1.01 F12 **Support and Advocacy for Regulatory Mechanisms That Ensure Faculty Recommendations on Academic and Professional Matters are Given Their Fullest Consideration**

Whereas, AB 1725 (Vasconcellos, 1988), the omnibus bill that created the modern framework for the California community college system, stated among its aims that

The people of California should have the opportunity to be proud of a system of community colleges which instills pride among its students and faculty, where rigor and standards are an assumed part of a shared effort to educate, where the hugely diverse needs of students are a challenge rather than a threat, where the community colleges serve as models for the new curricula and innovative teaching, where learning is what we care about most;

and recognized the importance of faculty involvement as professionals in college governance and decision-making by asserting that

It is a general purpose of this act to improve academic quality, and to that end the Legislature specifically intends to authorize more responsibility for faculty members in duties that are incidental to their primary professional duties;

Whereas, Education Code §70901 guarantees “faculty, staff, and students the right to participate effectively in district and college governance, and the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level and to ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration” and recognizes the special areas of faculty expertise by ensuring “the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards”;

Whereas, Title 5 §53200 operationalizes the primary recommending responsibility of faculty in the area of academic standards by requiring local governing boards to determine whether to “rely primarily upon” or “mutually agree with” the recommendations of the academic senate with respect to specified academic and professional matters, while Title 5 §53203 ensures that ultimate decision-making and responsibility remain with the elected governing board regarding all faculty recommendations; and

Whereas, The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, the gold standard by which colleges and universities are compared with respect to shared governance, states that

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty;

and the California community college system of participatory governance and its affirmation of faculty primacy in academic and professional matters is highly consistent with the AAUP statement;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges affirm its support for the current participatory governance structure defined by AB 1725;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support ways to enhance shared decision-making and collective responsibility for improving student learning and success; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose modifications or amendments to Title 5, Education Code, or other directives that impede the primary authority of academic senates to recommend with respect to curriculum and academic standards per Education Code and the AAUP definition of the faculty role in community college governance.

----------------------------------------------------

**3.01 F12 Student Progression and Achievement Rates (SPAR) and Socioeconomic Status**

Whereas, All colleges will soon publish their Student Progress and Achievement Rates (SPAR)[[1]](#footnote-1) on their “Scorecard” websites as part of the California Community College System response to the Student Success Task Force recommendations, and the biggest predictor of a college’s SPAR rate is the zip code of students attending that college, with zip code acting as a proxy for socioeconomic status[[2]](#footnote-2);

Whereas, SPAR rates will also be disaggregated by ethnicity and published in an effort to encourage colleges to appropriately focus their efforts on reducing existing achievement gaps;

Whereas, Over a decade of research in K-12 indicates that if income is taken into account along with ethnicity, income is the significantly larger predictor of academic achievement[[3]](#footnote-3); and

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) is also now requiring that colleges report data about enrolled students disaggregated by ethnicity and socioeconomic status[[4]](#footnote-4), although many colleges do not directly collect socioeconomic status information and therefore must use other data as a proxy;

Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage colleges to begin collecting socioeconomic status information to be defined more specifically by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) directly on student applications in addition to zip code data; and

Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage colleges to report cross-tabulated data regarding ethnicity and socioeconomic status to the public and to faculty and staff in an effort to correctly identify true existing achievement gaps.

--------------------------------------------------

**17.01 F12 Approval of Grant Driven Projects**

Whereas, Unprecedented budget challenges are prompting California community colleges to seek alternative funding sources such as grants with increasing urgency;

Whereas, Grants often include provisions for the creation and implementation of new educational programs and curricula that do not require the students to earn college credit;

Whereas, Local senates and curriculum committees have developed curriculum approval processes to ensure their colleges’ offerings are of the highest quality for students, but grant-inspired curriculum not involving credit may not be required to go through these pathways of curriculum development and approval; and

Whereas, Circumvention of these processes may have unintended negative consequences on curricular quality and subsequently on students’ preparedness for success in their lives and careers;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates and curriculum committees to collaborate with administrators to develop formal policies and procedures for the development and approval of mission-driven funded programs and curricula.

**17.02 F12 Faculty Involvement in Grant-funded Efforts Related to Academic and Professional Matters**

Whereas, Unprecedented budget challenges are prompting California community colleges to seek alternative funding sources, such as grants, with increasing urgency;

Whereas, Grants often include provisions for the creation and/or implementation of new policies, processes, and technologies that are within the purview of the local senate;

Whereas, Districts and colleges have well-established processes for ensuring that decision-making is a participatory process and that faculty have primacy in making recommendations related to academic and professional matters; and

Whereas, Circumvention of these processes may have unintended negative consequences that eschew the 10+1 responsibilities of the local senate;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to collaborate with administrators to develop formal policies and procedures for the development and approval of grant-driven projects.

**17.03 F12 Integration of Grants With College Planning and Budget Processes**

Whereas, Unprecedented budget challenges are prompting California community colleges to seek alternative funding sources, such as grants, with increasing urgency;

Whereas, Grants are increasingly a *de facto* part of college planning and budget processes and are used to maintain and/or expand new and existing programs; and

Whereas, Failure to integrate grants development into college planning and budget development processes circumvents, and thus disrupts, those college processes;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges affirm that grant development processes are processes for institutional planning and thus fall under the purview of academic senates in accordance with Title 5 §53200; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges research and report on existing policies and procedures for the development of grant-driven programs at California community colleges and identify which of those policies and procedures are integrated into college institutional planning processes.
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