring requirements for full-time credit faculty; and

Whereas, The pending increase of funding for Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) noncredit instruction to a level equal to that of credit instruction in 2015-2016⁷ provides numerous opportunities that could enable greater student success, opportunities that will not be fully embraced by districts while the disincentive established by the FON to hiring full-time noncredit faculty remains;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office and other system partners to restructure the calculation of the Faculty Obligation Number (FON) in a manner that includes full-time noncredit faculty without diminishing the requirements for hiring full-time credit faculty.

Contact: Candace Lynch-Thompson, School of Continuing Education, Noncredit Committee

9.01 F14 Local Degrees for Transfer and General Education Requirements

⁶Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2009). Noncredit instruction: Opportunity and challenge, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved September 20, 2014 from http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/noncredit-instruction09_0.pdf.

⁷Education Finance: Education Omnibus Trailer Bill, Cal. Senate B. 860 (2013–14), Chapter 34 (Cal. Statue §84750.5).

Whereas, The mandate of using only the California State University (CSU) Breadth or Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) patterns for a local degree⁸ that has the local program goal of transfer began with the 5th edition of Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH), with the result that a local degree with a program goal of transfer will not be approved by the Chancellor's Office if a college uses its local general education pattern;

Whereas, Title 5 §55063(b)(1) states that “Students receiving an associate degree shall complete a minimum of 18 semester or 27 quarter units of general education coursework which includes a minimum of three semester or four quarter units in each of the Natural Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, Language and Rationality” and that “The remainder of the unit requirement is also to be selected from among these four divisions of learning or as determined by local option”;

Whereas, The 5th edition of the PCAH conflicts with Title 5 §55063(b)(1) by improperly mandating the use of only CSU Breadth or IGETC general education patterns for local degrees that have the program goal of transfer; and

Whereas, Limiting students to completing the CSU Breadth or IGETC patterns in order to receive a local degree erodes local control of degree creation and local degree requirements and may result in the student having to accumulate extra units or transfer without receiving a local degree that would otherwise be obtained, which may significantly limit the ability of students to transfer to institutions other than CSU or the University of California;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Colleges assert to the Chancellor’s Office that students should be able to choose the general education patterns that best serve their educational goals, regardless of the program goal associated with a local degree as reported to the Chancellor’s Office in the Curriculum Inventory; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to revise the Program and Course Approval Handbook in order to eliminate the mandate that only the CSU Breadth or IGETC patterns for a local degree that has the local program goal of transfer may be used and to ensure that Title 5 §55063(b)(1) is followed.

Contact: Ginni May, Sacramento City College, Curriculum Committee

⁸Any associate degree that a college offers that is not an Associate Degree for Transfer (non-ADT)

Note: See Appendix B for excerpts from the 3rd, 4th and 5th editions of the *Program and Course Approval Handbook*.

http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Appendix%20B%20Excerpts%20from%20the%20PCAH_0.docx

13.01 F14 Improving Student Success Through Compliance with the 75/25 Ratio

Whereas, The California Legislature stated in AB 1725 (Vasconcellos, 1988) that “If the community colleges are to respond creatively to the challenges of the coming decades, they must have a strong and stable core of full-time faculty with long-term commitments to their colleges”;

Whereas, The full-time/part-time faculty ratio since 1993 has, statewide, steadily declined from 63.2%/36.8%⁹ to 56.14%/43.86% in 2013¹⁰;

Whereas, Research shows that increased reliance on part-time faculty correlates with declining graduation rates, particularly at public comprehensive institutions¹¹, and that community college graduation rates decrease as the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty employed decreases¹²;and

Whereas, The successful implementation of mandated programs such as the Basic Skills Initiative, Student Success and Support Programs, and Student Equity Plans requires sufficient numbers of full-time faculty;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in consultation with its system partners, support actions, including possible legislation, that ensure progress toward the statutory goal that 75% of credit courses offered be taught by full-time faculty, excluding overload assignments.

⁹From The Use of Part-Time Faculty in the California Community Colleges: Issues and Impact, adopted by the body Spring 1996, p.6 (http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/UsePartTime_0.pdf)

¹⁰From the Chancellor’s Office 2013 Full-time Faculty Obligation compliance report

¹¹In 2005, Ronald G. Ehrenberg, director of the Cornell Higher Education Research Institute (Conference presentation reported in Chronicle of Higher Education).

¹²Daniel Jacoby and Harry Bridges. "Effects of Part-Time Faculty Employment on Community College Graduation Rates." Journal of Higher Education November 2006.

Contact: Phil Crawford, Executive Committee, Educational Policies Committee

+13.01.01 F14 Amend 13.01 F14

Amend the resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in consultation with its system partners, support actions and ongoing funding, including possible legislation, that ensure progress toward the statutory goal that 75% of credit courses offered be taught by full-time faculty, excluding overload assignments.

Contact: Fran Chandler, Santa Monica College, Area C

+13.01.02 F14 Amend 13.01 F14

Amend the resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in consultation with its system partners, support actions, ~~including possible legislation,~~ that ensure progress toward the statutory goal that 75% of credit courses offered be taught by full-time faculty, excluding overload assignments.

Contact: Richard Mahon, Riverside City College, Area D

17.01 F14 Consulting Collegially with Local Senates on Participation in Statewide Initiatives

Whereas, The Chancellor's Office launched three major grant-funded initiatives in Fall 2013, with those initiatives being the Education Planning, Common Assessment, and the Online Education Initiatives;

Whereas, Participation in each of these initiatives has implications for local senate purview over academic and professional matters at college campuses, including but not limited to curriculum, educational program development, policies or standards for student preparation and success, faculty professional development and institutional planning processes; and

Whereas, Participation in the initiatives may lead governing boards and their designees to believe that local senate purview over academic and professional matters does not apply to matters related to college participation in any of the phases of these initiatives, or to any future statewide initiative that encompasses academic and professional matters;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges affirm that college or district participation in any of the current or future statewide initiatives does not nullify local senate purview over academic and professional matters;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor's Office to remind governing boards and their designees that they must engage in collegial consultation with local senates before and during participation in any current or future statewide initiatives which encompass academic and professional matters; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to focus on the educational needs of their students and the professional needs of their faculty when deciding whether or not to recommend to their governing boards and/or designees participation in any current or future statewide initiative.

Contact: John Freitas, Executive Committee

17.02 F14 Faculty Primacy in Distance Education Instructional Programs and Student Services

Whereas, The academic and professional matters identified in Title 5 §53200, including, but not limited to, curriculum development, approval policies, and procedures; educational program development; faculty professional development policies; student success policies; and institutional planning processes are matters of faculty primacy equally vital to ensuring the development and delivery of both quality in-person and distance education instructional programs and student services that promote educational success for faculty and students;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommends in its paper *Ensuring the Appropriate Use of Educational Technology: An Update for Local Academic Senates* (adopted Spring 2008)¹³ that “colleges should create a committee structure that ensures that the incorporation of

¹³ This paper is found at http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Educational_Technology_0.pdf

technology into the college is initiated and proceeds from an educational perspective rather than a technological perspective” and “colleges should ensure that their technology infrastructure provides support that promotes educational success for faculty and students”; and

Whereas, The provision of college and district distance education instructional programs and student services may be viewed by some colleges as purely an operational matter, which may result in misunderstandings about the necessary oversight role of college participatory governance structures, and about the requirements for collegial consultation with local academic senates on academic and professional matters in the development of policies and procedures for the development and delivery of quality college and district distance education instructional programs and student services;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges affirm that requirements for collegial consultation on academic and professional matters fully apply to college and district distance education instructional programs and student services; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support local academic senates in their efforts to assert to their governing boards and designees that faculty primacy over academic and professional matters applies fully to college and district distance education instructional programs and student services.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Executive Committee, Online Education Committee