



**Academic Senate  
for California Community Colleges**

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

# **46<sup>th</sup> SPRING SESSION RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION**

***Thursday, April 10, 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 Spring Plenary Session held April 10-12, 2014, in San Francisco.*

## Resolutions Committee 2013-2014

John Freitas, Los Angeles City College, Chair  
Julie Adams, ASCCC, Executive Director  
Randy Beach, Southwestern College, Area D  
Kenneth Bearden, Butte College, Area A  
Dolores Davison, Foothill College, Area B  
Michelle Grimes-Hillman, 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 RESOLUTIONS

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 are marked with a \*

+ Resolution or amendment submitted at pre-session Area meetings March 21-22, 2014

- 1.02 S14 Insert the Phrase “Promotes Academic Excellence” in the ASCCC Mission Statement
- +1.02.01 S14 Amend Resolution 1.02 S14
- 1.03 S14 Adopt the *Guidelines for the Periodic Review of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges* and *Periodic Review of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Review Criteria*
- +1.03.01 S14 Amend Resolution 1.03 S14
- 2.02 S14 Submitting Proposed Revisions to the *2014 First Reading Draft of the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards Through Written and Oral Testimony to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)*
- +5.01 S14 Oppose Flexibility Allowances Provided in the January Governor's Budget
- +5.02 S14 Endorse Funding for Full-Time Faculty and Addressing Issues with the FON
- 7.01 S14 Participation in State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (SARA) for Distance Education Offerings
- +7.02 S14 Allowing “P” Grades for Courses in the Major for the Associate Degree for Transfer
- +7.03 S14 Ensuring Faculty Intent in the Implementation of Transfer Model Curricula
- +7.04 S14 Immediate Supervision in Foreign Language Labs
- +7.05 S14 Program Review Decision-Making Tools
- 9.01 S14 Academic Senate Involvement in AB 86 Regional Planning Consortia
- +9.01.01 S14 Amend Resolution 9.01 S14
- +9.03 S14 Statewide Curriculum Coordination
- +9.04 S14 Consistency in Data Mart ESL Basic Skills Progress Tracker
- 10.01 S14 Adopt the Discipline List Handbook
- +13.03 S14 Add Established At-Risk Student Groups to Exemptions Under BOG Fee Waiver Policy
- +13.04 S14 Constructive Dialog on the Expectations for Community College Completion
- 14.01 S14 Adopt the Paper *Awarding Credit Where Credit is Due: Effective Practices for the Implementation of Credit by Exam*
- 14.02 S14 Local Use of Available Noncredit Progress Indicators
- +14.02.01 S14 Amend Resolution 14.02 S14

## CONSENT CALENDAR RESOLUTIONS

- +15.01 S14 IGETC for High Unit Majors
- 18.01 S14 Adopt the paper *Multiple Measures in Assessment: The Requirements and Challenges of Multiple Measures in the California Community Colleges*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### **1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE**

+1.01 S14	Election Signatures Discrepancies.....	1
*1.02 S14	Insert the Phrase “Promotes Academic Excellence” in the ASCCC Mission Statement .....	1
+*1.02.01 S14	Amend Resolution 1.02 S14.....	2
*1.03 S14	Adopt the Documents <i>Guidelines for the Periodic Review of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and Periodic Review of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Review Criteria</i> .....	2
+*1.03.01 S14	Amend Resolution 1.03 S14.....	4
+1.04 S14	Applying the Brown Act to Executive Committee Meetings.....	4

### **2.0 ACCREDITATION**

2.01 S14	Modify Title 5 To Allow Colleges To Be Accredited By Any Nationally Recognized Accrediting Agency.....	4
+2.01.01 S14	Amend Resolution 2.01 S14.....	5
*2.02 S14	Submitting Proposed Revisions to the <i>2014 First Reading Draft of the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards Through Written and Oral Testimony to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)</i> .....	5
2.03 S14	Explore Use of Mock Accreditation Site Visits.....	6
+2.03.01 S14	Amend Resolution 2.03 S14.....	7

### **3.0 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/CULTURAL DIVERSITY**

3.01 S14	Infusing Cultural Competence.....	7
+3.01.01 S14	Amend Resolution 3.01 S14.....	8
+3.01.02 S14	Amend Resolution 3.01 S14.....	8

### **5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE**

+*5.01 S14	Oppose Flexibility Allowances Provided in the January Governor's Budget.....	8
+*5.02 S14	Endorse Funding for Full-Time Faculty and Addressing Issues with the FON.....	9

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

*7.01 S14	Participation in State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (SARA) for Distance Education Offerings.....	10
+*7.02 S14	Allowing “P” Grades for Courses in the Major for the Associate Degree for Transfer.....	10
+*7.03 S14	Ensuring Faculty Intent in the Implementation of Transfer Model Curricula.....	11
+*7.04 S14	Immediate Supervision in Foreign Language Labs.....	11
+*7.05 S14	Program Review Decision-Making Tools.....	12

### **9.0 CURRICULUM**

*9.01 S14	Academic Senate Involvement in AB 86 Regional Planning Consortia.....	13
+*9.01.01 S14	Amend Resolution 9.01 S14.....	13
+9.02 S14	Changes to Recent Community College Repeatability Regulations.....	14
+*9.03 S14	Statewide Curriculum Coordination.....	15
+*9.04 S14	Consistency in Data Mart ESL Basic Skills Progress Tracker.....	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST**

\*10.01 S14 Adopt the Discipline List Handbook .....16

**12.0 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

12.01 S14 Consistent and Sustainable Funding for Professional Development.....17

+12.01.01 S14 Amend Resolution 12.01 S14.....18

+12.01.02 S14 Amend Resolution 12.01 S14.....18

12.02 S14 Faculty Professional Development.....18

**13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS**

13.01 S14 Researching the Feasibility of the CCC Bachelor's Degree.....19

+13.01.01 S14 Amend Resolution 13.01 S14.....19

+13.01.02 S14 Amend Resolution 13.01 S14.....20

+13.02 S14 Baccalaureate degrees offered by the California Community Colleges  
and Cooperation with the California State Universities System.....20

+\*13.03 S14 Add Established At-Risk Student Groups to Exemptions  
Under BOG Fee Waiver Policy.....21

+\*13.04 S14 Constructive Dialog on the Expectations for  
Community College Completion.....22

**14.0 GRADING**

\*14.01 S14 Adopt the Paper *Awarding Credit Where Credit is Due:  
Effective Practices for the Implementation of  
Credit by Exam*.....23

\*14.02 S14 Local Use of Available Noncredit Progress Indicators .....24

+\*14.02.01 S14 Amend Resolution 14.02 S14.....24

**15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES**

+\*15.01 S14 IGETC for High Unit Majors.....25

**18.0 MATRICULATION**

\*18.01 S14 Adopt the paper *Multiple Measures in Assessment: The Requirements  
and Challenges of Multiple Measures in the California Community  
Colleges*.....25

\* Consent calendar

+ Resolution or amendment submitted at pre-session Area meetings March 21-22, 2014

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

### **1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE**

#### **+1.01 S14 Election Signatures Discrepancies**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges believes in a fair, democratic, and inclusive election process and that disqualification of a ballot and the corresponding representation that is denied should be kept to a minimum;

Whereas, During the Spring 2013 balloting for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges officers and representatives, a significant number of ballots were disqualified due to signature discrepancies; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognizes that some individuals can vary the strokes of their signatures slightly based on numerous factors;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Elections Chair announce from the podium the names of delegates whose signatures need to be validated and allow up to five minutes for the individuals to report to the Elections Chair to provide validation prior to discarding the ballot and totaling the votes effective Spring 2014.

Contact: Evelyn Lord, Laney College, Area B

**Note:** If Resolution 1.01 S14 as presented is adopted by the delegates, the Elections Rules would be modified immediately and applied to any remaining elections during the 2014 Spring Plenary Session.

#### **\*1.02 S14 Insert the Phrase “Promotes Academic Excellence” in the ASCCC Mission Statement**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is the official representative of all California community college faculty on academic and professional matters, and as that representative is responsible for promoting academic excellence in policy, initiative, consultative situations, to the legislature and Board of Governors, and to the media;

Whereas, The Academic Senate mission currently states<sup>1</sup>:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges fosters the effective participation by community college faculty in all statewide and local academic and professional matters; develops, promotes, and acts upon policies responding to statewide concerns; and serves as the official voice of the faculty of California Community Colleges in academic and professional matters. The Academic Senate strengthens and supports the local senates of all California community colleges;

Whereas, While the current mission implies that the Academic Senate actively promotes academic excellence, an explicit statement to that effect will strengthen the understanding of the work and mission of the Academic Senate given the competing state and national organizations that attempt to claim that they ensure academic quality in the state; and

---

<sup>1</sup> The current Academic Senate mission statement is found at <http://asccc.org/about/mission>

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Whereas, The Academic Senate often helps to develop and act on policies created in the state but does not always promote all policies in the state because some policies are contrary to positions of the Academic Senate;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend its mission statement to read:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges promotes academic excellence and fosters the effective participation by community college faculty in all statewide and local academic and professional matters; develops, ~~promotes,~~ advocates for, and acts upon policies of responding to statewide concerns; and serves as the official voice of the faculty of California Community Colleges in academic and professional matters. The Academic Senate strengthens and supports the local senates of all California community colleges.

Contact: Dianna Chiabotti, Executive Committee

**+\*1.02.01 S14 Amend Resolution 1.02 S14**

Amend the title to read:

**Insert the Phrase “Promotes Academic Excellence and Student Success” in the ASCCC Mission Statement**

Delete fourth whereas:

~~Whereas, The Academic Senate often helps to develop and act on policies created in the state but does not always promote all policies in the state because some policies are contrary to positions of the Academic Senate;~~

Amend the resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend its mission statement to read:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges promotes academic excellence and student success; and fosters the effective participation by community college faculty in all statewide and local academic and professional matters; develops, ~~promotes,~~ advocates for, and acts upon policies of responding to statewide ~~concerns~~ concern to the Academic Senate; and serves as the official voice of the faculty of California Community Colleges in academic and professional matters. The Academic Senate strengthens and supports the local senates of all California community colleges.

Contact: David Beaulieu, Los Angeles Community College District, Area C

**\*1.03 S14 Adopt the Documents *Guidelines for the Periodic Review of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and Periodic Review of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Review Criteria***



## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Whereas, Academic Senate Resolution 1.02 S13<sup>2</sup> directed the Academic Senate to “create a task force consisting of equal numbers of Executive Committee representatives and member delegates to develop a process of periodic institutional review for assessing the operations, processes, policies, and programs of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges including the composition of the review team, what standards of accountability will be used, what components would comprise such a review, the number of years between reviews, and how commendations and recommendations will be offered at the conclusion of the process” and that the task force’s recommendation “be presented to the body for adoption by the Spring 2014 Plenary Session so that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges can undergo and complete its first periodic review by the Fall 2014 Plenary Session”;

Whereas, In response to resolution 1.02 S13 the Operational Oversight Committee was formed and charged with developing an evaluation process for the Academic Senate, and this committee held a breakout at the Fall 2013 Plenary Session to present progress to and obtain feedback from the body that was used to inform the work of the committee;

Whereas, The deadline for completion of the first periodic review established as Fall 2014 Plenary Session would place a substantial burden on the organization and the individuals charged with completing the review, and therefore an extension of the timeline to Spring 2016 is much more reasonable; and

Whereas, Upon completion of the periodic evaluation review the Academic Senate should assess the entire process to determine what, if any, changes are required to improve the process and ensure its usefulness to the organization;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the documents *Guidelines for the Periodic Review of Academic Senate for California Community Colleges* and *Periodic Review of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Review Criteria*;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges complete the selection process for the Review Task Force in Spring 2015 and undergo and complete its first periodic review by the Spring 2016 Plenary Session; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assess the efficacy of the Periodic Evaluation of ASCCC process, including the documents *Guidelines for the Periodic Review of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges* and *Periodic Review of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Review Criteria*, after completion of the first periodic review and report back to the body any modifications or adjustments by Spring 2017 Plenary Session.

Contact: Julie Bruno, Executive Committee, Operational Oversight Committee  
(Please see Appendix A for the full text of these documents.)

---

<sup>2</sup> The text of this resolution is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/periodic-evaluation-academic-senate-california-community-colleges>.

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

**+\*1.03.01 S14 Amend 1.03 S14**

Amend the third whereas:

Whereas, The deadline for completion of the first periodic review established as Fall 2014 Plenary Session would place a substantial burden on the organization and the individuals charged with completing the review; ~~and therefore an extension of the timeline to Spring 2016 is much more reasonable;~~ and

Delete the fourth whereas:

~~Whereas, Upon completion of the periodic evaluation review the Academic Senate should assess the entire process to determine what, if any, changes are required to improve the process and ensure its usefulness to the organization;~~

Contact: David Beaulieu, Los Angeles Community College District, Area C

**+1.04 S14 Applying the Brown Act to Executive Committee Meetings**

Whereas, From May of 2013 to January of 2014 the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges held an unprecedented eight closed sessions (May 31, Aug 23, October 4, October 18, October 19, two on December 13, and January 31);

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has always been a proponent and champion for ensuring the right of all persons to participate in academic discourse and democracy where the ability to participate in such discourse potentially affects them;

Whereas, Over the course of the last eight years the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has received ambiguous, inconsistent, conflicting opinions from multiple legal representatives concerning the applicability of the laws requiring open meetings (Brown Act or Bagley-Keene Act) such that this information is not reasonably predictive of how any given judiciary might rule in the instance of a formal open-meeting action taken against the Senate; and

Whereas, These open-meeting laws are complex, difficult to interpret with respect to a variety of circumstances, and difficult to self impose without clear guidelines, all of which ultimately means there are no clear guiding parameters provided in law or by the body to its elected representatives that establishes expectations around open meeting requirements for Executive Committee meetings held by the Academic Senate;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work to revise its bylaws at Fall Session 2014 to incorporate the requirements of the Brown Act for all Executive Committee meetings.

Contact: Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College, Area D

**2.0 ACCREDITATION**

**2.01 S14 Modify Title 5 To Allow Colleges To Be Accredited By Any Nationally Recognized Accrediting Agency**

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Whereas, California Code of Regulations, Title 5 §51016 currently requires that, “Each community college within a district shall be an accredited institution. The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges shall determine accreditation;”

Whereas, A basic criterion for participation in federal financial aid programs is that colleges be accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency, not one specific agency;

Whereas, Naming a specific accrediting agency in Title 5 is problematic because agencies may change their names, merge with other entities, or cease to be recognized, any one of such circumstances requiring a corresponding change to Title 5; and

Whereas, Naming a specific accrediting agency in Title 5 reduces the options California community colleges have to affiliate with an accrediting agency that fits their mission and circumstances<sup>3</sup>;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the appropriate bodies to remove references to one specific accrediting agency in Title 5 and to replace the language with a neutral statement requiring only that colleges be accredited by a federally recognized agency.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Executive Committee

**+2.01.01 S14 Amend Resolution 2.01 S14**

Amend the resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the appropriate bodies to remove references to one specific accrediting agency in Title 5 and to replace the language with a neutral statement requiring only that ~~colleges~~ the California Community Colleges be accredited by a common federally recognized agency.

Contact: Don Gauthier, Los Angeles Community College District, Area C

**\*2.02 S14 Submitting Proposed Revisions to the 2014 First Reading Draft of the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards Through Written and Oral Testimony to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)**

Whereas, On January 24, 2014, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) released for first reading a revised set of Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and began soliciting public comment about the draft revisions and will accept public comments until April 30, 2014;

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) will hold public hearings about *the 2014 First Reading Draft of the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards* at Sylmar, California on April 28, 2014 and Sacramento, California on April 30, 2014;

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, if a California community college chooses or is required to become an institution that offers multiple baccalaureate degrees, it must be accredited by an agency that has been nationally recognized to assess such institutions.

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Whereas, In order to assist the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in providing public comment to the ACCJC, the Accreditation and Assessment Committee of the Academic Senate collected and compiled a list of recommended proposed revisions based upon research and analysis by the committee, including input from the field, in a single document entitled *Suggested Revisions to the Draft 2014 Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards*; and

Whereas, It would be impossible to present oral testimony for all of the items in the *Suggested Revisions to the Draft 2014 Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards* document in the available time, and therefore the Academic Senate must prioritize the proposed revisions that are of greatest importance to faculty;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the *Suggested Revisions to the Draft 2014 Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards* and direct the Executive Committee to submit these proposed revisions on behalf of the Academic Senate through written and oral testimony at the ACCJC's public hearings, and furthermore devote its oral testimony to the proposed revisions determined to be of highest importance by the Executive Committee; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to provide oral and/or written testimony about the *2014 First Reading Draft of the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards*<sup>4</sup> identified to the ACCJC based on their own locally identified concerns.

Phil Smith, Executive Committee, Accreditation and Assessment Committee  
(Please see Appendix B for the full text of this document)

### **2.03 S14 Explore Use of Mock Accreditation Site Visits**

Whereas, Preparing for accreditation site visits can be a daunting experience for most colleges;

Whereas, A possible resource for colleges is the use of mock evaluation teams, a group of accreditation-knowledgeable faculty, administrators, and staff either from the college, other colleges in the same district, or outside colleges who visit the college and provide a simulated experience of an actual site visit; and

Whereas, Based upon the mock visit, the college may be better prepared to respond to the actual evaluation team visit;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges investigate the use of mock accreditation team visits and report back to the body by Spring 2015.

---

<sup>4</sup> The ACCJC draft 2014 revisions to the eligibility requirements and accreditation standards are found at [http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/Eligibility-Requirements-crosswalked\\_-First-Reading-January-2014.pdf](http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/Eligibility-Requirements-crosswalked_-First-Reading-January-2014.pdf) and [http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/Accreditation-Standards-crosswalked\\_-First-Reading-January-2014.pdf](http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/Accreditation-Standards-crosswalked_-First-Reading-January-2014.pdf)

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Contact: Adrienne Foster, West Los Angeles College, Accreditation and Assessment Committee

### **+2.03.01 S14 Amend Resolution 2.03 S14**

Amend the title to read:

#### **Explore Use of ~~Mock~~ Simulated Accreditation Site Visits**

Amend the first whereas:

Whereas, Preparing for accreditation site visits can be a complex process ~~daunting experience~~ for most colleges;

Amend the second whereas:

Whereas, A possible resource for colleges to prepare for accreditation team visits is the use of ~~mock-simulated~~ evaluation teams, a group of accreditation-knowledgeable faculty, administrators, and staff either from the college, other colleges in the same district, or outside colleges who visit the college and provide a simulated experience of an actual site visit; and

Amend third whereas:

Whereas, Based upon the simulated ~~mock~~ visit, the college may be better prepared to respond to the actual evaluation team visit;

Amend resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges investigate the use of simulated ~~mock~~ accreditation team visits and report back to the body by Spring 2015.

Contact: Adrienne Foster, West Los Angeles College, Area C

## **3.0 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/CULTURAL DIVERSITY**

### **3.01 S14 Infusing Cultural Competence**

Whereas, Resolution 1.02 Spring 2010<sup>5</sup> asks for “the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create a plan for infusing best practices regarding cultural competence into professional development, work, goals, and other aspects of the work of the Senate and produce the plan as a model for local senates”;

Whereas, Cultural competence is a skill set that makes one effective in working in diverse environments and teaching diverse students, and faculty who make progress toward becoming culturally competent should positively affect the success of students; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted its inclusivity statement<sup>6</sup> in June 2012, that reads in part:

“The Academic Senate respects and is committed to promoting equal opportunity and inclusion of diverse voices and opinions. We endeavor to have a diversity of talented faculty participate in Academic Senate activities and support local senates in recruiting

---

<sup>5</sup> The full text of this resolution is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/plan-infuse-cultural-competence>

<sup>6</sup> Executive Committee Policy 30.00 – Inclusivity is found at <http://asccc.org/policies/diversity>

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

and encouraging faculty with different backgrounds to serve on Academic Senate standing committees and task forces. In particular, the Academic Senate acknowledges the need to remove barriers to the recruitment and participation of talented faculty from historically excluded populations in society”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges engage in cultural competency training at its annual Executive Committee orientation, and use the information from that training to develop its plan.

Contact: Jeff Burdick, Willow International Community College Center, Student Equity Task Force

### **+3.01.01 S14 Amend Resolution 3.01 S14**

Delete the third whereas:

~~Whereas, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted its inclusivity statement<sup>7</sup> in June, 2012, that reads in part:~~

~~“The Academic Senate respects and is committed to promoting equal opportunity and inclusion of diverse voices and opinions. We endeavor to have a diversity of talented faculty participate in Academic Senate activities and support local senates in recruiting and encouraging faculty with different backgrounds to serve on Academic Senate standing committees and task forces. In particular, the Academic Senate acknowledges the need to remove barriers to the recruitment and participation of talented faculty from historically excluded populations in society”;~~

Amend the resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges engage in cultural competency training at its next annual Executive Committee orientation, and use the information from that training to develop its cultural competency plan as a model for local senates.

Contact: Alex Immerblum, East Los Angeles College, Area C

### **+3.01.02 S14 Amend Resolution 3.01 S14**

Add second resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges report its cultural competency plan to the body by Spring 2015 and include in that plan a component that will encourage greater diversity in local senates.

Contact: B.J. Snowden, Cosumnes River College, Area A

## **5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE**

### **+\*5.01 S14 Oppose Flexibility Allowances Provided in the January Governor's Budget**

Whereas, The 2014 - 2015 budget proposed in January 2014 by Governor Brown contains a proposal to allow for flexible movement of up to 25% of the funds directed to Extended

---

<sup>7</sup> Executive Committee Policy 30.00 – Inclusivity is found at <http://asccc.org/policies/diversity>

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS), California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) and the Basic Skills Initiative;

Whereas, While these provisions allow for some local accommodating of resources outside of their intended purposes, allowing this flexibility at this time could lead to a continuation of inequities because these needs have never been met, which will exacerbate internal competition for dwindling resources;

Whereas, The Faculty Association of California Community Colleges, the EOPS Association, and the CalWORKs Association have taken an “oppose” position to this proposal; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has previous resolutions that broadly oppose flexible funding for categorical programs (6.02 S10, 5.03 S11);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly oppose flexible budget options provided in the January 2014 Governor’s Budget for EOPS, CalWORKs and the Basic Skills Initiative.

Contact: Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College, Area D

**+\*5.02 S14 Endorse Funding for Full-Time Faculty and Addressing Issues with the FON**

Whereas, Full-time faculty, both in the classroom and in student services, are essential to delivering a quality educational experience and to promoting student success;

Whereas, Positive budget forecasts indicate the expectation that additional funding will be available for community colleges in the May revision of the California State budget, and this additional funding could best be used to promote the hiring of full-time faculty throughout the system;

Whereas, The full-time faculty obligation number (FON) currently utilized by the California Community College System has not led to a significant increase in the percentage of full-time faculty hires because it was intended to maintain the status quo in faculty hiring rather than to promote progress toward the 75% full-time faculty goal and is based on 1988 faculty hiring data that does not accurately or fairly represent current system hiring needs; and

Whereas, On March 20, 2014, the California Community Colleges Consultation Council agreed to form a task force to explore ways to address inequities in the FON for various districts and to encourage hiring of full-time faculty in districts with lower percentages of full-time faculty;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse the inclusion of dedicated funding for the hiring of full-time faculty in the May 2014 revision of the California State budget as well as in future budget years; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse the concept of revising or weighting the faculty obligation number (FON) to address in an equitable way full-

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

time hiring of faculty among colleges throughout the California Community College System and to increase the hiring of full-time faculty statewide.

Contact: David Morse, Long Beach City College, Area D

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

#### **\*7.01 S14 Explore Participation in State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (SARA) for Distance Education Offerings**

Whereas, Colleges and districts that enroll students living in other states in distance education courses may be required by those states to enter into state authorization agreements in order to enroll those students, which can be burdensome to institutions and can result in thousands of dollars in fees to a state, even for a single student;

Whereas, The proposed 34 CFR §600.9(c) states:

“If an institution is offering postsecondary education through distance or correspondence education to students in a State in which it is not physically located or in which it is otherwise subject to State jurisdiction as determined by the State, *the institution must meet any State requirements for it to be legally offering distance or correspondence education in that State.* An institution must be able to document to the Secretary the State’s approval upon request.”

and that if enacted will become an accreditation requirement as colleges are expected to comply with all federal regulations; and

Whereas, Participation by the State of California in the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA)<sup>8</sup>, which provides for “an agreement among member states, districts, and territories that establishes comparable national standards for interstate offerings of postsecondary distance education courses and programs,” could relieve colleges and districts of having to directly negotiate agreements with states and territories, as that would be done by the State of California on behalf of colleges and districts, and could also ensure compliance with the proposed 34 CFR §600.9(c);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor’s Office and other state entities to analyze without delay the potential benefits and risks of participation in the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement, and report the results of the analysis to the field as soon as possible.

Contact: John Freitas, Executive Committee

#### **+\*7.02 S14 Allowing “P” Grades for Courses in the Major for the Associate Degree for Transfer**

Whereas, In September 2013, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office adopted the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of the Program and Course Approval Handbook and modified the courses that

---

<sup>8</sup> For more information, please go to <http://nc-sara.org>. To review the policies and standards for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements, please go to <http://nc-sara.org/files/docs/SARA-General-Policies.pdf>.



RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

could be used in the major component of Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs) by inserting the following sentence: "A 'P' (Pass) grade is not an acceptable grade for courses in the major" (p. 89);

Whereas, Title 5 regulations §55023 define a "P" grade as "at least satisfactory" and a "C" as "satisfactory," establishing that a "P" is equal to a "C" or better as required for the major component of an ADT;

Whereas, Some forms of credit (e.g., AP, IB, and CLEP) are only graded on a pass/no pass basis and are commonly accepted for the major at many California State Universities; and

Whereas, Education Code clearly grants the authority to community colleges for the content of the ADTs, and this authority extends to community colleges the right and responsibility for granting credit they deem appropriate to these degrees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to take whatever measures are needed to reverse the prohibition against using grades of "P" in the major component of Associate Degrees for Transfer.

Contact: Dave DeGroot, Allan Hancock College, Area C

**+\*7.03 S14 Ensuring Faculty Intent in the Implementation of Transfer Model Curricula**

Whereas, Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) provide a faculty-developed structure to the major component of Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs); and

Whereas, The California Community College Chancellor's Office develops templates for degree submission that are derived from the TMC and should accurately reflect the intent of the faculty who developed the TMC;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to establish a mechanism to ensure that template development and later template interpretation is consistent with the intent of the TMC as developed by the faculty.

Contact: Dave DeGroot, Allan Hancock College, Area C

**+\*7.04 S14 Immediate Supervision in Foreign Language Labs**

Whereas, Legal Opinion 08-02 (2008 October 1) established new strictures by which districts can claim apportionment for "TBA" (To Be Arranged) hours, strictures that many community college labs, including foreign language labs, did not or simply cannot meet;

Whereas, The foreign languages discipline universally recognizes labs as necessary, successful delivery modes for improving student learning outcomes;

Whereas, Meeting the new strictures would entail staffing foreign language labs with instructors from all languages at any given time, even though instructors with minimum qualifications in any foreign language possess knowledge of the pedagogy of foreign language teaching and

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

learning, and can thereby assist students with lab materials and activities that have been assigned by and will be assessed by the instructor of record; and

Whereas, The Board of Governors amended Title 5 §58055 (“Immediate Supervision”) to allow exemptions for health science education, for the Firefighter Joint Apprenticeship programs<sup>9</sup>, and for early childhood education programs to allow them to meet the new strictures;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges collaborate with the Chancellor’s Office to develop a recommendation to the Board of Governors that Title 5 be amended to allow an exemption for foreign language labs so that immediate supervision can be shared by people who meet the state minimum qualifications for teaching any foreign language taught at the college.

Contact: Fred Teti, City College of San Francisco, Area B  
(For additional background information, please see “Resolving the TBA Dilemma: A Tale of Three Memos,” M. Pilati, *Rostrum* September 2009,  
<http://www.asccc.org/content/resolving-tba-dilemma-tale-three-memos> )

### **+\*7.05 S14 Program Review Decision-Making Tools**

Whereas, There are over 6,000 approved certificate and degree programs in the California Community College System (System) inventory of programs and courses and approximately 51% of these need to be reviewed at least every six years while the other 49% (Career Technical Education programs) need to be reviewed every two years, resulting in the need to review 2,000 programs every year system-wide;

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, working in collaboration with CalPASS Plus, WestEd, the California Department of Labor, California Department of Education and a variety of other state and national agencies has developed a host of data gathering and research tools such as the Student Success Scorecard, Salary Surfer and the newly emerging Launchboard, which all provide the quantitative data necessary to making sound programmatic decisions;

Whereas, The California Legislature has long provided various funding streams such as the Telecommunication and Technology Information Program funds that are intended to develop and leverage System infrastructure where it will benefit colleges and maximize System purchasing power; and

Whereas, The data, tools, technology, staff, and infrastructure are now available to build a customizable program review system that contains narrative and auto/self populating quantitative data that colleges can choose to adopt, locally develop and adapt, save and reuse, or update prior data that is still relevant, in ways that would simplify the effort of program review, and would

---

<sup>9</sup> “For both of these areas, the requirement for immediate supervision can be met as a responsibility shared by a qualified person in the workplace/clinic and by an academic district employee.” Memo of June 10, 2009, Carole Bogue-Feinour, Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs Division, Second To Be Arranged (TBA) Hours Follow-up Memorandum

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

improve the utility of program review by making it more coordinated and meaningful both locally and statewide;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community College Chancellor's Office and other appropriate agencies to further develop decision-making research tools that are both quantitative, qualitative and meaningful to the local program review processes.

Contact: Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College, Area D

### **9.0 CURRICULUM**

#### **\*9.01 S14 Academic Senate Involvement in AB 86 Regional Planning Consortia**

Whereas, In 2013 the legislature passed and the governor signed AB 86 (Education Omnibus Trailer Bill, 2013-2014) that amended California Education Code §84830 to create regional consortia to implement a plan to "better serve the educational needs of adults" in areas that include basic skills, ESL, and short-term CTE educational services;

Whereas, AB 86 further requires an evaluation and integration of faculty professional development to achieve greater student achievement; and

Whereas, Curricular design, educational planning, student success, and faculty professional development are all part of the 10+1 academic and professional matters under the purview of local academic senates, as stated in Title 5 §53200;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to use established CB21 coding to develop a framework for connections between credit basic skills, noncredit basic skills, and adult education offerings;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that local academic senates should be active participants in the regional planning consortia since the work of these consortia, as defined by law, is an academic and professional matter; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor's Office to remind local governing boards that the Title 5 requirements for collegial consultation with academic senates on academic and professional matters extends to interagency legislative bodies, including joint powers authorities established between community college and K-12 governing boards.

Contact: John Stankas, Executive Committee, Noncredit Task Force  
(Please see Appendix C for the relevant text from AB 86.)

#### **+\*9.01.01 S14 Amend Resolution 9.01 S14**

Add fourth whereas:

Whereas, Faculty-defined rubrics for aligning courses before transfer have already been created and would provide useful tools for integrating courses;

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Amend first resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to use established ~~CB21 coding~~ faculty-defined rubrics to develop a framework for connections between credit basic skills, noncredit basic skills, and adult education offerings;

Amend second resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that local academic senates ~~should be active participants~~ actively participate in the regional planning consortia since the work of these consortia, as defined by law, is an academic and professional matter; and

Contact: Don Gauthier, Los Angeles Community College District, Area C

**+9.02 S14 Changes to Recent Community College Repeatability Regulations**

Whereas, California community colleges have built extensive depth and breadth of educational programs for over 50 years, responding to the educational needs of their respective communities, contributing to a skilled workforce, fostering a more engaged citizenry and creating a diverse, multi-generational component in the social and cultural make-up of our state, and in November 2012 voters passed Proposition 30, signifying state-wide, taxpayer support for maintaining access to this high quality public educational system;

Whereas, During the recent economic downturn, when California community colleges were turning away hundreds of thousands of students due to budget shortfalls, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, in the context of rationing education, passed regulations to limit the repeatability of coursework in order to focus on and prioritize basic skills, career technical education, and transfer preparation;

Whereas, Lack of repeatability in performance and skill-building courses has had the unintended consequence of severely limiting the ability of students of the arts (including dance, music, theater, creative writing, and the visual arts) to transfer as majors into advanced programs which select students based on demonstrated performance skills, excellent portfolios, and strong resumes, often developed over years of repeating coursework in order to attain the required higher levels of proficiency needed to transfer to selective four-year programs; and

Whereas, The repeatability regulations raise other barriers for community college students, particularly those enrolled in career and technical education programs, to take a more current version of a course they have already completed in order to update skills, adapt to new technologies or maintain professional competency;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges continue to support unfettered access to quality community college education for all Californians, including lifelong learners; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Consultation Council and the Board of Governors to increase repeatability options needed for

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

student success in order to provide equal access to a balanced, comprehensive, and high-quality education as outlined in the California Master Plan for Education.

Contact: Michael Mangin, Cabrillo College, Area B

**Note:** This resolution, through the second resolved, represents a change in Academic Senate positions established by resolutions 9.03 S11 and 9.07 F11<sup>10</sup> and thus requires approval by a two-thirds majority of delegates voting.

### **+\*9.03 S14 Statewide Curriculum Coordination**

Whereas, The establishment of infrastructure to support the coordinated development of curriculum (either intra or inter-segmentally) and corresponding efforts to identify comparable curriculum is a valuable mechanism for increasing student pathway efficiency because it permits students to readily transition across and among the public and private segments of education and into viable careers;

Whereas, These efforts are and should remain faculty-driven, including projects such as Statewide Career Pathways and the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID), the creation of school to college articulation, and the development of Model and Transfer Model Curricula (MC/TMCs);

Whereas, Inter-coordination of these efforts where appropriate is essential to making school-to-colleges-to-careers pathways rigorous, seamless, and flexible for students irrespective of their academic and career trajectory; and

Whereas, California legislation has inadvertently introduced inconsistency into the current inter-coordination efforts by providing regional funding streams that bypass the California Community College System governance processes;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work to ensure that statewide curriculum systems remain funded, faculty driven, and inter-coordinated where appropriate so that institution-to-institution and institution-to-career pathways remain rigorous, seamless, and flexible.

Contact: Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College, Area D

### **+\*9.04 S14 Consistency in Data Mart ESL Basic Skills Progress Tracker**

Whereas, The California Community College Chancellor's Office tool, Data Mart Basic Skills Progress Tracker, is used to compile the Basic Skills Report for the State of California, integrating data from all basic skills/English as a Second Language (ESL) courses at all California Community Colleges (CCC) for the purpose of measuring quality of programs at a college level;

Whereas, The ESL programs of CCCs are unique from other basic skills classes in having

---

<sup>10</sup> Resolutions 9.03 S11 and 0.07 F11 are found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/eliminate-repeatability-“activity”-courses> and <http://asccc.org/resolutions/amend-and-endorse-“recommendations-regarding-repeatability”>

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

complex intricacies such as nonlinear course sequencing, multiple skill strands at the same level, complicated sequencing in the pathway to transfer, and varied coding including noncredit, non-degree applicable credit, degree-applicable credit, and transferable credit in the same department; and

Whereas, An analysis by a subcommittee of the California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) of several ESL departments' data in Data Mart Basic Skills Progress Tracker has revealed several errors, including but not limited to wrong courses being tracked, courses missing, and incorrect coding of courses, all resulting in an inaccurate picture of success data of ESL departments;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide information and guidance to ESL departments throughout the California Community College System to ensure that all ESL courses are accurately and consistently coded in alignment for the purpose of collecting and reporting accurate data in the Data Mart Basic Skills Progress Tracker tool; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chief Instructional Officers to facilitate accurate entry of ESL coding into the Data Mart Basic Skills Progress Tracker tool.

Contact: Leigh Anne Shaw, Skyline College, Area B

**Note:** This resolution was first submitted to the body at the Fall 2013 Plenary Session as resolution 9.02 F13. The body referred this resolution to the Executive Committee to be perfected and to be returned to the body by Spring 2014 Plenary Session. The resolution was rewritten and is being brought back for consideration by the body.

### **10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST**

#### **\*10.01 S14 Adopt the Discipline List Handbook**

Whereas, The body adopted resolution 10.07 S13<sup>11</sup> that directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to consolidate information related to the disciplines list process to ensure that all pertinent information to the process is consistent, housed in one place, and can be used by both the Standards and Practice Committee and the field;

Whereas, Resolution 10.09 S13 and amendment 10.09.01 S13, both of which were referred to the Executive Committee<sup>12</sup>, addressed concerns about the need to simplify the way discipline list recommendations were brought to the body and to clarify the process; and

Whereas, The Standards and Practice Committee developed a Discipline List Handbook that consolidates the disciplines list process, as directed in resolution 10.07 S13, and addresses the concerns stated in the referred resolution 10.09 S13 and amendment 10.09.01 S13;

---

<sup>11</sup> The full text of resolution 10.07 S13 is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/improvements-disciplines-list-process>

<sup>12</sup> The full texts of resolution 10.09 S13 and 10.09.01 S13 are found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/disciplines-list-motion> and <http://asccc.org/resolutions/amend-resolution-1009-s13>

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the Discipline List Handbook and implement the new discipline list process immediately upon its adoption by the body.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Executive Committee, Standards and Practices Committee  
(Please see Appendix D for the full text of this document.)

### **12.0 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

#### **12.01 S14 Consistent and Sustainable Funding for Professional Development**

Whereas, AB 2558 (Williams, 2014) as of February 21, 2014, contains provisions that would implement two of the recommendations of the Chancellor's Office Professional Development Committee, including changing name of the Faculty and Staff Development Fund to the Professional Development Program and making the program inclusive of all college employees, but not does not provide the consistent and sustainable funding for professional development as recommended by the committee;

Whereas, AB 2558 (Williams, 2014) would repeal Education Code §87152, which allocates to districts at a minimum "an amount equivalent to one half of one percent of the fiscal year revenues . . . received by the district, for the 1987-88 fiscal year" for the Faculty and Staff Development Fund;

Whereas, The faculty and staff development funding indicated in Education Code §87152 has not been received by districts since 2002, in part because the language of the section is unclear in terms of whether the funds are subtracted from or added to the general fund and in part because of the section's outdated reference to the 1987-88 fiscal year; and

Whereas, Ongoing consistent and sustainable funding is essential for the creation and maintenance of meaningful and vital professional development programs in the California community colleges;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse AB 2558 (Williams, 2014) as of February 21, 2014, regarding its provisions for renaming and making the Professional Development Program inclusive of all college personnel;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse AB 2558 (Williams, 2014) as of February 21, 2014, in its efforts to clarify or remove the outdated and ineffective language of Education Code §87152; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and other constituent groups to establish through statute ongoing consistent and sustainable funding for the Professional Development Program.

Contact: David Morse, Executive Committee  
(Note: Legislation can be tracked at <http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/home.xhtml>)

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

**+12.01.01 S14 Amend Resolution 12.01 S14**

Amend the first resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges ~~endorse~~ support the intent of AB 2558 (Williams, 2014) as of February 21, 2014, regarding its provisions for renaming and making the Professional Development Program inclusive of all college personnel;

Contact: David Beaulieu, Los Angeles Community College District, Area C

**+12.01.02 S14 Amend Resolution 12.01 S14**

Delete the third whereas

~~Whereas, The faculty and staff development funding indicated in Education Code §87152 has not been received by districts since 2002, in part because the language of the section is unclear in terms of whether the funds are subtracted from or added to the general fund and in part because of the section's outdated reference to the 1987-88 fiscal year;~~

Replace the second resolved

~~Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse AB 2558 (Williams, 2014) as of February 21, 2014, in its efforts to clarify or remove the outdated and ineffective language of Education Code §87152;~~

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate that the allocation language in Education Code §87152 remain until such a time as a statute for ongoing and sustainable funding for the professional development program has been established.

Contact: Matt Clark, Woodland Community College, Area A

**12.02 S14 Faculty Professional Development**

Whereas, The primary basis for faculty hiring is subject matter expertise and meeting the minimum qualifications outlined in Title 5 and in *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in Community Colleges (January 2012)*<sup>13</sup>;

Whereas, The California Community College faculty minimum qualifications do not include requirements for pedagogical knowledge or teacher preparation;

Whereas, Many colleges do not have a formal faculty professional development program tied to improvement of teaching and pedagogy; and

Whereas, The climate and culture of California community colleges have changed greatly over the last several years and faculty must be responsive to the needs of students at all levels and the vast array of diversity among students;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges take the position that faculty need ongoing professional development opportunities in pedagogy that are driven by the needs of faculty; and

---

<sup>13</sup> This handbook is found at

[http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/AA/MinQuals/MinimumQualificationsHandbook2012\\_2014.pdf](http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/AA/MinQuals/MinimumQualificationsHandbook2012_2014.pdf)



## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges research professional development programs for college faculty linked to teaching and learning and their impact on student success, and report its findings back to the body by Spring 2015.

Contact: Dianna Chiabotti, Executive Committee

**Note:** This resolution was first submitted to the body at the Fall 2013 Plenary Session as resolution 12.03 F13. The body referred this resolution and amendments 12.03.01 and 12.03.02 to the Executive Committee for perfecting and to be returned to the body by Spring 2014 Plenary Session. The minor changes proposed by the two amendments were incorporated into the resolution. The resolution was rewritten and is being brought back for consideration by the body.

### **13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS**

#### **13.01 S14 Researching the Feasibility of the CCC Bachelor's Degree**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office recently released a report from the California Community Colleges Baccalaureate Degree Study Group<sup>14</sup> on the topic of expanding the mission of community colleges in the state to include the awarding of bachelor's degrees, and the report concludes with a recommendation that the topic "merits serious review and study;"

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges currently is opposed to adding bachelor's degrees to the mission of California community colleges, Resolution 6.01 S10<sup>15</sup>, but given changes in the labor market and fewer spaces available for transfer students at California State University campuses, faculty may want to reconsider this position; and

Whereas, Any comprehensive change to the mission of the California community colleges should include comment and input from many California State University and the University of California colleagues, and the composition of the California community college study group that produced the report included no faculty representation from these two segments;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly recommend that, before any action is taken to change the mission of the California community colleges to include the awarding of bachelor's degrees, a comprehensive feasibility study and environmental scan by independent researchers be conducted and distributed to the colleges for information, deliberation, and further recommendations to the Legislature.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Executive Committee

#### **+13.01.01 S14 Amend Resolution 13.01 S14**

Amend the resolved:

---

<sup>14</sup> The full report is found at

[http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/portals/0/reportsTB/2014\\_01\\_BacDegree\\_StudyGroup\\_WEB.pdf](http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/portals/0/reportsTB/2014_01_BacDegree_StudyGroup_WEB.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> The full text of resolution 6.01 S10 is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/opposition-proposed-modification-community-college-mission>

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly recommend that, before any action is taken to change the mission of the California community colleges to include the awarding of bachelor's degrees, a comprehensive feasibility study and environmental scan by independent, unbiased researchers be conducted and distributed to the colleges for information, deliberation, and further recommendations to the legislature.

Contact: Beta Meyer, Mt. San Antonio College, Area C

### **+13.01.02 S14 Amend Resolution 13.01 S14**

Amend the second whereas:

Whereas, The Academic Senate currently is opposed to adding bachelor's degrees to the mission of California community colleges, Resolution 6.01 S10, and does not seek to alter that position until such time as the research proposed by the Baccalaureate Degree Study Group has been conducted and the body is provided with a comprehensive opportunity to consider these data before any efforts are made to revise its current position ~~but given changes in the labor market and fewer spaces available for transfer students at California State University campuses, faculty may want to reconsider this position;~~ and

Amend the resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly recommend that, before any action is taken to change the mission of the California community colleges to include the awarding of bachelor's degrees, a comprehensive feasibility study and environmental scan by independent, unbiased researchers be conducted and distributed to the colleges to for information, the body for deliberation and possible reconsideration of existing positions, ~~and further recommendations to the legislature.~~

Contact: Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College, Area D

### **+13.02 S14 Applied Baccalaureate Degrees Offered by the California Community Colleges and Cooperation with the California State University System**

Whereas, There are 21 states in which community colleges are offering baccalaureate degrees and the State of California has passed and is contemplating additional legislation enabling community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees at the same time the demand for applied baccalaureates in technical fields is increasing, with projections for the demand for all baccalaureates to exceed the capacity of the public and private universities to provide these, with a projected shortfall of 60,000 degrees by 2025<sup>16</sup>;

Whereas, Authorizing California community colleges to offer degrees not offered by the University of California and the California State University systems would increase access for underserved areas and populations, benefit the State's economy, and remove barriers to completion;

---

<sup>16</sup>For more information, go to

<http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/AA/Miscellaneous/BaccalaureateDegreeStudyGroup/CaliforniaDemandfor4YearDegrees.pdf>

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Whereas, There are numerous issues such as funding, funding mechanisms, student fees, and the California community college mission that would need to be explored; and

Whereas, The California State University System neither offers nor is projected to offer these degrees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the concept of applied baccalaureates in technical fields being offered at the California community college that are neither offered nor projected to be offered in the University of California or California State University systems;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community College Chancellor's Office, the Board of Governors, California State University faculty and system representatives, and legislators to draft or support legislation enabling the offering of applied baccalaureate degrees by California community colleges in areas agreed to by the California State University System; and

Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support colleges that proceed towards implementation of applied baccalaureate degrees as acceptable answers to issues involved in areas such as funding, funding mechanisms, student fees, and community college mission are found.

Contact: Karen Chow, Foothill-De Anza Community College District, Area B

**Note:** This resolution proposes to reverse the position established when the body adopted resolution 6.01 S10 in opposition to expanding the mission of the California community colleges to include the awarding of baccalaureate degrees. Adoption of this resolution requires approval by a two-thirds majority of the body.

### **+\*13.03 S14 Add Established At-Risk Student Groups to Exemptions Under BOG Fee Waiver Policy**

Whereas, In January 2014, the Board of Governors (BOG) of the California Community Colleges approved new minimum academic and progress standards that a student qualifying for a BOG fee waiver must meet in order to retain eligibility, but allowed an exemption to those standards for foster youth;

Whereas, Based on a California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office simulation report<sup>17</sup> on a cohort from 2011, as many as 31,342 (4.8% Extended Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS); 4.7% California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs); 6% Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS) at-risk students could be subject to loss of the fee waiver for failure to meet the new academic and progress standards;

---

<sup>17</sup> Analysis presented to the Board of Governors by the Chancellor's Office, March 3-4 2014 - [http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2014\\_agendas/March/3\\_3\\_BOG\\_Fee\\_Waiver.pdf](http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/ExecutiveOffice/Board/2014_agendas/March/3_3_BOG_Fee_Waiver.pdf)

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Whereas, Students who participate in EOPS/CARE, CalWorks, and DSPS programs, as well as veterans, qualify as at-risk students and therefore should receive the same exemptions from the new academic and progress standards as foster youth; and

Whereas, Students who participate in EOPS/CARE, CalWorks, and DSPS programs are already held to established academic and progress standards through such instruments as the EOPS Mutual Responsibility Contract;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the Board of Governors amend §58621 of Title 5 to grant EOPS/CARE, CalWORKs, DSPS, and veterans the same exemptions to the new academic and progress standards currently granted for foster youth.

Contact: Fabio R Gonzalez, San Jose City College, Area B

### **+\*13.04 S14 Constructive Dialog on the Expectations for Community College Completion**

Whereas, Community colleges are commonly referred to as “two-year colleges,” and students are often expected by external observers and even themselves to complete their studies within time frames and unit limitations that stress greater speed to completion and economy of course scheduling rather than the quality of their experience;

Whereas, Many students remain at community colleges beyond two years and take more than the minimum units needed to complete their educational goals for legitimate reasons, including the following:

- Family or work circumstances that prevent full-time attendance
- Lack of access to courses that are compatible with other commitments and offered in the student’s preferred mode of instruction
- Employment circumstances that compel students to return for retraining or additional coursework despite having achieved previous goals
- Insufficient preparation for college coursework that creates a need for remediation
- Completion of lower-division coursework not required for an associate’s degree but required or recommended as lower-division preparation for the corresponding bachelor’s degree by a transfer institution
- A simple desire to explore the options available before choosing a career path or major;

Whereas, Students should be provided with proper academic support, counseling and career advisement, financial aid, and other services to help them make appropriate course-taking decisions in order to reach their educational goals in a timely and efficient manner, but no student should be pushed into career-path choices or major programs due to misguided time or unit constraints before he or she is prepared to make such decisions; and

Whereas, Community college programs should be focused on giving students a high quality educational experience, not on pushing students through a model of education that stresses efficiency over true student success;

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office and other interested constituencies to expand the necessary support structure that will enable all community college students to determine and achieve their educational goals in a timely and efficient manner, including but not limited to financial aid, counseling and career advisement, and academic support; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office and other system partners to engage policy makers in a constructive dialog that will expand their understanding of community colleges beyond the narrow view that students are expected to reach institutionally defined goals within two years and with a minimum number of units earned.

Contact: David Morse, Long Beach City College, Area D

### 14.0 GRADING

#### **\*14.01 S14 Adopt the Paper Awarding Credit Where Credit is Due: Effective Practices for the Implementation of Credit by Exam**

Whereas, Academic Senate Resolution 9.05 F08<sup>18</sup> called for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) to “assert the right of discipline faculty to establish the content of credit by exam processes, . . .” and “research and share effective practices for credit by exam processes with local senates”;

Whereas, Academic Senate Resolution 9.08 F10<sup>19</sup> called for the ASCCC to “develop and disseminate information to local academic senates regarding effective practices for using credit by exam to recognize learning gained through alternative mechanism,” to “encourage local academic senates to ensure that students are aware of the existing mechanisms for earning credit through exam processes,” and to “recommend that local academic senates consider the needs of their local communities and strive to ensure that all appropriate exam opportunities are available”; and

Whereas, The paper *Awarding Credit Where Credit is Due: Effective Practices for the Implementation of Credit by Exam* asserts the right of discipline faculty to establish the content of credit by exam processes, shares effective practices for implementing credit by exam processes with local senates, offers effective practices for using credit by exam, including ways to ensure that students are aware of mechanisms for earning credit by exam, while encouraging local senates to consider the needs of their local communities;

Resolved, That the Academic Senates for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Awarding Credit Where Credit is Due: Effective Practices for the Implementation of Credit by Exam*.

Contact: Lesley Kawaguchi, Executive Committee, Credit by Exam Paper Task Force

---

<sup>18</sup> The full text of resolution 9.05 F08 is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/ensuring-integrity-credit-exam-processes>

<sup>19</sup> The full text of resolution 9.08 F10 is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/credit-exam-processes>

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

**\*14.02 S14 Local Use of Available Noncredit Progress Indicators**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted resolution 14.01 S12<sup>20</sup> that requested changes to Title 5 to include a progress indicator of Satisfactory Progress, (SP); at its Spring 2012 session;

Whereas, The Chancellor's Office Scorecard currently voids all data submitted for noncredit progress, thus indicating zero achievement and success;

Whereas, The Chancellor's Office currently lacks the staff to facilitate the requested Title 5 change; and

Whereas, The Chancellor's Office is capable of collecting noncredit progress indicators, and all other progress indicators (A, B, C, D, F, P and NP) are currently defined in Title 5 for credit and noncredit courses (§55021/§55023);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to recommend policies that allow their colleges to begin the practice of assigning progress indicators to all noncredit curriculum; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to elevate the priority of the requested Title 5 change to allow for the use of Satisfactory Progress (SP) as a viable progress indicator.

Contact: Ginni May, Sacramento City College, Noncredit Task Force

**+\*14.02.01 S14 Amend Resolution 14.02 S14**

Amend the first whereas:

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted resolution 14.01 S12<sup>21</sup> that requested changes to Title 5 to include a noncredit progress indicator of Satisfactory Progress (SP) at its Spring 2012 session;

Delete the third whereas:

~~Whereas, The Chancellor's Office currently lacks the staff to facilitate the requested Title 5 change; and~~

Delete the fourth whereas:

~~Whereas, The Chancellor's Office is capable of has the capacity to collecting noncredit progress indicators, and all other progress indicators (A, B, C, D, F, P and NP) are currently defined in Title 5 for credit and noncredit courses (§55021/§55023);~~

Add a new whereas:

---

<sup>20</sup> The full text of resolution 14.01 S12 is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/progress-indicator-implementation-noncredit-coursework>

<sup>21</sup> The full text of resolution 14.01 S12 is found at <http://asccc.org/resolutions/progress-indicator-implementation-noncredit-coursework>

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Whereas, The inclusion of the Satisfactory Progress indicator (SP) would improve data collection both at the local and system-wide levels;

Amend the second resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to elevate the priority of the requested Title 5 change to allow for the use of Satisfactory Progress (SP) as a viable non-credit progress indicator.

Contact: Beta Meyer, Mt. San Antonio College, Area C

### **15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES**

#### **+\*15.01 S14 IGETC for High Unit Majors**

Whereas, Senate Bill (SB) 1440 (Padilla, 2010) defines the Associate in Arts for Transfer and Associate in Science for Transfer degree as having no more than 60 semester units (or 90 quarter units) eligible for transfer to the California State University (CSU);

Whereas, The 60 semester units (or 90 quarter units) include a minimum of 18 semester units (or 27 quarter units) in a major or area of emphasis and an approved general education curriculum, either Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) or CSU General Education Breadth Requirements;

Whereas, IGETC for Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (IGETC for STEM), which allows exclusion of one course from Area 3 and one course from Area 4 for the Associate Degree for Transfer is approved for the chemistry major since it is a high-unit major; and

Whereas, Some non-STEM majors, such as music, theater, nursing, and elementary education are also high unit majors;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with its intersegmental partners to allow general education exceptions in both the IGETC and CSU General Education patterns similar to IGETC for STEM in all appropriate disciplines.

Contact: Tiffany Tran, Irvine Valley College, Area D

### **18.0 MATRICULATION**

#### **\*18.01 S14 Adopt the paper *Multiple Measures in Assessment: The Requirements and Challenges of Multiple Measures in the California Community Colleges***

Whereas, The Board of Governors held a study session on basic skills in March 2007, and passed a motion directing the Chancellor to "begin the process of evaluating the implementation of a system-wide uniform, common assessment with multiple measures of all community college students...";

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted the paper *Student Success: The Case for Establishing Prerequisites through Content Review* (Spring 2010)<sup>22</sup> and its recommendations included the need for a paper on multiple measures; and

---

<sup>22</sup> This paper is available at <http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Prerequisite-review-fall2010.pdf>

RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2014

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges through Resolution 18.01 F13<sup>23</sup> adopted the position that any common assessment system developed for use by the California community colleges should allow local control both in the selection of multiple measures for use in placement processes and in the manner in which those multiple measures are applied;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Multiple Measures in Assessment: The Requirements and Challenges of Multiple Measures in the California Community Colleges*; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to continue to engage in discussions at their colleges regarding the determination of appropriate multiple measures and placement processes that improve the success of their students.

Contact: Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Executive Committee, Multiple Measures Task Force  
(Please see Appendix F for the full text of this document.)

---

<sup>23</sup> The full text of this resolution is found at <http://www.asccc.org/resolutions/use-multiple-measures-common-statewide-assessment-exams>