



**Academic Senate  
for California Community Colleges**

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

# 46<sup>th</sup> 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  
Debbie Klein, Gavilan College, Area B  
Michelle Sampat, Mt. San Antonio College, Area C

## RESOLUTIONS PROCESS OVERVIEW

In order to assure that deliberations are organized, effective, and meaningful, the Academic Senate uses the following resolution procedure:

- Pre-session resolutions are developed by the Executive Committee (through its committees) and submitted to the Pre-Session Area Meetings for review.
- Amendments and new pre-session resolutions are generated in the Area Meetings.
- The Resolutions Committee meets to review all pre-session resolutions and combine, re-word, append, or render moot these resolutions as necessary.
- Members of the Senate meet during the session in topic breakouts and give thoughtful consideration to the need for new resolutions and/or amendments.
- After all Session presentations are finished each day, members meet during the resolution breakouts to discuss the need for new resolutions and/or amendments. Each resolution or amendment must be submitted to the Resolutions Chair before the posted deadlines each day. There are also Area meetings at the Session for discussing, writing, and amending resolutions.
- New resolutions submitted on the second day of session are held to the next session unless the resolution is declared urgent by the Executive Committee.
- The Resolutions Committee meets again to review all resolutions and amendments and to combine, re-word, append, or render moot the resolutions as necessary.
- The resolutions are debated and voted upon in the general sessions on the last day of the Plenary Session.

Prior to plenary session, it is each attendee's responsibility to read the following documents:

- Senate Delegate Roles and Responsibilities
- Plenary Session Resolution Procedures
- Resolution Writing and General Advice

New delegates are strongly encouraged to attend the New Delegate Orientation on Thursday morning prior to the first breakout session.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

The resolutions that have been placed on the Consent Calendar 1) were believed to be noncontroversial, 2) do not potentially reverse a previous position and 3) do not compete with another proposed resolution. Resolutions that meet these criteria and any subsequent clarifying amendments have been included on the Consent Calendar. To remove a resolution from the Consent Calendar, please see the Consent Calendar section of the *Resolution Procedures for the Plenary Session*.

\* Consent calendar resolutions in the packet

+ Resolution or amendment submitted at pre-session Area meetings October 24-25, 2014

- 1.01 F14 Adopt the Resolutions Handbook
- +7.03 F14 Aligning State Reporting Deadlines With Academic Calendars
- 9.02 F14 Reporting Data on Low Unit Certificates
- 9.03 F14 Reinstating Local Approval of Stand-Alone Courses
- 9.06 F14 Update the paper The Course Outline of Record: A Curriculum Reference Guide
- 10.01 F14 Revise the Paper Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications
- 12.01 F14 Professional Development and the Academic Senate
- 12.02 F14 Professional Development and Part-Time Faculty
- 12.03 F14 Faculty Professional Development

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|             |  |           |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| <b>1.0</b>  | <b>ACADEMIC SENATE</b> .....   | <b>1</b>  |
|             | *1.01 F14 Adopt the Resolutions Handbook.....  | 1         |
|             | +1.02 F14 Establish a Part-Time Representative Seat on the Executive<br>Committee .....  | 1         |
| <b>2.0</b>  | <b>ACCREDITATION</b> .....   | <b>2</b>  |
|             | 2.01 F14 Student Learning Outcomes and Faculty Evaluations.....  | 2         |
|             | +2.01.01 F14Amend 2.01 F14 .....   | 3         |
|             | 2.02 F14 Accreditation Evaluation Teams and Commission Actions .....   | 4         |
| <b>7.0</b>  | <b>CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE</b> .....   | <b>4</b>  |
|             | 7.01 F14 Restructure the FON to Include Noncredit Faculty .....  | 4         |
|             | 7.02 F14 ASCCC Involvement in the California Community College<br>Institutional Effectiveness and Technical Assistance Program .....                       | 5         |
|             | +*7.03 F14 Aligning State Reporting Deadlines With Academic<br>Calendars .....   | 6         |
| <b>9.0</b>  | <b>CURRICULUM</b> .....  | <b>7</b>  |
|             | 9.01 F14 Local Degrees for Transfer and General Education Requirements .....   | 7         |
|             | *9.02 F14 Reporting Data on Low Unit Certificates .....  | 8         |
|             | *9.03 F14 Reinstating Local Approval of Stand-Alone Courses .....  | 8         |
|             | 9.04 F14 Faculty Inclusion in Development and Implementation of<br>Community College Baccalaureate Degrees .....   | 9         |
|             | +9.04.01 F14Amend 9.04 F14 .....   | 10        |
|             | 9.05 F14 General Education Patterns for Community College Baccalaureate<br>Degrees .....   | 10        |
|             | *9.06 F14 Update the paper The Course Outline of Record: A Curriculum<br>Reference Guide .....   | 11        |
|             | 9.07 F14 Secure Funding to Develop C-ID Course Descriptors for College<br>Preparation Courses .....  | 11        |
| <b>10.0</b> | <b>DISCIPLINES LIST</b> .....  | <b>12</b> |
|             | *10.01 F14 Revise the Paper Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications.....   | 12        |
| <b>12.0</b> | <b>FACULTY DEVELOPMENT</b> .....   | <b>12</b> |
|             | *12.01 F14 Professional Development and the Academic Senate .....  | 12        |
|             | *12.02 F14 Professional Development and Part-Time Faculty .....  | 13        |
|             | *12.03 F14 Faculty Professional Development.....   | 14        |
|             | 12.04 F14 Using Anticipated Savings from Adopting the Common Course<br>Management System to Support Online Faculty Professional<br>Development Needs ..... | 14        |
| <b>13.0</b> | <b>GENERAL CONCERNS</b> .....  | <b>15</b> |
|             | 13.01 F14 Improving Student Success Through Compliance with the 75/25<br>Ratio .....   | 15        |
|             | +13.01.01 F14Amend 13.01 F14.....  | 16        |
|             | +13.01.02 F14Amend 13.01 F14.....  | 16        |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**17.0 LOCAL SENATES ..... 16**  
17.01 F14 Consulting Collegially with Local Senates on Participation in .....  
Statewide Initiatives.....16  
17.02 F14 Faculty Primacy in Distance Education Instructional Programs and  
Student Services .....17

**20.0 STUDENTS ..... 18**  
20.01 F14 Developing a System Plan for Serving Disenfranchised .....  
Students .....18

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

### **1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE**

#### **\*1.01 F14 Adopt the Resolutions Handbook**

Whereas, The work of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is directed by resolutions adopted by the body at fall and spring plenary sessions;

Whereas, Four Academic Senate documents currently exist regarding the resolutions process, two of which are public and distributed to the body prior to plenary sessions (“Resolution Writing and General Advice” and the “Plenary Session Resolutions Procedures”) and two of which are internal Executive Committee documents (“Resolutions Philosophy, Procedures and Process,” adopted by the Executive Committee in June 2012, and the “Resolutions Committee Manual,” approved by the Executive Committee in December 2008);

Whereas, At its January 2014 meeting the Executive Committee approved the Resolutions Committee’s recommendation to compile the existing Academic Senate resolutions documents into a handbook that provides a single, comprehensive source of information to the field, including information on the role of the Executive Committee and Resolutions Committee, about the resolutions process; and

Whereas, The Resolutions Committee drafted a Resolutions Handbook that consolidates all of the Senate’s internal and public resolutions documents;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the Resolutions Handbook as the official document of its resolution development and writing process that replaces all previous resolutions process documents, effective immediately upon its adoption by the body.

Contact: John Freitas, Executive Committee, Resolutions Committee

Note: The draft Resolutions Handbook is found in Appendix A  
[http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/resolution-handbook\\_0.pdf](http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/resolution-handbook_0.pdf)

#### **+1.02 F14 Establish a Part-Time Representative Seat on the Executive Committee**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges represents all faculty currently teaching at our California community colleges, serving as the voice of all faculty in academic and professional matters;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strengthens and supports all local California community college academic senates, many of which currently have part-time faculty designated seats or representatives, and supports diversity and equal opportunity for all faculty;

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

Whereas, Part-time faculty comprise a majority of academic faculty in the California Community College System, and simple democracy would dictate that the majority retain some degree of permanent representation; and

Whereas, Part-time faculty retain some very specific viewpoints and knowledge within the California Community College System which should be included in the governance structure for the healthy functioning of the system;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges bring to the body for consideration at the Spring 2015 plenary session an amendment to its bylaws to establish a permanent, designated seat on the Executive Committee to be filled specifically and exclusively by part-time faculty.

Contact: Phil Crawford, San Jose City College, Area B

Note: This resolution requires a two-thirds vote in the affirmative of delegates voting. It seeks to reverse the established Academic Senate position on this matter in its position paper *Participation of Part-Time Faculty on the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges* (p.15), adopted by the body Fall 1998. [http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/PartTime\\_Exec\\_0.pdf](http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/PartTime_Exec_0.pdf)

### **2.0 ACCREDITATION**

#### **2.01 F14 Student Learning Outcomes and Faculty Evaluations**

Whereas, Standard III A.6 of the Accreditation Standards<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup>[http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Accreditation\\_Standards\\_Adopted\\_June\\_2014.pdf](http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Accreditation_Standards_Adopted_June_2014.pdf)

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

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: 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*<sup>2</sup>, 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”<sup>3</sup>;

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

---

<sup>2</sup> This paper is found at [http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/AccreditationPaper\\_0.pdf](http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/AccreditationPaper_0.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> This 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 improvement<sup>4</sup>;

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*<sup>5</sup> 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

## **7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE**

### **7.01 F14 Restructure the FON to Include Noncredit Faculty**

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 faculty<sup>6</sup> 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

---

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

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

<sup>6</sup> Academic 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](http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/noncredit-instruction09_0.pdf).

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

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 2015-2016<sup>7</sup> 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

### **7.02 F14 ASCCC Involvement in the California Community College Institutional Effectiveness and Technical Assistance Program**

Whereas, In September 2014 the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office issued a Request for Applications (RFA) for a new California Community College Institutional Effectiveness and Technical Assistance Program "for the benefit of all California Community Colleges and Students" with a goal of "develop[ing] and manage[ing] a comprehensive technical assistance program to enhance institutional effectiveness and further student success";

Whereas, The RFA for the Institutional Effectiveness and Technical Assistance Program solicits a community college district to serve as fiscal agent for the program and states that the grant recipient "will be responsible solely for handling the creation, fiscal and logistical needs, and the evaluation and expansion of the program" but does not at any point require the grant recipient to consult or coordinate with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges;

Whereas, The RFA states that the primary areas in which the program will provide technical assistance are accreditation status, fiscal viability, student performance and outcomes, and programmatic compliance with state and federal guidelines and that the grant recipient will "establish a network of content experts" to help provide assistance in these areas to districts; and

Whereas, Three of the four areas in which the program will provide technical assistance — accreditation status, fiscal viability, student performance and outcomes — are related to the

---

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

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

Academic Senate's purview over academic and professional matters, and the Academic Senate should be the content expert to provide assistance in the area of student performance and outcomes;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request of and strongly urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to require the recipient of the Institutional Effectiveness and Technical Assistance Program Grant to contract directly with the Academic Senate regarding technical assistance in the areas of student performance and outcomes and to consult appropriately with the Academic Senate regarding technical assistance in the areas of accreditation status and fiscal viability.

Contact: Julie Bruno, Executive Committee

### **+\*7.03 F14    Aligning State Reporting Deadlines With Academic Calendars**

Whereas, Colleges are required, per Education Code, to allow effective participation by staff and students in college governance and to collegially consult with the faculty through academic senates, which includes allowing for sufficient vetting of critical documents and reports through college governance structures;

Whereas, Most, if not all, academic senates do not meet during the summer, most faculty who are not on special assignments are not required to work during the summer, and therefore academic senates cannot deliberate and act on critical matters until the fall semester resumes;

Whereas, State-mandated reports that are directly tied to a college's funding are often revised during the summer to include additional reporting elements, making accurate data gathering and review through college governance bodies and academic senates nearly impossible to conclude in a timely manner, particularly if governing board approval is required, when report submission dates are set during the fall term; and

Whereas, The legislative and academic calendars are not aligned, yet the legislature expects funds to be spent during the fiscal year;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor's Office to align the distribution of state reporting documents and state reporting deadlines with academic calendars; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with its system partners and the Chancellor's Office to establish reasonable and workable deadlines for submission of all reports related to academic and professional matters that specifically affect college budget allotments.

Contact: Alex Immerblum, Los Angeles Community College District, Area C

## **9.0 CURRICULUM**

### **9.01 F14 Local Degrees for Transfer and General Education Requirements**

Whereas, The mandate of using only the California State University (CSU) Breadth or Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) patterns for a local degree<sup>8</sup> that has the local program goal of transfer began with the 5<sup>th</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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

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

[http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Appendix%20B%20Excerpts%20from%20the%20PCAH\\_0.docx](http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Appendix%20B%20Excerpts%20from%20the%20PCAH_0.docx)

---

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

**\*9.02 F14 Reporting Data on Low Unit Certificates**

Whereas, Title 5 §§55070-55072 allow colleges to create certificates of less than 18 units, with those between 12 and 18 units eligible for submission at the option of the district to the Chancellor's Office for approval as Certificates of Achievement, while those below 12 units may not be submitted for such approval but may be conferred on students as a recognition of reaching an academic goal; and

Whereas, Many of these low-unit certificates are not reported into the system data-gathering records and therefore are not counted in the state's reporting, contributing to a failure to tell the full story about student success and completion in California's community colleges;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage colleges to report optional data for all certificate awards, including certificates of less than 12 units, to more comprehensively and accurately demonstrate student success in California's community colleges.

Contact: Cheryl Aschenbach, Lassen College, Curriculum Committee

**\*9.03 F14 Reinstating Local Approval of Stand-Alone Courses**

Whereas, Assembly Bill (AB) 1943 (Nava, 2006) amended California Education Code §§70901-70902 to allow California community college districts to offer credit courses that are not part of an approved educational program (stand-alone credit courses), requiring approval only by local curriculum committees and district governing boards and eliminating the requirement for approval by the Chancellor's Office for the period Fall 2007 through December 31, 2012;

Whereas, The extension of local approval of credit stand-alone courses until January 1, 2014, authorized by AB 1029 (Lara, 2011) expired, removing the authority to approve credit stand-alone courses from local curriculum committees and governing boards and returning this authority to the Chancellor's Office, which has created a backlog of curriculum review and approval; and

Whereas, The removal of approval authority for stand-alone courses from local curriculum committees and governing boards prevents colleges from responding to emerging community needs in a timely manner;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor's Office to sponsor new legislation that would return stand-alone course approval authority to local curriculum committees and district governing boards; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend to the Chancellor's Office that guidelines that provide colleges with instructions and effective practices for local approval of stand-alone courses be developed in consultation with the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum and the Academic Senate.

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

Contact: Sofia Ramirez Gelpi, Allan Hancock College, Curriculum Committee

**9.04 F14 Faculty Inclusion in Development and Implementation of Community College Baccalaureate Degrees**

Whereas, On September 29, 2014, the governor signed Senate Bill (SB) 850 (Block, 2014), authorizing a baccalaureate degree pilot program in which 15 community colleges in 15 separate districts can be authorized to develop and offer one baccalaureate degree if that degree is not offered by any California State University (CSU) or University of California (UC) campus;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges had previously taken a position opposing the community college baccalaureate degrees, but now that SB 850 been passed by the legislature and signed by the governor, the Academic Senate should participate in the implementation of the pilot in order to ensure the protection of faculty purview and the highest quality programs for students;

Whereas, Numerous questions regarding the implementation of the community college baccalaureate degrees remain to be answered before implementation can take place, including but not limited to questions regarding instructors' minimum qualifications, articulation of upper division courses, determinations of similar programs at the university level, upper division general education, and appropriate funding; and

Whereas, The implementation of the baccalaureate degree pilot program may have significant implications for the CSU and UC systems as well as for the community college system, and thus faculty from all three segments should be included in the implementation process in order that all implementation issues are addressed and resolved clearly and successfully;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to ensure that community college faculty are appropriately represented on all task forces and other bodies involved with the development and implementation of the community college baccalaureate degree pilot program; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request of the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office that appropriate faculty representation from the California State University and University of California segments be included on task forces and other bodies involved with the implementation of the community college baccalaureate degree pilot program.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Executive Committee

**+9.04.01 F14 Amend 9.04 F14**

Add a third resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges collaborate with the Chancellor's Office to establish parameters and standards for the California Community College Baccalaureate Degree before any degree is offered to students.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Mt. San Antonio College, Area C

**9.05 F14 General Education Patterns for Community College Baccalaureate Degrees**

Whereas, Senate Bill (SB) 850 (Block, 2014)<sup>9</sup> creates a baccalaureate degree pilot program that authorizes the creation of one baccalaureate degree per college if that degree is not offered by any California State University (CSU) or University of California (UC) campus;

Whereas, The CSU Executive Order 1065 (General Education Breadth Requirements)<sup>10</sup> mandates that "At least nine of these semester units or twelve of these quarter units must be upper-division level, taken no sooner than the term in which upper-division status (completion of 60 semester units or 90 quarter units) is attained"; and

Whereas, No perceived difference should exist between the quality of a baccalaureate degree offered by the California community colleges and those offered in any other segment of the California higher education system;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) to define the expectations for lower division and upper division general education course work and communicate the expectations for transfer general education and non-transfer general education; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and other relevant constituencies to ensure that any baccalaureate degree created in the California community colleges must include upper division general education requirements comparable with those offered by the California State University.

Contact: Rich Cameron, Cerritos College, Curriculum Committee

---

<sup>9</sup> Public Postsecondary Education: Community College Districts: Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program, Cal. Senate B. 850 (2013–14), Chapter 747 (§§78040-78043)

<sup>10</sup>CSU Executive Order 1065 (2011) is found at <http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1065.html>

**\*9.06 F14 Update the paper The Course Outline of Record: A Curriculum Reference Guide**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted the paper *The Course Outline of Record: A Curriculum Reference Guide*<sup>11</sup> in Spring 2008 and has not updated it since; and

Whereas, Numerous changes to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office curriculum requirements have occurred since Spring 2008;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update *The Course Outline of Record: A Curriculum Reference Guide* to more accurately reflect the current curriculum processes, guidelines, and requirements and present it for adoption at the Spring 2016 Plenary Session.

Contact: Ginni May, Sacramento City College, Curriculum Committee

**9.07 F14 Secure Funding to Develop C-ID Course Descriptors for College Preparation Courses**

Whereas, Statewide efforts are currently underway to align and integrate instruction for college preparation, including credit basic skills, noncredit basic skills, adult education, regional occupational programs, and both public and private K-12 education;

Whereas, The various approaches to college preparation lead to inconsistent expectations and standards across these systems, often causing incoming college students to be placed in lower levels before embarking on transfer-level study;

Whereas, Course Identification Numbering (C-ID) System course descriptors establish broad minimum expectations for a course and define the expectations for student achievement and success, and thus developing C-ID descriptors for the top pre-transfer level courses would provide a means for these systems to voluntarily adopt common curricular expectations for students entering into college; and

Whereas, The California Community College System and the State of California have not allocated sufficient resources to coordinate and support the efforts required to develop C-ID descriptors for pre-transfer level basic skills education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with college preparation stakeholders to secure funding for the development, submission, and review of C-ID course descriptors for levels below transfer in order to establish consistent curricular expectations and pathways for California's pre-transfer level students.

---

<sup>11</sup> This paper is found at [http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Curriculum-paper\\_0.pdf](http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Curriculum-paper_0.pdf)



## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

Contact: Leigh Anne Shaw, Skyline College, Noncredit Committee

### 10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST

#### **\*10.01 F14 Revise the Paper Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications**

Whereas, Education Code §87359(b) states that local academic senates are responsible for developing procedures for evaluating and determining equivalency to minimum qualifications by joint agreement with their governing boards;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted Resolutions 10.06 S07, 10.01 S09, 10.02 F09, and 10.11 S11<sup>12</sup>, which call for further guidance on equivalency through such actions as the development of criteria and standards and the presentation of model practices for determining equivalence to minimum qualifications by establishing eminence;

Whereas, Numerous breakout sessions held at plenary sessions since 2006 on minimum qualifications and equivalency have included discussions and requests for assistance regarding eminence, criteria, and model practices; and

Whereas, The paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications* was last revised in 2006<sup>13</sup>;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges survey the field to identify local practices for establishing equivalence to minimum qualifications, including the use of eminence; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges revise the paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications* and bring it to the body for adoption at the Spring 2016 Plenary Session.

Contact: Paul Setziol, De Anza College, Standards and Practices Committee

### 12.0 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

#### **\*12.01F14 Professional Development and the Academic Senate**

Whereas, The academic and professional matters identified in Title 5 §53200 include “faculty professional development policies” as an area that falls under the purview of local academic senates and by extension, at the state level, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges;

Whereas, The Board of Governors Standing Orders<sup>14</sup>§332 (b) states, “The appointment of faculty to councils, committees, and task forces established in conjunction with Consultation to deal

---

<sup>12</sup> All adopted resolutions are found at <http://asccc.org/resources/resolutions>

<sup>13</sup> This paper is found at [http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Equivalency\\_2006\\_0.pdf](http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Equivalency_2006_0.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> *Procedures and Standing Orders of the Board of Governors*, January 2013, pp. II-27 to II-28 ([http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2013\\_agendas/january/updated\\_procedures\\_standing\\_orders\\_2013.pdf](http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2013_agendas/january/updated_procedures_standing_orders_2013.pdf))

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

with academic and professional matters on the system-wide level shall be made by the Academic Senate”;

Whereas, The Online Education and the Common Assessment Initiatives have identified faculty professional development components and appointed faculty and selected colleges which are leading these components without consultation with the Academic Senate or, in some cases, the local academic senates; and

Whereas, The presence of faculty on these initiatives does not equate with the participation of either the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges or local academic senates;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert to statewide initiative leaders the importance of respecting the purview of the Academic Senate and local senates regarding faculty professional development; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office and other system partners to ensure that the Board of Governors’ Standing Orders are respected and that all future assignments in the area of faculty professional development involve input and affirmation from the Academic Senate and local senates.

Contact: Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, Mt. San Jacinto College, Professional Development Committee

**\*12.02 F14 Professional Development and Part-Time Faculty**

Whereas, Professional development benefits all faculty, regardless of discipline, position, or college;

Whereas, Professional development opportunities for part-time faculty can be limited or even non-existent in many districts; and

Whereas, Part-time faculty are able to contribute to professional development activities in many ways, including bringing a variety of perspectives and experiences to the college;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to extend and promote professional development opportunities to all faculty at their colleges, regardless of full- or part-time status.

Contact: Arnita Porter, West Los Angeles College, Professional Development Committee

**\*12.03 F14 Faculty Professional Development**

Whereas, The passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 2558 (Williams, 2014)<sup>15</sup> establishes a new structure for professional development at the California community colleges, creating a new Community College Professional Development Program for professional development opportunities for faculty, administration, and staff;

Whereas, Funding for professional development would only be allocated to districts which submit affidavits demonstrating that the district has established a professional development advisory committee (comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators), that the district has a completed campus human resources development plan which covers the current and subsequent years, and that the district provides a report of the actual expenditures for faculty and staff development for the preceding year;

Whereas, The academic and professional matters identified in Title 5 §53200 include “faculty professional development policies” as an area which falls under the purview of local senates; and

Whereas, The new legislation has no provision specifically naming local senates as a body that should, as stated in Title 5, be involved in the development of faculty professional development policies, including the dissemination of any funds forthcoming from AB 2558 (Williams, 2014);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges remind local senate leaders of their rights and responsibilities for involvement in the development of faculty professional development policies, including the use of potential funding provided by AB 2558 (Williams, 2014); and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide opportunities and information to local senate leaders regarding faculty professional development and its role at their colleges.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Executive Committee, Professional Development Committee

**12.04 F14 Using Anticipated Savings from Adopting the Common Course Management System to Support Online Faculty Professional Development Needs**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) has proposed that if the system could purchase a Common Course Management System (CCMS) for distance education courses throughout the state it would provide an “economy of scale” allowing this course management system to be provided at little or no cost to colleges and districts;

---

<sup>15</sup> Community Colleges: Faculty and Staff Development, Cal. Assembly B. 2558 (2013–14), Chapter 473 (§§87150-87152)

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

Whereas, The CCCCO is hopeful that a potentially significant migration to a CCMS would provide the system leverage to create or purchase a system that exceeds those course management systems currently on the market;

Whereas, While the adoption of a CCMS would be optional for local colleges, local senates and faculty potentially could feel great pressure to adopt this system because of anticipated budgetary savings arising from migration to the CCMS; and

Whereas, A conversion between course management systems without careful forethought may result in unanticipated financial and personnel costs for the college and place burdens upon faculty, including but not limited to training in the new system, and conversion of course materials, assignments, and other materials into the new system;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates and bargaining units to work with their administrations to ensure that any monetary savings which may result from a district or college transitioning to a Common Course Management System (CCMS) be used primarily to support the professional development needs of distance education faculty making the transition to the new CCMS.

Contact: Kale Braden, Executive Committee, Online Education Committee

### **13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS**

#### **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%<sup>16</sup> to 56.14%/43.86% in 2013<sup>17</sup>;

Whereas, Research shows that increased reliance on part-time faculty correlates with declining graduation rates, particularly at public comprehensive institutions<sup>18</sup>, and that community college graduation rates decrease as the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty employed decreases<sup>19</sup>; 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;

---

<sup>16</sup>From 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](http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/UsePartTime_0.pdf))

<sup>17</sup>From the Chancellor’s Office 2013 Full-time Faculty Obligation compliance report

<sup>18</sup>In 2005, Ronald G. Ehrenberg, director of the Cornell Higher Education Research Institute (Conference presentation reported in Chronicle of Higher Education).

<sup>19</sup>Daniel Jacoby and Harry Bridges. "Effects of Part-Time Faculty Employment on Community College Graduation Rates." Journal of Higher Education November 2006.

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

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: 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

## **17.0 LOCAL SENATES**

### **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;

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

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)<sup>20</sup> that “colleges should create a committee structure that ensures that the incorporation of 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;

---

<sup>20</sup> This paper is found at [http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Educational\\_Technology\\_0.pdf](http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Educational_Technology_0.pdf)

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2014

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

### **20.0 STUDENTS**

#### **20.01 F14 Developing a System Plan for Serving Disenfranchised Students**

Whereas, California's community colleges serve a diverse population of students, some of whom are attempting to achieve academic goals while their emotional and environmental circumstances disenfranchise them from engaging in normal societal privileges and activities;

Whereas, These disenfranchised students may be homeless, may be suffering from untreated medical and mental ailments, may not have steady income or transportation, and are often highly disinclined to allow themselves to be identified as being in need of support because the common characteristic among these students is that they exist in a constant state of threat and fear;

Whereas, California's community colleges are already overburdened with mandates to provide education plans for each of their students without sufficient resources and are underprepared and underfunded to provide the extensive services required by these disenfranchised students with greater needs; and

Whereas, The California Community College System has established no future plans to provide the services that these disenfranchised students so badly need;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and Board of Governors to develop a long range plan that will increase services to the growing population of disenfranchised students.

Contact: Cynthia Rico, Executive Committee, Transfer and Articulation Committee