

**47th FALL SESSION RESOLUTIONS**

***FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS***

*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 November 5 – 7, 2015.*

Resolutions Committee 2015-2016

John Stanskas, Executive Committee, Chair

Julie Adams, ASCCC, Executive Director

Cheryl Ashenbach, 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

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.

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 \*

\*2.01 F15 Adopt the ASCCC Paper Effective Practices in Accreditation

\*7.01 F15 LGBT MIS Data Collection and Dissemination

\*7.02 F15 Support for Authorization Reciprocity Agreements

\*7.03 F15 Ensuring Accurate Information in the California Virtual Campus Catalog

\*9.01 F15 Creation of Local Online Education Rubrics

\*9.07 F15 Definition of Regular, Effective, and Substantive Contact

\*9.08 F15 Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Local Curriculum Processes

\*9.09 F15 Revisit the Title 5 Definition of the Credit Hour

\*9.10 F15 Professional Guidelines and Effective Practices for Using Publisher Generated Course Materials

\*13.01 F15 Addition of Course Identification Numbers (C-ID) to College Catalogs and Student Transcripts

\*13.02 F15 Update System Guidance for Noncredit Curriculum

\*13.03 F15 Opposition to Compensation for Adoption of Open Educational Resources

\*15.01 F15 Adoption of Statement on Competencies in the Natural Sciences

[**2.0 ACCREDITATION 1**](#_Toc431743538)

[\*2.01 F15 Adopt the ASCCC Paper *Effective Practices in Accreditation* 1](#_Toc431743539)

[2.02 F15 Endorse the CCCCO Task Force on Accreditation Report 1](#_Toc431743540)

[7.0 CONSULTATION WITH CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE 2](#_Toc431743541)

[\*7.01 F15 LGBT MIS Data Collection and Dissemination 2](#_Toc431743542)

[\*7.02 F15 Support for Authorization Reciprocity Agreements 3](#_Toc431743543)

[\*7.03 F15 Ensuring Accurate Information in the California Virtual Campus Catalog 3](#_Toc431743544)

[9.0 CURRICULUM 4](#_Toc431743545)

[\*9.01 F15 Creation of Local Online Education Rubrics 4](#_Toc431743546)

[9.02 F15 Defining the Parameters of the California Community College Baccalaureate Degree 4](#_Toc431743547)

[9.03 F15 Baccalaureate Level General Education at the California Community Colleges 5](#_Toc431743548)

[9.04 F15 Limitations on Enrollment and Admission Criteria for Baccalaureate Programs 6](#_Toc431743549)

[9.05 F15 Upper Division General Education Curriculum for Baccalaureate Pilot Programs 6](#_Toc431743550)

[9.06 F15 Support for Baccalaureate Pilot Programs 7](#_Toc431743551)

[\*9.07 F15 Definition of Regular, Effective, and Substantive Contact 7](#_Toc431743552)

[\*9.08 F15 Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Local Curriculum Processes 7](#_Toc431743553)

[\*9.09 F15 Revisit the Title 5 Definition of the Credit Hour 8](#_Toc431743554)

[\*9.10 F15 Professional Guidelines and Effective Practices for Using Publisher Generated Course Materials 9](#_Toc431743555)

[10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST 10](#_Toc431743556)

[10.01 F15 Minimum Qualifications for Instruction of Upper Division Courses
 at the California Community Colleges 10](#_Toc431743557)

[13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS 11](#_Toc431743558)

[\*13.01 F15 Addition of Course Identification Numbers (C-ID) to College Catalogs and Student Transcripts 11](#_Toc431743559)

[\*13.02 F15 Updated System Guidance for Noncredit Curriculum 11](#_Toc431743560)

[\*13.03 F15 Opposition to Compensation for Adoption of Open Educational 12](#_Toc431743561)

[15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL 13](#_Toc431743562)

[\*15.01 F15 Adoption of Statement on Competencies in the Natural Sciences 13](#_Toc431743563)

# **2.0 ACCREDITATION**

**\*2.01 F15 Adopt the ASCCC Paper *Effective Practices in Accreditation***

Whereas, Accreditation is an ongoing concern for all colleges in the California Community College System;

Whereas, Faculty participation in the accreditation process and the role of faculty in maintaining an individual college’s accreditation are essential and have been the subject of many Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) *Rostrum* articles, resolutions, and breakout sessions; and

Whereas, Resolution 02.01 S12 directed the ASCCC to develop resources, including a paper, on effective practices for accreditation compliance to be used by faculty at the local level;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Effective Practices in Accreditation: A Guide To Support Colleges in the Accreditation Cycle* and disseminate the paper upon its adoption.

Contact: Randy Beach, Executive Committee, Accreditation and Assessment Committee

Appendix A: Effective Practices in Accreditation Paper

**2.02 F15 Endorse the CCCCO Task Force on Accreditation Report**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) convened the 2014-2015 Task Force on Accreditation to review and address serious concerns regarding California community colleges’ accreditation process;

Whereas, The president of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, several community college presidents and administrators, a representative from the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges, a community college board trustee, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office were active participants in the work of the Task Force on Accreditation and unanimously supported its findings and recommendations;

Whereas, The recommendations of the Task Force on Accreditation were, in part, based on ASCCC resolutions, which included recommendations for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC); and

Whereas, According to the Task Force on Accreditation, “On several occasions the ACCJC has promised changes and has offered reports detailing their efforts to address concerns, but these promises and reports have led to few significant improvements”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse the recommendations of the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Task Force Report on Accreditation.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Contact: Executive Committee

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

## **\*7.01 F15 LGBT MIS Data Collection and Dissemination**

Whereas, California law (AB 620, Block, 2011) requires the California community colleges (CCC) to collect aggregate demographic information regarding the sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression of students, and Education Code section 66271.2 communicates a concern for the obstacles uniquely faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students;

Whereas, AB 620 (Block, 2011) requests annual transmittal of summary demographic reporting to the Legislature and posting of each summary of information on the CCC Chancellor’s Office web site, and the Chancellor’s Office also currently collects Management Information Systems (MIS) data to support statewide equity work;

Whereas, The collection of MIS data related to AB 620 (Block, 2011) on CCCApply creates a confusing array of questions that obfuscates the data collected on sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression by, for example, asking about gender identity in one spot and about being transgender in another spot and asking students to self-identify according to categories that have changed over time; and

Whereas, Specific data collected on sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression intersects with the statewide equity work and could inform local decision-making processes such as identifying possible disproportionate impact, evaluating the efficacy of local work done to ameliorate obstacles unique to LGBT populations, assisting colleges to better serve LGBT students through accurate demographics, placement rates, course success and retention, 30-unit completion, degree and certificate achievement, and transfer rates, and this information could potentially be used to develop student programs that provide peer mentoring similar to Puente or Umoja models;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor's Office to change the MIS data elements to clarify responses to gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation choices so that the data collected by CCCApply matches with the MIS database and yields significant and useful data on LGBT students; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor’s Office to disseminate data collected on gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation to local community colleges to better serve LGBT students and to do so in a safe and secure manner in acknowledgement of the sensitive nature of the data.

Contact: Julie Bruno, Executive Committee

## **\*7.02 F15 Support for Authorization Reciprocity Agreements**

Whereas, The State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) has garnered support around the United States, with more than 10 states joining the agreement to allow students to take online courses without individual colleges needing to seek authorization from those students’ home states;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in resolution 7.01 S14, urged “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”;

Whereas, Senate Bill 634 (Block, 2015), “provides the mechanism for California colleges and universities to participate in limited interstate reciprocity among states, including through the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement” but is now a two-year bill; and

Whereas, Current reciprocity agreements vary by college and therefore potentially prevent students in the Online Education Initiative Exchange from being able to participate as intended;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges partner with the Chancellor’s Office and other organizations to urge support for the inclusion of California community colleges in reciprocity agreements, including the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement.

Contact: Fabiola Torres, Glendale College, Online Education Committee

## **\*7.03 F15 Ensuring Accurate Information in the California Virtual Campus Catalog**

Whereas, The California Virtual Campus (CVC)[[2]](#footnote-2), which is operated by the California Community Colleges Technology Center, maintains a catalog that is intended to be a resource used by students to identify the distance education classes that meet their particular educational goals, including identifying courses that fulfill their degree-completion needs;

Whereas, Elements of the CVC catalog are misleading due to over-simplified statements regarding Associate Degrees for Transfer and the recognition of any course included anywhere in such degrees as an Associate Degree for Transfer course when such courses may not actually be articulated with a UC or CSU and as a consequence may have no value upon transfer;

Whereas, Any information provided to students by the CVC on its website about courses and educational programs on behalf of the participant colleges must be clear and accurate in order to ensure that students are able to make the best choices possible in achieving their educational goals; and

Whereas, The integration of data related to Associate Degrees for Transfer into the CVC was made without any consultation with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, which is on record expressing its concerns with efforts like the CVC moving forward absent appropriate consultation[[3]](#footnote-3);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to immediately establish a work group charged with reviewing, updating, and correcting as needed the CVC catalog; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to identify and charge a responsible party with the ongoing responsibility for continually reviewing and updating the information in the California Virtual Campus (CVC) catalog to ensure that students receive the correct information needed to make properly informed decisions when choosing courses through the CVC.

Contact: John Freitas, Executive Committee

# **9.0 CURRICULUM**

## **\*9.01 F15 Creation of Local Online Education Rubrics**

Whereas, Faculty across California are considering migration to a new Course Management System (CMS) in conjunction with the adoption of the Canvas course management system by the Online Education Initiative (OEI);

Whereas, Migration to a new CMS provides an opportunity for faculty to evaluate and update their online and hybrid courses, and colleges may wish to include their courses in the OEI Exchange, which will require compliance with certain standards as set forth by the OEI in its adopted rubric; and

Whereas, The latest Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) standards regarding online education have increased scrutiny of online course offerings in terms of rigor, effective contact, and other standards;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates to explore the creation and endorsement of rubrics for online course standards.

Contact: Fabiola Torres, Glendale College, Online Education Committee

## **9.02 F15 Defining the Parameters of the California Community College Baccalaureate Degree**

Whereas, SB 850 (Block, 2014) authorized the Board of Governors to establish a statewide baccalaureate degree program at not more than 15 pilot colleges; and

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

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to modify Title 5 to define baccalaureate degrees at California community colleges as a minimum of 120 semester units including a minimum of 24 upper division units; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to ensure that upper division units are defined as requiring lower division knowledge and applying that knowledge as demonstrated measures of critical thinking through writing, oral communication, or computation and allow that upper division coursework may encompass research elements, workforce training, apprenticeships, internships, required practicum, or capstone projects.

Contact: Jolena Grande, Cypress College, ASCCC Bachelor Degree Task Force

## **9.03 F15 Baccalaureate Level General Education at the California Community Colleges**

Whereas, SB 850 (Block, 2014) authorized the Board of Governors to establish a statewide baccalaureate degree program at not more than 15 pilot colleges;

Whereas, The faculty of the California community colleges value the integral role of general education as essential to degree attainment, and the breadth of general education addresses the skills needed to succeed in the workforce, as identified by employers cited in the National Association of Colleges and Employers in their October 2013 survey[[4]](#footnote-4);

Whereas, Students seeking to transfer to a public institution in California generally follow the IGETC or the CSU-GE Breadth pattern to complete lower division general education, and each segment of California’s higher education, the public at large, and the Legislature is familiar with and recognizes the value of these patterns as lower-division preparation for baccalaureate level attainment; and

Whereas, In order to meet the timeframe established by SB850 (Block, 2014), pilot colleges will begin offering upper division classes in Fall 2016, leaving an insufficient timeframe to develop a system-wide community college general education pattern for the baccalaureate level;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to ensure that all baccalaureate degrees granted by the California community colleges require either IGETC or CSU-GE Breadth as lower division general education preparation;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to ensure that all baccalaureate degrees granted by the California community colleges require six semester units of upper division general education offered by at least two disciplines external to the major, one of which must have an emphasis in written communication, oral communication, or computation; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges evaluate the feasibility of creating a baccalaureate level general education pattern for the California Community College System and report back to the field by Spring 2017 Plenary Session.

Contact: John Stanskas, Executive Committee, ASCCC Bachelor Degree Task Force

**9.04 F15 Limitations on Enrollment and Admission Criteria for Baccalaureate Programs**

Whereas, SB 850 (Block, 2014) authorized the Board of Governors to establish a statewide baccalaureate degree program at not more than 15 pilot colleges;

Whereas, The mission of the California community college is based on providing an open-access higher education opportunity to all who may benefit from instruction;

Whereas, Education Code §78261.5 provides for a limitation on enrollment for nursing; and

Whereas, It is anticipated that demand for community college baccalaureate programs will exceed capacity in the initial cohorts;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to create guidelines that adhere to principles of the California community college mission of open educational access and equity while allowing enrollment restrictions for baccalaureate pilot programs.

Contact: Jolena Grande, Cypress College, ASCCC Bachelor Degree Task Force

**9.05 F15 Upper Division General Education Curriculum for Baccalaureate Pilot Programs**

Whereas, SB 850 (Block, 2014) authorized the Board of Governors to establish a statewide baccalaureate degree program at not more than 15 pilot colleges;

Whereas, Upper division units offered by the pilot colleges have not yet been established as transferrable to other institutions of higher education; and

Whereas, Pilot colleges need to meet the general education needs of students utilizing a limited cohort model;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local curriculum committees to ensure that courses developed to meet upper division general education requirements for the baccalaureate pilot program are designed for the baccalaureate pilot student cohort and not for the general population of students.

Contact: Lynell Wiggins, Pasadena City College, ASCCC Bachelor Degree Task Force

**9.06 F15 Support for Baccalaureate Pilot Programs**

Whereas, SB 850 (Block, 2014) authorized the Board of Governors to establish a statewide baccalaureate degree program at not more than 15 pilot colleges;

Whereas, Originally no additional funding was allocated to support the development of curriculum, student services, or implementation of course offerings beyond the $84 per unit additional fee for upper division offerings; and

Whereas, Six million dollars was allocated in the 2015-16 budget cycle to support the baccalaureate pilot programs;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates and the Chancellor’s Office to ensure the baccalaureate pilot programs are adequately supported with appropriate financial resources.

Contact: Cheryl Aschenbach, Executive Committee, ASCCC Bachelor Degree Task Force

**\*9.07 F15 Definition of Regular, Effective, and Substantive Contact**

Whereas, The requirement of regular, effective, and substantive contact between faculty and students in online courses is present in Title 5, Department of Education regulations, and Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges standards;

Whereas, A wide variance exists around the state regarding the definition of regular, effective, and substantive contact in online classes, leading to confusion for students and faculty; and

Whereas, The absence of a clear definition of regular, effective, and substantive contact in online classes may result in courses not meeting regulatory standards;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that the development of local policies regarding regular, effective, and substantive contact is an academic and professional matter that requires the expertise of faculty and therefore should be created by faculty rather than administration or outside forces; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges compile models and practices regarding regular, effective, and substantive contact for online courses and disseminate that information to the field by Fall 2016.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Executive Committee, Online Education Committee

## **\*9.08 F15 Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Local Curriculum Processes**

Whereas, The *Recommendations of the California Community Colleges Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy* (August 14, 2015)[[5]](#footnote-5) identified six recommendations for improving curriculum processes, including the recommendation to “evaluate, revise and resource the local, regional, and statewide CTE curriculum approval process to ensure timely, responsive, and streamlined curriculum approval”;

Whereas, The reported inefficiencies of local curriculum processes are often cited as the reason courses and programs are not approved in a timely enough manner to meet student, community, and industry needs; and

Whereas, Colleges may benefit from an evaluation of their local curriculum processes that leads to improvements in the effectiveness and efficiency that allow for more timely responses to student, community, and industry needs;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly urge local senates and curriculum committees to evaluate their curriculum approval processes in order to develop, revise, and implement curriculum in a timely manner.

Contact: Diana Hurlbut, Irvine Valley College, Curriculum Committee

## **\*9.09 F15 Revisit the Title 5 Definition of the Credit Hour**

Whereas, The United States Department of Education (USDE) defines the credit hour in Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §600.2[[6]](#footnote-6) as follows:

Credit hour: Except as provided in 34 CFR §668.8(k) and (l), a credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

(1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

(2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours;

Whereas, Title 5 §55002.5 defines the credit hour as requiring “a minimum of 48 hours of lecture, study, or laboratory work at colleges operating on the semester system or 33 hours of lecture, study or laboratory work at colleges operating on the quarter system,” and Title 5 §§55002 (a)(2)(B) and (b)(2)(B) state that a credit “course requires a minimum of three hours of student work per week, per unit, including class time and/or demonstrated competency, for each unit of credit, prorated for short-term, extended term, laboratory, and/or activity courses,” but unlike USDE 34 CFR §600.2 and the *Program and Course Approval Handbook* (*PCAH*, 5th Edition) Title 5 does not include any minimum time requirements for out of class student work, also known as homework hours;

Whereas, Accrediting agencies are expected by USDE to assess an institution’s compliance with USDE regulations related to higher education, including the credit hour as defined in 34 CFR §600.2, when evaluating that institution’s accreditation status; and

Whereas, The inconsistency between the definitions of the credit hour found in Title 5 §§55002-55002.5, USDE 34 CFR §600.2 and the *Program and Course Approval Handbook* (*PCAH*, 5th Edition) may cause confusion at colleges about the appropriate ratio between classroom hours and direct faculty interaction and homework hours, and colleges may interpret the use of the word “minimum” in Title 5 as allowing significantly more student work per week per unit of credit than what is normally expected of college students in the United States system of higher education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to revisit the definition of the credit hour as stated in Title 5 §§55002-55002.5 to determine whether any changes are required to achieve alignment with the United States Department of Education definition of the credit hour as stated in 34 CFR §600.2; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide guidance to local senates and curriculum committees regarding the appropriate application of the definitions of the credit hour as currently stated in Title 5 §§55002-55002.5 and 34 CFR §600.2 and based on the established professional norms for higher education in the United States.

Contact: John Freitas, Executive Committee, Curriculum Committee

**\*9.10 F15 Professional Guidelines and Effective Practices for Using Publisher Generated Course Materials**

Whereas, Lectures, course materials, assessments, and other pedagogical materials have traditionally been developed by the faculty member teaching a course;

Whereas, The increase in the number of online courses offerings has led to an increase in the number of publisher generated materials, including “canned” courses and assessments, being produced by publishers and other groups and an increase in use of these materials by faculty in both online and in-person classes; and

Whereas, There are concerns that the increased widespread use of these “canned” courses and publisher generated materials may potentially damage the pedagogical soundness of all classes being offered by the California community colleges;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, along with other interested parties, draft a paper that provides professional guidance and effective practices for the use of publisher generated materials by faculty in all courses and bring the paper to the body for approval by Spring 2017.

Contact: Fabiola Torres, Glendale College, Online Education Committee

# **10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST**

## **10.01 F15 Minimum Qualifications for Instruction of Upper Division Courses at the California Community Colleges**

Whereas, SB 850 (Block, 2014) authorized the Board of Governors to establish a statewide baccalaureate degree program at not more than 15 pilot colleges;

Whereas, The purpose of establishing minimum qualifications is to ensure qualified faculty for all courses;

Whereas, Title 5 §53410 defines minimum qualifications for teaching lower division curriculum, and the passage of SB850 (Block, 2014) created upper division curriculum in the California community colleges; and

Whereas, Educational preparation necessary to teach upper division curriculum exceeds the education necessary to teach some lower division curriculum;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to modify Title 5 §53410 to include the following subsection to address the qualifications for the instructor of record:

(e) For faculty assigned to teach upper division courses in disciplines where the master's degree is not generally expected or available, but where a related bachelor's or associate degree is generally expected or available, possession of either:

(1) a master's degree in the discipline directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment or equivalent foreign degree plus two years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment and any appropriate licensure; or

(2) a bachelor degree in the discipline directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment or equivalent foreign degree plus six years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment and any appropriate licensure.

(f) For faculty assigned to teach upper division courses in disciplines where the master's degree is not generally expected or available, and where a related bachelor's or associate degree is not generally expected or available, possession of either:

(1) any master's degree or equivalent foreign degree plus two years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment and any appropriate licensure; or

(2) any bachelor degree or equivalent foreign degree plus six years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment and any appropriate licensure.

and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to modify Title 5 §53430 to add the following subsection:

(d) Equivalency is not appropriate for faculty assigned to teach upper division courses and those individuals are required to satisfy the minimum qualifications outlined in §53410.

Contact: John Stanskas, Executive Committee, ASCCC Bachelor Degree Task Force

# **13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS**

## **\*13.01 F15 Addition of Course Identification Numbers (C-ID) to College Catalogs and Student Transcripts**

Whereas, California Articulation Number System (CAN) designations were typically included in college catalogs, typically in a list with the University of California Transfer Course Agreement and at the end of each course’s catalog description;

Whereas, CAN has been replaced by Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) designations which indicate that a course outline of record is aligned to an intersegmentally developed descriptor, establishing intrasegmental articulation and often permitting inclusion in Associate Degrees for Transfer;

Whereas, Adding C-ID designations to colleges catalog provides students with valuable information regarding the transferability of courses and in determining the most appropriate courses to complete their educational goals; and

Whereas, Including C-ID designations on student transcripts facilitates students receiving proper credit when taking classes at multiple California community colleges and upon transfer to a California State University (CSU) campus;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates and curriculum committees to include information about courses with an approved C-ID numbers in their college catalogs, either as a single list, at the end of each course’s description, or both; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to work with their administration to add C-ID numbers to student transcripts.

Contact: Craig Rutan, Executive Committee

## **\*13.02 F15 Update System Guidance for Noncredit Curriculum**

Whereas, Changes to regulations governing course repeatability, the recent efforts at realigning adult education (AB 86 and AB 104, Budget Committee, 2013), the recent equalization of funding for Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) noncredit class apportionment with credit class apportionment, the ongoing funding for student success efforts including Basic Skills, Equity, and Student Success and Support Programs, and the Recommendations of the California Community Colleges Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy (August 14, 2015) are all resulting in an increased focus on the use noncredit instruction to improve student success and close equity gaps in basic skills as well as provide additional options for preparation for courses in career and technical education programs; and

Whereas, Both the Chancellor’s Office document *Noncredit at a Glance*, published in 2006, and the Academic Senate paper *Noncredit Instruction: Opportunity and Challenge,* adopted by the body in Spring 2009, are outdated and require revision in order to reflect the recent changes to credit course repeatability and potential use of noncredit as an alternative to course repetition, the efforts to realign adult education, the changes to CDCP noncredit funding, and the current focus on career technical education programs and workforce development and to provide timely and relevant guidance to the field in these and other areas;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office and other system partners to revise the 2006 document *Noncredit at a Glance* or create a new document on noncredit that provides timely and relevant guidance to the field on the appropriate implementation of noncredit curriculum, programs, and instruction; and

Resolved, The Academic Senate of California Community Colleges update its paper on noncredit instruction to include recent developments affecting noncredit, including using noncredit to improve equity and close the achievement gap, leveraging Career Development/College Preparation (CDCP) equalization funding, and addressing an increased emphasis on adult basic skills and workforce education.

Contact: Diane Edwards-LiPera, Southwestern College, Noncredit Committee

Appendix B: *Noncredit at a Glance*, Chancellor’s Office, September 21, 2006

## **\*13.03 F15 Opposition to Compensation for Adoption of Open Educational Resources**Whereas, The development of curriculum, which includes the choice of textbooks and other course materials, is an area of faculty primacy under Title 5 §53200 and a responsibility of every community college faculty member;

Whereas, Assembly Bill 798 (Bonilla, 2015) encourages the use of Open Educational Resources (OER) and was supported by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in its form as of April 6, 2015 but has since been amended to allow for direct compensation of faculty who choose to adopt open educational resources in the form of reassigned time from instructional duties;

Whereas, Evaluation and approval of grant applications under AB 798 (Bonilla, 2015) is granted to the California Open Educational Resources Council, which includes representatives from the California State University and University of California systems who may differ in their perspectives regarding the proper use of the AB 798 grant funds; and

Whereas, The practice of incentivizing faculty to adopt any specific instructional materials over others could potentially compromise academic quality by encouraging or pressuring faculty to adopt materials that are less pedagogically sound;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges inform the California Open Educational Resources Council of its objection to direct compensation to individual faculty members for adoption of open educational resources;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the community college faculty appointees to the California Open Educational Resources Council to oppose approval of any grant application that allows direct compensation to individual faculty members for adoption of open educational resources; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates not to approve any grant submissions for AB 798 funding that include direct compensation to individual faculty members for adoption of open educational resources.

Contact:  Dan Crump, California Open Educational Resources Council

# **15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL**

## **\*15.01 F15 Adoption of Statement on Competencies in the Natural Sciences**

Whereas, On September 4, 2013, the California State Board of Education adopted the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) as the new standards for scientific instruction for all K-12 students in California;

Whereas, The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) originally published the *Statement on Natural Science Expected of Entering Freshmen* in 1988 and had not updated the documents since its initial adoption;

Whereas, ICAS appointed science faculty representing the California community colleges, the California State University, and the University of California to review and update the *Statement on Natural Science Expected of Entering Freshmen*to reflect the newly adopted California Science Standards; and

Whereas, The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) has reviewed the *Statement on Competencies in the Natural Sciences* and approved sending it forward to the Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, California State University, and University of California at its meeting on September 25, 2015;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) *Statement on Competencies in the Natural Sciences*.

Contact: Craig Rutan, Executive Committee

Appendix C: Statement on Competencies in the Natural Sciences

1. <http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/reports/2015-Accreditation-Report-ADA.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Go to <https://cvc.edu> for more information about the CVC [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See resolution 7.01 S00 (<http://asccc.org/resolutions/system-policy-and-grant-process>) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://www.naceweb.org/about-us/press/skills-qualities-employers-want.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Please go to <http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/Portals/6/docs/SW/2015_08_22%20BOG%20TF%20DRAFT%20report%20v5.pdf> to review the draft recommendations of the Workforce Task Force. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Please go <http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/retrieveECFR?gp=&SID=6ce62b4ea71a518e9eb92b10e98ba715&mc=true&n=pt34.3.600&r=PART&ty=HTML#sp34.3.600.a> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)