



**Academic Senate
for California Community Colleges**

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

48th SPRING SESSION RESOLUTIONS

FOR DISCUSSION ON APRIL 21, 2016

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 21 – 23, 2016.

Resolutions Committee 2015-2016

John Stanskas, Executive Committee, Chair
Julie Adams, ASCCC, Executive Director
Cheryl Aschenbach, Lassen College, Area A
Randy Beach, Southwestern College, Area D
Rochelle Olive, College of Alameda, 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, or 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

Table of Contents

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 *
Additions added by Area meetings are marked with a +

1.01	S16	Mentoring Programs for Part-Time Faculty
9.01	S16	Adopt the Paper <i>Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates</i>
9.02	S16	Develop a Paper on Effective Practices for Educational Program Development
9.04	S16	Flexibility in Awarding Unit Credit for Cooperative Work Experience
9.05	S16	Modify Regulations on Certificates of Achievement for Greater Access to Federal Financial Aid
9.07	S16	Guidance on Using Noncredit Courses as Prerequisites and Co-requisites for Credit Courses
+9.08	S16	Associate Degree for Transfer in Music
+9.09	S16	Z Degrees and Faculty Primacy
10.01	S16	Adopt the Paper <i>Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications</i>
+10.02	S16	Explore Changes to Minimum Qualifications
11.01	S16	Update the 2008 Technology Paper
+18.02	S16	Placement Model for Transfer Statistics Using High School Transcript Data
+18.03	S16	Local Determination of Advanced Placement Credit at California Community Colleges
19.01	S16	Support for Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinators

Table of Contents

1.0	ACADEMIC SENATE	1
	*1.01 S16 Mentoring Programs for Part-Time Faculty.....	1
3.0	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/CULTURAL DIVERSITY	1
	3.01 S16 Diversifying Faculty to Enhance Student Success.....	1
7.0	CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE.....	2
	7.01 S16 Costs Associated with Prior Military Experience Credit.....	2
9.01	CURRICULUM.....	3
	*9.01 S16 Adopt the Paper <i>Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates</i>	3
	*9.02 S16 Develop a Paper on Effective Practices for Educational Program ... Development.....	3
	9.02.01 F16 Amend 9.02 F16.....	4
	9.03 S16 Criteria for Recording Low-Unit Certificates on Student Transcripts 5	
	*9.04 S16 Flexibility in Awarding Unit Credit for Cooperative Work Experience	6
	*9.05 S16 Modify Regulations on Certificates of Achievement for Greater Access to Federal Financial Aid.....	6
	9.06 S16 Student Learning Outcomes Assessment is a Curricular Matter.....	7
	*9.07 S16 Guidance on Using Noncredit Courses as Prerequisites and Co- requisites for Credit Courses	8
	*+9.08 S16 Associate Degree for Transfer in Music.....	8
	*+9.09 S16 Z Degrees and Faculty Primacy	9
10.0	DISCIPLINES LIST	10
	*10.01 S16 Adopt the Paper <i>Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications</i>	10
	*+10.02 S16 Explore Changes to Minimum Qualifications	10
11.0	TECHNOLOGY.....	11
	*11.01 S16 Update the 2008 Technology Paper.....	11
18.0	MATRICULATION	12
	18.01 S16 Develop Retesting Guidelines for the Common Assessment.....	12
	*18.02 S16 Placement Model for Transfer Statistics Using High School Transcript Data.....	12
	*+18.03 S16 Local Determination of Advanced Placement Credit at California .. Community Colleges.....	13
19.0	PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS.....	14
	*19.01 S16 Support for Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinators.....	14
	*+19.02 S16 Career Technical Education Faculty and College Governance	15

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE

*1.01 S16 Mentoring Programs for Part-Time Faculty

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has long-standing positions¹ in support of the creation of local faculty mentoring programs as stated in resolution 9.06 F90, which calls for local senates to create mentoring programs for all new full-time and part-time faculty members, and 12.07 F92, which calls for local senates to encourage departments and divisions to assist in providing mentoring services to new part-time faculty;

Whereas, The provision of formal mentoring services for new full-time faculty is a common practice in the California community colleges, but little is known about what mentoring services, formal or informal, are provided to part-time faculty; and

Whereas, Local senates are experiencing increased workloads related to basic skills, student success, and student equity and therefore need assistance and resources in not only developing but also implementing and sustaining mentoring programs for part-time faculty;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges research effective practices for developing, implementing, and sustaining mentoring programs for part-time faculty and report its findings by Spring 2017; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create resources for developing, implementing, and sustaining mentoring programs for part-time faculty.

Contact: Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, Mt. San Jacinto College, Part-Time Task Force

3.0 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/CULTURAL DIVERSITY

3.01 S16 Diversifying Faculty to Enhance Student Success

Whereas, Studies have indicated that a more diverse faculty workforce can enhance student success and may help to close achievement gaps for underrepresented students by as much as 20% to 50%²;

Whereas, Since the publication of the Academic Senate Paper *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures* in Fall 2000, the ASCCC has passed 15 resolutions reaffirming positions that express the need for and value of faculty diversity, yet a great disparity between the faculty diversity and the diversity of the student

¹ Please see resolution 9.06 F90 (<http://asccc.org/resolutions/faculty-mentoring>) and resolution 12.07 F92 (<http://asccc.org/resolutions/part-time-faculty-mentoring>).

² See, for example, "To Be Young, Gifted, and Black, It Helps to Have a Black Teacher" at <http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2016/01/20/463190789/to-be-young-gifted-and-black-it-helps-to-have-a-black-teacher> and Fairlie, R. W., Hoffman, F., Oreopoulos, P. (2014). *A Community College Instructor Like Me: Race and Ethnicity Interactions in the Classroom*. American Economic Review, 104(8): 2567-2591.

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

population remains, as approximately 70% of faculty in the system are white while nearly 70% of the students are non-white³;

Whereas, Education Code Section 87100 (a) (3) cites the need for a “work force that is continually responsive to the needs of a diverse student population,” and hiring practices that promote the development of a workforce better able to serve student needs can work to reduce biases in hiring processes and combat the persistent perception that initiatives to promote the hiring of ethnic minorities compromise professional and academic standards; and

Whereas, Practices that promote the recruitment and hiring of faculty who can serve the needs of diverse student populations will ultimately lead to a more diverse faculty workforce by focusing on and identifying candidates that can best understand, communicate with, and advocate for diverse student populations, thus increasing both faculty diversity and student success;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide rigorous and easily accessible training to educate colleges and faculty on ways in which they can increase the ethnic diversity of faculty through multiple targeted actions to recruit and hire faculty who are best able to serve the needs of diverse student populations while in no way compromising the professionalism nor standards of academic programs; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop guidelines for local academic senates to work jointly with collective bargaining agents, EEO Officers, and Human Resources Offices in order to ensure hiring practices reflect the urgency for developing a work force responsive to the needs of diverse student populations and to correct misperceptions about obstacles to promoting faculty diversity.

Contact: Adrienne Foster (EEO ASCCC Representative) and Cleavon Smith (Equity and Diversity Action Committee), Executive Committee

7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE

7.01 S16 Costs Associated with Prior Military Experience Credit

Whereas, AB 2462 (Block, 2012) calls for “the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, using common course descriptors and pertinent recommendations of the American Council on Education, [to] determine for which courses credit should be awarded for prior military experience”; and

Whereas, Responsibility for determining credit for prior learning, using mechanisms like credit by exam, relies on input and evaluation by faculty in the disciplines for which credit is being sought and is an academic and professional matter;

³ CCCCCO Equity Summit Presentation, Irvine, CA November 4, 2015.

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in conjunction with the Chancellor's Office and other system partners, research the costs of implementation of credit for prior military experience; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in conjunction with the Chancellor's Office and other system partners, work to secure sufficient and ongoing funding to cover the costs for colleges to ensure the timely implementation and ongoing awarding of credit for prior military experience.

Contact: Erik Shearer, Napa College, SACC Chair

9.01 CURRICULUM

9.01 S16 Adopt the Paper *Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates

Whereas, Resolution 9.01 S15 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to "develop a paper on effective practices for local curriculum approval and present it to the field for adoption at the Fall 2016 Plenary Session";

Whereas, The recommendations of the Strong Workforce Task Force have resulted in renewed focus on the effectiveness on local curriculum approval processes; and

Whereas, The timely adoption and revision of curriculum requires effective faculty-driven curriculum approval processes through local academic senates and curriculum committees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates* (as of April 2, 2016) and disseminate the paper to local senates and curriculum committees upon its adoption.

Contact: John Freitas, Executive Committee, Curriculum Committee

See Appendix A - Ensuring Effective Curriculum Approval Processes: A Guide for Local Senates

***9.02 S16 Develop a Paper on Effective Practices for Educational Program Development**

Whereas, "Educational program development," which is an academic and professional matter identified in Title 5 §53200, involves the development of all certificates and degrees and is therefore inherently a curricular matter;

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, The Strong Workforce Task Force⁴ has identified several recommendations that have resulted in a focus on the development of educational programs, including the following:

- Evaluate, strengthen, and revise the curriculum development process to ensure alignment from education to employment.
- Evaluate, revise, and resource the local, regional, and statewide CTE curriculum approval process to ensure timely, responsive, and streamlined curriculum approval.
- Improve program review, evaluation, and revision processes to ensure program relevance to students, business, and industry as reflected in labor market data.
- Develop robust connections between community colleges, business and industry representatives, labor and other regional workforce development partners to align college programs with regional and industry needs and provide support for CTE programs; and

Whereas, Faculty and colleges would benefit from a paper specifically dedicated to effective practices for developing and revising all educational programs;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a paper on effective practices for developing and revising all educational programs and bring the paper to the Spring 2017 Plenary Session for approval.

Contact: Diana Hurlbut, Irvine Valley College, Curriculum Committee

9.02.01 F16 Amend 9.02 F16

Strike the second whereas:

~~Whereas, The Strong Workforce Task Force⁵ has identified several recommendations that have resulted in a focus on the development of educational programs, including the following:~~

- ~~• Evaluate, strengthen, and revise the curriculum development process to ensure alignment from education to employment.—~~
- ~~• Evaluate, revise, and resource the local, regional, and statewide CTE curriculum approval process to ensure timely, responsive, and streamlined curriculum approval.—~~
- ~~• Improve program review, evaluation, and revision processes to ensure program relevance to students, business, and industry as reflected in labor market data.—~~

⁴ The report of the Strong Workforce Task Force is available at <http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/StrongWorkforce/ReportRecommendations.aspx>

⁵ The report of the Strong Workforce Task Force is available at <http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/StrongWorkforce/ReportRecommendations.aspx>

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

- ~~• Develop robust connections between community colleges, business and industry representatives, labor and other regional workforce development partners to align college programs with regional and industry needs and provide support for CTE programs; and~~

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

9.03 S16 Criteria for Recording Low-Unit Certificates on Student Transcripts

Whereas, Title 5 §55070 states that certificate programs of 18 or more semester units or 27 quarter units require Chancellor's Office approval and must be designated "certificates of achievement" and also allows colleges the option of seeking Chancellor's Office approval and certificate of achievement designation for certificate programs of 12 or more semester units or 18 quarter units but less than 18 semester units or 27 quarter units with Chancellor's Office approval required in order for the certificates to be listed on student transcripts;

Whereas, Title 5 contains no provision for Chancellor's Office approval of certificates of less than 12 semester units or 18 quarter units (often referred to as low-unit certificates), and therefore certificates of less than 12 semester units or 18 quarter units cannot be recorded on student transcripts even though they may be of value to students and may meet the needs of the community and industry partners;

Whereas, In January 2016 the Chancellor's Office provided the following voluntarily reported data on the award of low-unit certificates to the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum:

- During the period 2010-2015, a total of 77,836 certificates of less than 18 units and not approved by the Chancellor's Office were awarded to students without being recorded on their transcripts
- Of these 77,836 certificates awarded to students but not listed on their transcripts, 56,787 were certificates between 6 and 18 semester units and 21,049 were certificates of less than 6 semester units; and

Whereas, The Strong Workforce Task Force recommendations include a recommendation to "(e)xpand the definition of student success to better address workforce training outcomes for both 'completers' (students who attain certificates, including low-unit certificates, defined as fewer than 12 units; degrees; transfer-readiness; or enrollment in four-year institutions) and 'skills builders' (workers who are maintaining and adding to skill sets required for ongoing employment and career advancement)," a recommendation that clearly recognizes the value of certificates of less than 12 semester units or 18 quarter units to industry partners and to the students who earn them;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office and other system partners to identify criteria and any regulatory changes needed to allow colleges to record the completion of all certificates on student transcripts; and

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates and curriculum committees to review their certificates of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units or more but less than 18 semester units or 27 quarter units that have not been submitted to the Chancellor's Office and evaluate the efficacy and potential benefit to students of submitting such certificates to the Chancellor's Office for approval and allowing such certificates to be recorded on student transcripts, as a potential benefit.

Contact: Michael Heumann, Imperial Valley College, Curriculum Committee

***9.04 S16 Flexibility in Awarding Unit Credit for Cooperative Work Experience**

Whereas, Cooperative work experience education, as defined in Title 5 §55252, allows students to earn college credit while gaining work experience either related or not related to their educational goals;

Whereas, Title 5 §55256.5 states that the course credit for cooperative work experience is granted according to the following formula:

- (1) Each 75 hours of paid work equals one semester credit or 50 hours equals one quarter credit.
- (2) Each 60 hours of non-paid work equals one semester credit or 40 hours equals one quarter credit.

Whereas, Title 5 §55002.5 allows increments of 0.5 units or less if local policy permits, but §55256.5 is ambiguous on the allowance of increments of less than one unit for cooperative work experience; and

Whereas, The consensus of the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum is that colleges should be allowed to offer credit for cooperative work experience in increments of less than one unit in order to provide flexibility to colleges in their efforts to develop cooperative work experience programs that meet the specific needs of their students;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office and other system partners to revise Title 5 §55256.5 to allow greater flexibility in awarding unit credit, including credit in increments of less than one unit, for cooperative work experience.

Contact: Toni Parsons, San Diego Mesa College, Curriculum Committee

***9.05 S16 Modify Regulations on Certificates of Achievement for Greater Access to Federal Financial Aid**

Whereas, Title 5 §55070(a) defines a Certificate of Achievement as "Any sequence of courses consisting of 18 or more semester units or 27 or more quarter units of degree-applicable credit coursework," and these certificates must be submitted to the Chancellor's Office for approval and are included on a student's transcript upon completion;

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, Any state-approved educational program that consists of 16 or more semester units or 24 quarter units is eligible for federal financial aid;

Whereas, Colleges are not required to seek Chancellor's Office approval for certificate programs that are less than 18 semester units or 27 quarter units; and

Whereas, Local decisions to not seek Chancellor's Office approval for certificates that are 16 or more semester units and less than 18 semester or at least 24 quarter units and at least 27 quarter units effectively block access to federal financial aid for students who complete such certificate programs;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to modify Title 5 §55070(a) to require all certificate programs consisting of 16 or more semester units or 24 or more quarter units be submitted to the Chancellor's Office for approval in order to maximize student access to federal financial aid; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to review and consider for submission to the Chancellor's Office any existing local certificates that are 16 or more semester units and less than 18 units or at least 24 quarter units and less than 27 quarter units to more immediately expand student access to federal financial aid.

Contact: Tiffany Tran, Irvine Valley College, Curriculum Committee

9.06 S16 Student Learning Outcomes Assessment is a Curricular Matter

Whereas, The ASCCC paper "Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment," approved by the body in Fall 2010 states, "SLOs are instruments of curriculum development, and therefore both the design and the assessment of SLOs clearly are curricular matters";

Whereas, Outcomes assessment is a form of research that may inform improvements in course curriculum, program curriculum and teaching methodologies with the goal of improving student achievement; and

Whereas, Curriculum is an academic and professional matter;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to ensure that institutional decisions regarding student learning outcomes assessment are understood to be a curricular matter and therefore institutions should consult collegially with local senates; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senate leaders to advocate for outcomes assessment as a form of academic research that emphasizes improvement in student learning.

Contact: Stephanie Curry, Reedley College, Accreditation Committee

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

***9.07 S16 Guidance on Using Noncredit Courses as Prerequisites and Co-requisites for Credit Courses**

Whereas, Recent legislative action to equalize the apportionment funding rate for career development and college preparation noncredit instruction with that of credit instruction may make the use of noncredit courses as prerequisites and co-requisites for credit courses an attractive option for colleges that are developing alternative curricular pathways designed to prepare students for college-level work;

Whereas, Because students are not awarded units for completing noncredit courses, the potential benefits to students of the use of noncredit courses as prerequisites and co-requisites for credit courses include no registration fees, no effect on registration priority, and no effect on financial aid eligibility; and

Whereas, Title 5 §§55002 and 55003 are silent on the use of noncredit courses as prerequisites and co-requisites for credit courses, and no existing professional guidance from the Academic Senate has been created to assist faculty in the effective use of noncredit prerequisite and co-requisite courses to adequately prepare students for the target credit courses;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop guidelines on the appropriate use of noncredit courses as prerequisites and co-requisites for credit courses that ensure the quality and rigor of the curriculum, and distribute the guidelines by Spring 2017.

Contact: Michael Heumann, Imperial Valley College, Curriculum Committee

***+9.08 S16 Associate Degree for Transfer in Music**

Whereas, Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs) are limited to a total of 60 semester units completed at a community college and must include the completion of CSU Breadth or IGETC, which consists of 37-39 semester units, leaving only 21-22 units of major preparation for music if none of the music courses have been approved for general education;

Whereas, The ADT in Music is not truly “a degree with a guarantee” due to the requirement for students to audition into music programs, students can not enter a university music program at the junior level, students still have to take placement tests, students can only get a Bachelor of Arts degree instead of a Bachelor of Music degree, and music faculty do not recommend the ADT degree to students interested in music as a career or transferring as a music major;

Whereas, The music major is a recognized high unit major as evidenced by the 124-132 semester unit Bachelor of Music (BM) degrees at numerous CSU campuses, including CSU Long Beach, CSU Los Angeles, CSU Fullerton, CSU Stanislaus, San Jose State, San Diego State, and the required lower division music curriculum at these institutions ranges between 33 and 40 semester units; and

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, Some disciplines, such as Biology and Chemistry, have developed Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) using IGETC for STEM, which allows the community colleges to required additional discipline specific units by permitting six units of general education to be completed after transfer;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognize the special character of the music major that requires admission by audition which does not fit well with the parameters of the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Academic Senate for the California State University to include music as a discipline eligible to use IGETC for STEM as the general education pattern for the ADT; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to create a new Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) code for the Transfer Model Curriculum in Music to eliminate the legal requirement that all colleges with an approved Associate's Degree in Music must have an approved Associate Degree for Transfer in Music.

Contact: Rob Fremland, San Diego Mesa College, Area D

***+9.09 S16 Z Degrees and Faculty Primacy**

Whereas, The Department of Finance has introduced trailer bill language to incentivize California Community Colleges to develop "Z-Degrees", designed so that students can complete a degree with zero costs for textbooks;

Whereas, The development and review of curriculum and degree programs, as well as the selection of textbooks and other instructional materials, are items of faculty primacy under the 10+1; and

Whereas, The trailer bill language calls for consultation with the local academic senate but fails to recognize the primacy of faculty in these types of decisions;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage and support local and statewide discussions regarding degree paths with zero text book cost to students, known as Z-Degrees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges remind legislators and others evincing interest in Z-Degrees of the primacy of faculty in decisions regarding degree and program development; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the 2016 budget trailer bill language be changed to reflect the local academic senate's

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

approval of the development of Z-Degrees and participation in any kind of incentive program related to Z-Degrees to ensure that the primacy of faculty is retained.

Contact: Stacey Searl-Chapin, Mt San Jacinto College, Area D

10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST

10.01 S16 Adopt the Paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications

Whereas, Questions regarding equivalence to faculty minimum qualifications and equivalency processes have been raised with increasing frequency in recent years, especially due to the 2015 discussions of the Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy; and

Whereas, Resolution 10.01 F14 directed the ASCCC to revise its 2006 paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications*;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the proposed revisions to the paper *Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications*.

Contact: John Stankas, Executive Committee, Standards and Practices Committee Chair

See Appendix B – Equivalency Paper

***+10.02 S16 Explore Changes to Minimum Qualifications**

Whereas, The discussions and recommendations of the 2015 Board of Governors Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy included extended consideration of minimum qualifications for career technical education (CTE) faculty, as some districts report difficulty with finding faculty who meet minimum qualifications to teach in their CTE programs;

Whereas, One frequently proposed solution to issues regarding difficulty in hiring CTE faculty who meet minimum qualifications is a reconsideration of single-course equivalency, but Legal Opinion L 03-28 (R. Black, 2004) states that “a district is not authorized to establish a single course equivalency as a substitute for meeting minimum qualifications in a discipline,” and Academic Senate Resolution 10.09 S02 affirms the ASCCC’s opposition to single-course and sub-disciplines equivalency;

Whereas, The 2016 California Budget Trailer Bill Language (February 1, 2016) calls on the Community College System to “Eliminate barriers to hiring qualified instructors for career technical education courses, including reevaluating the required minimum qualifications for career technical education instructors,” and thus considerable legislative pressure may be exerted regarding the reform of the minimum qualifications process; and

Whereas, Certain disciplines are indeed very broad in scope, and an exploration of creating within broad disciplines a number of more narrowly defined disciplines as recommended by the discipline faculty through the ASCCC’s Disciplines List Process

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

might be both prudent in the face of possible legislative pressure and beneficial for community college CTE programs and the communities they serve;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with discipline faculty and other interested stakeholders to explore the possibility of creating within existing CTE disciplines more narrowly defined disciplines when discipline faculty deem such a discussion to be potentially beneficial.

Contact: John Stanskas, San Bernardino Valley College, Area D

11.0 TECHNOLOGY

*11.01 S16 Update the 2008 Technology Paper

Whereas, The creation of educational programs, including professional development, technology, and curriculum standards, is an area of faculty primacy regardless of modality, and an increasing number of colleges are creating or expanding online programs in response to student interest in online courses, degrees, and certificates;

Whereas, In order to be effective in serving students, high quality online educational programs require sufficient resources, including infrastructure, technology, professional development resources, and student support services, all of which are needs that may be identified through local program review processes, institutional planning and budget development processes, and faculty development processes, each of which is a matter of local senate purview;

Whereas, Since the publication of the Academic Senate paper *Ensuring the Appropriate Use of Educational Technology: An Update for Local Academic Senates* in 2008, substantial advances in online education have occurred in the areas of technology, pedagogy, and student support services, including those promoted through the efforts of the California Community Colleges Online Education Initiative; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is the legal representative of faculty on academic and professional matters and therefore has primacy in providing professional guidance to the field on the elements of high quality online education programs, including curriculum, student support service needs, infrastructure, technology, and faculty professional development;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in order to provide guidance to local senates and colleges on best practices in online education programs, update the 2008 paper *Ensuring the Appropriate Use of Educational Technology: An Update for Local Academic Senates*.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Executive Committee, Online Committee

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

18.0 MATRICULATION

18.01 S16 Develop Retesting Guidelines for the Common Assessment

Whereas, Title 5 §55522 (b) specifies that “Each community college district shall adopt procedures that are clearly communicated to students, regarding the college's sample test preparation, how the student test results will be used to inform placement decisions, and the district's limits on the student's ability to re-test”;

Whereas, Existing district policies often permit students to retake an assessment test after some period of time, but that period of time can vary greatly from one district to another, with some districts allowing students to reassess immediately while other districts require students to wait several years; and

Whereas, The Common Assessment will ensure that all community college students are assessed using the same assessment exam, and variances between district policies could create equity issues for students that do not have access to a district with a less restrictive retesting policy;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to develop guidelines for the development of assessment policies that maintain local control over retesting policies and procedures while maximizing access for students and distribute the guidelines to local senates and curriculum committees prior to the availability of the Common Assessment to all colleges; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to delay revision of current policies regarding retesting for placement until after the distribution of assessment retesting guidelines.

Contact: Craig Rutan, Executive Committee, Co-chair Common Assessment Initiative

*18.02 S16 Placement Model for Transfer Statistics Using High School Transcript Data

Whereas, The Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP) has developed placement models in English, mathematics, English as a Second Language (ESL), and reading, using high school transcript data that are currently being piloted at more than 20 different community colleges;

Whereas, The placement models developed by MMAP typically require a higher level of predicted success than many placement tests currently in use at colleges;

Whereas, Using actual student data, MMAP has developed a placement model for transfer level statistics that indicates that some students are likely to be successful at statistics even though Algebra I was their highest high school mathematics course completed; and

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, An analysis of 22,403 students that enrolled in transfer level statistics as their first college mathematics course, 2,435 of those students had completed Algebra I as their highest high school mathematics course, 703 of these would have been placed based MMAP placement model with a 60 % success rate, while 1,732 of these students do not satisfy the MMAP placement model and had a success rate of 48%;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges authorize the distribution of the “MMWG Mathematics Decision Rules Recommendation and Discussion Summary” to Multiple Measures Assessment Project and Common Assessment Initiative pilot colleges;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to work with their administrations to ensure that the proposed statistics placement model is analyzed using data for their students to ensure that the model works as predicated prior to using it to place students;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to review the proposed statistics placement model and make any necessary modifications to ensure that there is no negative impact on existing articulation agreements between their college and four year universities; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges collect data on the effectiveness of the statistics placement models and report the results by Fall 2017.

Contact: Craig Rutan, Santiago Canyon College, Area D

Appendix C: MMWG Mathematics Decision Rules Recommendation

Appendix D: Discussion Summary, CAISC 2_2_16 MMAP Update

***+18.03 S16 Local Determination of Advanced Placement Credit at California Community Colleges**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges, California State University and University of California Systems offer credit for Advanced Placement (AP) Scores of 3, 4, and 5, yet how that credit will be awarded and applied is determined by each individual institution;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges worked with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) partners in response to Resolution 9.06 07 Researching AP Uses and Cut Scores to “clarify how AP exam scores are applied to grant unit and/or subject credit for purposes that vary among segments, with the goal of achieving similarity in standards across our institutions and for our students”;

Whereas, The determination of appropriate credit for AP exam results is a curricular matter over which local faculty have purview, yet Assembly Bill 1985 (Williams, 2016)

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

would mandate that all community colleges grant course credit for any student who earns a score of three or higher on an AP Exam, thus conflicting with Education Code and Title 5 Regulations and removing from the local decision-making process any evaluation of whether such credit is appropriate or in the best interests of students; and

Whereas, Due to the continually developing nature of AP Exam content and structure, AP policies and practices at all colleges should be reviewed regularly to ensure that the best interest of students are being served;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates and curriculum committees to work with discipline faculty to conduct regular reviews of processes and practices for awarding credit for Advanced Placement scores in order to ensure that students receive all proper credit and are not required to duplicate coursework; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose legislation that mandates community colleges to award course credit for specific levels of performance on Advanced Placement Exams.

Contact: Ginni May, Sacramento City College, Area A

<http://asccc.org/resolutions/researching-ap-uses-and-cut-scores>

<http://calstate.edu/transfer/requirements/AdvancedPlacementAPCourses.shtml>

<http://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/counselors/exam-credit/ap-credits/index.html>

19.0 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

***19.01 S16 Support for Faculty Open Educational Resources Coordinators**

Whereas, The College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015 (AB 798 Bonilla, 2015), provides incentives to colleges that seek to reduce textbook costs by adopting Open Educational Resources (OER) in a minimum of 10 course sections;

Whereas, The intersegmental California Open Educational Resources Council (COERC) created a Request for Proposals (RFP) that included the specific requirement that colleges include in the RFP the “Identification, roles, and responsibilities of your Textbook Affordability Campus Coordinator who will coordinating your textbook affordability program, including ensuring the programs are implementing in a timely and effective manner and providing reports and evaluations on the campus’s program outcomes”; and

Whereas, The evaluation of program outcomes regarding curricular decisions, including the adoption of textbooks, is an academic and professional matter;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates that intend to apply to participate in the Textbook Affordability Act ensure that the process for the selection of the Textbook Affordability Campus Coordinator involves collegial consultation with the local academic senate.

2016 Spring Plenary Session Executive Committee Resolutions

Contact: Cheryl Aschenbach, Executive Committee, COERC Member

***+19.02 S16 Career Technical Education Faculty and College Governance**

Whereas, The Board of Governors Task Force on Work Force, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy recommendations not only recognized the necessity of colleges' career technical education (CTE) programs but increased the necessity of CTE faculty participation in governance locally and statewide;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) recognizes the need for CTE faculty participation through resolutions and positions; and

Whereas, CTE faculty typically have more contact hours with students as a result of local bargaining agreements that count laboratory hours differently than lecture hours, which decreases the number of hours that CTE faculty have to fully participate in the governance matters of local senates and the ASCCC;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chief Executive Officers and Chief Instructional Officers to foster local support, such as substitutes and compensation, for CTE faculty to participate in local governance and statewide work associated with the task force recommendations; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the state-level leadership of faculty unions toward a joint effort to eliminate differential between lecture and laboratory hours in order to permit all classroom faculty to have the standard 15 student contact hours thus allowing more time for laboratory faculty to participate in governance matters at local colleges and statewide.

Contact: Dianna Chiabotti Napa Valley College, Area B