



Academic Senate
for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

42nd FALL SESSION RESOLUTIONS
FOR DISCUSSION AT THE
2010 Fall Plenary Session

November 13, 2010

Table of Contents

1.0	ACADEMIC SENATE	1
1.01	F10 Bylaws Change	1
1.02	F10 Separation of Accreditation and SLO Committee into Two Committees ..	1
1.03	F10 Professional Development for Successful Implementation of SB 1440 and AB 2302	1
1.04	F10 Use of Technology during Executive Committee Elections.....	2
1.05	F10 Creation of a Part-time Faculty Member of the Year Award.....	2
2.0	ACCREDITATION	3
2.01	F10 Federalization of Higher Education	3
6.0	STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES	4
6.01	F10 Evaluation and Revision of Financial Aid Systems.....	4
	6.01.01 F10 Amend Resolution 6.01 F10	5
	6.01.02 F10 Amend Resolution 6.01 F10.....	5
6.02	F10 Duration of Interim Appointments	5
6.03	F10 Accountability Measures of Student Success	6
	*6.03.01 F10 Amend Resolution 6.03 F10.....	6
6.04	F10 Development of an Economic Recovery Fund	6
6.05	F10 Examining SB1143 Best Practices and Models for Accomplishing Student Success	7
7.0	CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR	7
7.01	F10 Basic Skills and Student Success Efforts.....	7
7.02	F10 Commission on the Future	8
	7.02.01 F10 Amend Resolution 7.02 F10.....	8
7.03	F10 SB 1440 Long Term Impact Research	9
	7.03.01 F10 Amend Resolution 7.03 F10.....	9
	7.03.02 F10 Amend Resolution 7.03 F10.....	10
	*7.03.03 F10 Amend Resolution 7.03 F10.....	10
7.04	F10 Faculty Primacy and SB 1143 Implementation Task Force	10
7.05	F10 Commission on the Future Recommendations.....	11
9.0	CURRICULUM	11
9.01	F10 Developing a Reference Document for Curriculum	11
9.02	F10 Examining Conversion from TOP to CIP	12
	9.02.01 F10 Amend Resolution 9.02 F10.....	13
9.03	F10 Faculty Responsibilities for CB and SP Codes.....	13
	9.03.01 F10 Amend Resolution 9.03 F10.....	14
9.04	F10 College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Exam Applicability to Associate Degree General Education Requirements.....	14
	9.04.01 F10 Amend Resolution 9.04 F10.....	15
	9.04.02 F10 Amend Resolution 9.04 F10.....	15
9.05	F10 Adopt and Publicize California Community College International Baccalaureate List and Template	15
9.06	F10 Adopt the <i>Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment Paper</i>	16

Table of Contents

9.07	F10	Expediting the Flexibility in Approval of SB 1440 Degrees	16
9.08	F10	Credit by Exam Processes.....	17
9.09	F10	Golden Four Grades in New Transfer Degrees.....	17
9.10	F10	Double-Counting GE and Major Courses in New Transfer Degrees	18
9.11	F10	Adopt Paper <i>Student Success: The Case for Establishing Prerequisites Through Content Review</i>	19
9.12	F10	SB 1440 – Universal CSU Transferability	19
		*9.12.01 F10 Amend Resolution 9.12 F10.....	20
9.13	F10	Study of the 18-unit Major/Area of Emphasis Requirement for an Associate Degree.....	20
9.14	F10	Support of Maintaining Academic Standards for Alcohol and Drug Academic Program	21
10.0		DISCIPLINES LIST.....	21
10.01	F10	Reconsideration for Adding Art History to the Disciplines List	21
12.0		FACULTY DEVELOPMENT.....	22
12.01	F10	Developing Goals for Faculty Development Committees	22
13.0		GENERAL CONCERNS	23
13.01	F10	Fostering Dialog between Adult Education and Noncredit	23
		*13.01.01 F10 Amend Resolution 13.01 F10.....	24
13.02	F10	SB 1143 – Defining Student Success.....	24
		13.02.01 F10 Amend Resolution 13.02 F10.....	25
13.03	F10	Academic Freedom: New Recommendations.....	25
13.04	F10	Basic Skills Advisory.....	27
13.05	F10	Providing Part-time Faculty with Adequate Resources and Support.....	27
		*13.05.01 F10 Amend Resolution 13.05 F10.....	28
		*13.05.02 F10 Amend Resolution 13.05 F10.....	28
13.06	F10	Develop a Faculty Definition of Student Success.....	28
13.07	F10	CCLC Board Policy Templates	29
13.08	F10	Executive Order 1048, CSU Student Remediation.....	30
13.09	F10	Best Practices: Integrating Part-time Faculty into Shared-Governance ...	30
		*13.09.01 F10 Amend Resolution 13.09 F10.....	31
13.10	F10	Support for Distance Learning Coordinators	31
		*13.10.01 F10 Amend Resolution 13.10 F10.....	32
13.11	F10	Increasing Faculty Voice.....	32
15.0		INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES	33
15.01	F10	Use C-ID to Determine Similarity of CCC and CSU Courses.....	33
		*15.01.01 F10 Amend Resolution 15.01 F10.....	34
16.0		Library and Learning Resources	34
16.01	F10	Adopt Paper <i>Standards of Practice for California Community College Library Faculty and Programs</i>	34

Table of Contents

17.0	LOCAL SENATES	35
17.01	F10 Responses to Violations of Law, Policy, and Procedure.....	35
19.0	PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS	35
19.01	F10 Academic and Professional Matters Purview	35
20.0	STUDENTS	35
20.01	F10 Admissions Priorities and Practices Regarding Out-of-State and International Students.....	35
	20.01.01 F10 Amend Resolution 20.01 F10	36
20.02	F10 Prioritization of Resident Students	36
	20.02.01 F10 Amend Resolution 20.02 F10.....	36

*New amendments added on Friday, November 12, 2010

1.0			ACADEMIC SENATE
1.01		F10	<p>Bylaws Change Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Current Senate Rules do not provide directions to the body for who is eligible to vote when electing its officers;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges revise its Rules as follows:</p> <p>Add subdivision B:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">B. <u>Elections of Officers</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">1) <u>Officers. Each Officer will be elected to the Executive Committee by balloting from all Delegates.</u></p>
1.02		F10	<p>Separation of Accreditation and SLO Committee into Two Committees Julie Bruno, Sierra College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, The Accreditation and SLO Committee functions under two separate and distinct charges, providing guidance to faculty in the area of accreditation and accountability as well as providing guidance in the area of student learning, instruction, and assessment; and</p> <p>Whereas, In order to best serve faculty in two important areas, the Executive Committee for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges believes the Accreditation and Student Learning Outcomes Committee should be separated into two committees, the Accreditation Committee and the Student Learning and Assessment Committee;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend its Rules to revise Section V. A. 1. as follows “Accreditation and Student Learning Outcomes Committee”; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend its Rules to add Section V. A.14. as follows “Student Learning and Assessment Committee.”</p>
1.03		F10	<p>Professional Development for Successful Implementation of SB 1440 and AB 2302 Carolyn Holcroft, Foothill College, Curriculum Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Senate Bill (SB) 1440 (Padilla, 2010) and Assembly Bill (AB) 2302 (Fong, 2010) stress the need for Senate responsibility for degree development and implementation, as well as establishing the most effective</p>

		<p>methods to inform students, counseling faculty, and the general public about the transfer pathways;</p> <p>Whereas, Degree development is an academic and professional matter and under the purview of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges; and</p> <p>Whereas, Informing students about the transfer pathways and guiding them to efficiently follow the transfer degree requirements in a way that satisfies the students' individual needs is a responsibility of counseling faculty of the California community colleges;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide professional development opportunities for counselors, articulation officers, curriculum chairs, and other faculty regarding the implementation of SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) and AB 2302 (Fong, 2010).</p>
1.04	F10	<p>Use of Technology during Executive Committee Elections Kathy Sorensen, American River College, Area A</p> <p>Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges promotes the use of appropriate technology in the classroom; and</p> <p>Whereas, The election of members of the Executive Committee can take a disproportionate amount of time;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges explore the use of appropriate technology to expedite the election process and report no later than the Fall 2011 Plenary Session.</p>
1.05	F10	<p>Creation of a Part-Time Faculty Member of the Year Award Denise Cabanel-Bleuer, Orange Coast College</p> <p>Whereas, California Community College part-time faculty are invaluable partners in ensuring student success by providing high quality instruction and dedication to their profession;</p> <p>Whereas, California Community College part-time faculty contribute significantly to campus enrichment through activities such as serving on committees and as faculty advisors and participating in departmental, divisional, and campus-wide activities such as curriculum development, assessment, and program review; and</p> <p>Whereas, There are various awards that recognize faculty excellence that, although open to all faculty, historically advantage full-time faculty;</p>

			Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create a yearly award for a part-time faculty member that recognizes excellence in teaching and outstanding contributions to the campus environment and to student success and that the award amount and presentation be consistent with other comparable faculty awards given by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.
2.0			ACCREDITATION
2.01		F10	<p>Federalization of Higher Education Greg Gilbert, Copper Mountain College, Area D</p> <p>Whereas, The U.S. Department of Education appears set on shifting the oversight of American higher education from institutions of higher learning and regional accrediting agencies to the Federal Government;</p> <p>Whereas, Efforts by the U.S. Department of Education to regulate higher education are evidenced by its stated goal of establishing a credit hour that requires measurable outcomes for every class hour;</p> <p>Whereas, Council of Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) President Judith Eaton stated recently that “The worth of higher education is determined less and less through the professional judgments made by the academic community” (<i>Inside Education</i> July 2010) and that the growing belief in Washington D.C. is that self-regulating peer review represents “a conflict of interest” because the exchange of fees for peer review compromises rigor (<i>Inside Accreditation</i> August 2010); and</p> <p>Whereas, Institutions of higher learning (including students, faculty, administrators, trustees), taxpayers, and, indeed, the democratizing power of education would be irreparably harmed by a Federal takeover of higher education and accreditation because it would result in increasingly restrictive regulations, less responsive curricula, bloated government bureaucracies, and unfunded comply-and-report mandates that divert time and resources away from the classroom;</p> <p>Resolved, that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges conduct research and explain to the field the U.S. Department of Education’s specific reasoning and desired outcomes concerning an increase in the Federal oversight of higher education;</p> <p>Resolved, that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges share its findings throughout the System, as well as with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) and Western Association of Schools and Colleges/Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges in an effort to facilitate a coordinated, unified discussion with and</p>

			<p>response from California’s higher education community and regional accrediting organizations that include</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strategies for balancing requirements for accountability with independent decision making at the local level; 2. Processes, including budgetary planning, to supplement the Academic Senate’s already considerable assistance to local senates regarding issues of accountability; 3. Methods for articulating and defending those principles of academic freedom, effective pedagogy, and local decision making that must endure for the sake of our students, disciplines, profession, and, indeed, for the preservation of the independence of thought that is fundamental to American higher education; and <p>Resolved, that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges generate a timely response that will be of vital importance if California’s educators, as well as those across the nation, are to have a voice in influencing the U.S. Department of Education prior to the solidifying of Federal accountability into a system of intransigent regulations.</p>
6.0			STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES
6.01		F10	<p>Evaluation and Revision of Financial Aid Systems Dolores Davison, Foothill College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, The majority of California community college students are eligible for some form of federal or state financial aid;</p> <p>Whereas, Students remain in classes even when failing because they fear losing their financial aid, therefore engaging in unproductive and inefficient behaviors; and</p> <p>Whereas, Students may accumulate excessive units by enrolling in and completing courses solely in order to retain their financial aid, and the Board of Governors (BOG) fee waivers set no limit on the number of units students may accrue while attending college under a BOG fee waiver;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge state and federal officials to consider an overhaul of the current financial aid system in order to incentivize more productive and academically sound behavior by students.</p>

6.01	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 6.01 F10 Phil Smith, Los Rios Community College District, Area A</p> <p>Amend the resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge state and federal officials to <u>evaluate and revise</u> consider and overhaul of the current financial aid system in order to incentivize more productive and academically sound behavior by students.</p>
6.01	.02	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 6.01 F10 David Beaulieu, Los Angeles CCD, Area C</p> <p>Strike the second whereas.</p> <p>Amend first resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge state and federal officials to consider <u>a proposal to an</u> overhaul of the current financial aid system in order to incentivize more productive and academically sound behavior by students.</p>
6.02		F10	<p>Duration of Interim Appointments David Morse, Long Beach City College</p> <p>Whereas, Title 5 §53021 provides that "no interim appointment or series of interim appointments exceed one year in duration" and that even with the approval of the Chancellor extensions of such appointments may not exceed a second year;</p> <p>Whereas, Title 5 §53201 has been violated in various instances at community colleges throughout the State of California, with some interim appointments lasting as long as six years;</p> <p>Whereas, The Joint Equal Employment Opportunity, Diversity, and Title 5 EEO Advisory Committee has recommended a change to Title 5 that would limit interim appointments to a fixed duration of two years without the possibility of exceptions granted by the Chancellor's Office; and</p> <p>Whereas, The Title 5 change proposed by the Joint Equal Employment Opportunity, Diversity, and Title 5 EEO Advisory Committee has been discussed and viewed favorably during plenary session breakouts of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and in other venues;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges pursue the proposed change to Title 5 that would set a hard limit of two</p>

			years on interim administrative appointments without the possibility of extension.
6.03		F10	<p>Accountability Measures of Student Success Kim Harrell, Folsom Lake College</p> <p>Whereas, The original language in SB 1143 (Liu, 2010) predicated California community college funding on simplistic accountability measures of student success;</p> <p>Whereas, Performance based funding would likely have the unintended consequences of grade inflation, reduced funding for community colleges located in areas of low socio-economic status, and reduced access for students in need of remediation; and</p> <p>Whereas, The economic downturn has limited the type and number of course offerings, reduced overall student access, and, as a result, increased time to degree and certificate completion;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose educational legislation designed to alter the California Community Colleges’ funding structure to one based upon simplistic accountability measures of student success.</p>
6.03	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 6.03 F10 Shawn Bynum, Napa Valley College</p> <p>Amend the resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose educational legislation designed to alter the California Community Colleges’ funding structure to one based upon <u>implementation of</u> simplistic accountability measures of student success as the primary means of California community college funding.</p>
6.04		F10	<p>Development of an Economic Recovery Fund Scott Rippy, Crafton Hills College</p> <p>Whereas, California Community Colleges are funded through state revenues;</p> <p>Whereas, In times of economic hardship state revenues decrease, often resulting in colleges having to reduce the number of classes they can offer at a time when demand for classes at community colleges increases; and</p>

			<p>Whereas, Residents of California would benefit if, in times of economic hardship its community colleges be able to maintain, or even increase, the number of classes they can offer in order to meet the increase in public demand;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Legislature to encourage the development of a fund that shall be increased during good economic times and held in reserve until needed to supplement community college budgets in order to maintain or increase the number of classes offered at community colleges during times of general economic hardship.</p>
6.05		F10	<p>Examining SB 1143 Best Practices and Models for Accomplishing Student Success Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College</p> <p>Whereas, SB 1143 (Liu 2010) calls for the Board of Governors to develop a plan to promote and improve student success and examine specified best practices and models for accomplishing student success;</p> <p>Whereas, The Chancellor’s Office is developing a task force to begin developing these plans, and they are examining a number of existing student success projects such as Completion by Design, Complete to Compete, Complete College America, and the American Diploma Project; and</p> <p>Whereas, Local implementation of some of these models and activities is already occurring;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges study the many strategies being recommended for student success by external organizations and research their potential effect on community colleges to inform the faculty representatives on the SB 1143 task force and report as necessary to the body.</p>
7.0			CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR
7.01		F10	<p>Basic Skills and Student Success Efforts Candace Lynch-Thomson, School of Continuing Education, North Orange County Community College District, Basic Skills Committee</p> <p>Whereas, SB 1143 (Liu, 2010) directs the Board of Governors “to adopt a plan for promoting and improving student success within the California Community Colleges and to establish a task force to examine specified best practices and models for accomplishing student success. ... The bill would require the board, prior to implementation of the plan, to report the contents of the plan, and the recommendations of the taskforce, to specified legislative committees by March 1, 2012”;</p>

			<p>Whereas, 75-90% of California community college students who take a placement test place into basic skills in at least one subject; and</p> <p>Whereas, Students with needs for basic skills development are diverse in age, preparation level, income level, ethnicity, and intellectual ability;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office and task force to ensure that the basic skills needs of students are addressed as a central part of the work undertaken by the SB 1143 (Liu, 2010) task force.</p>
7.02		F10	<p>Commission on the Future Lesley Kawaguchi, Santa Monica College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, The Community College League of California (CCLC) Commission on the Future has met over a period of time and identified recommendations regarding student success for the future actions of the California community colleges over the next ten years; and</p> <p>Whereas, The California Community College System already has an established process for sending recommendations to the Board of Governors through the Consultation Council established Sections 330-342 in the Standing Orders of the Board of Governors;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges remind the Chancellor’s Office that any recommendation developed by the CCLC Commission on the Future and any implementation plan go through the Consultation Council, which includes faculty from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.</p>
7.02	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 7.02 F10 Cathy Cox, Mission College, Area B</p> <p>Insert a second whereas:</p> <p><u>Whereas, Many of the recommendations of the Commission on the Future properly fall under the areas defined as “academic and professional matters” as defined in Title 5 regulations and as such are the responsibility of faculty and of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges; and</u></p> <p>Add a second resolve:</p> <p><u>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge that implementation of all recommendations dealing with “academic and professional matters” at both the state and local level be carried out in a</u></p>

			<p><u>manner consistent with Title 5 regulations by relying primarily on the input of faculty through the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges or local academic senates.</u></p>
7.03		F10	<p>SB 1440 Long Term Impact Research Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, The recently signed SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) will improve the ability of students to transfer from California community colleges to California State Universities (CSU);</p> <p>Whereas, The impact of this law will potentially affect enrollment patterns and other existing patterns of service and instruction provided to students by California community colleges;</p> <p>Whereas, The bill requires research on student transfer and success rates, nothing in SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) requires research be done to measure if detrimental unintended consequences occur; and</p> <p>Whereas, Now is the time to establish a research plan and baseline metrics for research to ensure California community colleges and CSUs continue to meet the needs of all our students and communities;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office and other system constituents to develop a research plan that will comprehensively examine the impact of SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) on enrollment trends and other instructional and service needs of our students.</p>
7.03	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 7.03 F10 Kale Braden, Cosumnes River College, Area A</p> <p>Amend the first whereas:</p> <p>Whereas, The recently signed SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) <u>intends to</u> will improve the ability of students to transfer from California community colleges to California State Universities (CSU);</p> <p>Amend the third whereas:</p> <p>Whereas, While the bill requires research on student transfer and success rates, nothing in SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) requires research <u>into possible</u> be done to measure if unintended or undesirable consequences occur; and</p>

			<p>Amend the resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office and other system constituents to develop a research plan that will comprehensively examine the impact of SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) on enrollment trends and other instructional and service needs of our <u>non-transfer, as well as transfer</u> students.</p>
7.03	.02	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 7.03 F10 David Beaulieu, Los Angeles CCD, Area C</p> <p>Amend the resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work <u>collaboratively</u> with the Chancellor’s Office and other system constituents to develop a research plan <u>and current baseline metrics</u> that will comprehensively examine the <u>long-term</u> impact of SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) on enrollment trends and <u>as well as</u> other instructional and service needs of our students.</p>
7.03	.03	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 7.03 F10 David Beaulieu, Los Angeles CCD</p> <p>Add first resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work collaboratively with the Chancellor’s Office and other system constituents to develop a research plan and current baseline metrics that will comprehensively examine the long-term impact of SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) on enrollment trends as well as the instructional and service needs of our non-transfer and transfer students.</p>
7.04		F10	<p>Faculty Primacy and SB 1143 Implementation Task Force Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College, Area D</p> <p>Whereas, SB 1143 (Liu, 2010) calls for a task force to make recommendations on student success and the metrics used to measure success; and</p> <p>Whereas, By law and regulation the advice of the Academic Senate must be relied primarily upon in all academic and professional matters, and student success is an academic and professional matter;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges seek to assure that a majority of faculty exists on all task forces or committees leading to the statewide development of student success definitions and assessment metrics; and</p>

			Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that a majority of faculty exist on all task forces or committees leading to the local development of student success definitions and assessment metrics.
7.05		F10	<p>Commission on the Future Recommendations Phil Smith, Los Rios Community College District</p> <p>Whereas, The Community College League of California (CCLC) Commission on the Future has met over a period of time and identified large-scale recommendations to promote student success over the next ten years;</p> <p>Whereas, Processes for promoting student success are clearly academic and professional matters;</p> <p>Whereas, The Commission on the Future included only two faculty members, neither of whom were appointed by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges; and</p> <p>Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges only considers supporting policy recommendations after a full vetting by its members;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request to review and consider any recommendations or implementation plans proposed by the CCLC’s Commission on the Future; and</p> <p>Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Community College League of California to follow the established consultation process for sending recommendations to the Board of Governors as stated in Sections 330-342 of its Standing Orders.</p>
9.0			CURRICULUM
9.01		F10	<p>Developing a Reference Document for Curriculum David Morse, Long Beach College, Curriculum Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Curriculum chairs and curriculum committee members frequently encounter questions regarding curriculum regulations and procedures for which they do not have ready answers;</p> <p>Whereas, A “frequently asked questions” reference or other similar document would prove a valuable tool for curriculum committees in addressing such questions or issues;</p>

		<p>Whereas, A formally developed reference document will present more consistent and detailed responses to inquiries from curriculum chairs than replies made on an individual basis; and</p> <p>Whereas, A curriculum reference document published on the Academic Senate’s Curriculum Website will provide hyperlinks to relevant sections of Title 5 or Education Code, thus allowing curriculum chairs to bypass the inconvenience posed by currently available search tools;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a reference document or tool designed expressly for curriculum chairs and curriculum committees that offers information and advice regarding commonly posed questions on curricular regulations and procedures and make that reference tool available through the Academic Senate Curriculum website and other appropriate methods.</p>
9.02	F10	<p>Examining Conversion from TOP to CIP Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Resolution 21.01 F99 asked for review and updating of Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) codes, including an annual revision to accommodate federal Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes;</p> <p>Whereas, The System Advisory Committee on Curriculum (SACC) has been in discussions regarding the steps and factors that would be necessary to convert from TOP to CIP code use in the California community colleges and recommends that a few disciplines be invited to participate in a pilot project to see how much work is involved in making the switch;</p> <p>Whereas, TOP code revisions should be conducted with direct input from faculty; and</p> <p>Whereas, Converting from TOP to CIP will also involve many aspects of college functioning (e.g., fiscal reporting, faculty work load, CTE reporting) beyond faculty and curriculum committee participation;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend representatives of various disciplines work with the Chancellor’s Office on the issues of converting from TOP to CIP codes for courses; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to provide communication and implementation strategies if a greater conversion of TOP to CIP codes is inaugurated. See Appendix A.</p>

9.02	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 9.02 F10 Cathy Cox, Mission College, Area B</p> <p>Amend the first whereas:</p> <p>Whereas, Resolution 21.01 F99 asked for review and updating of Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) codes, including an annual revision to accommodate federal Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes, <u>which are used nationally except in the California community colleges;</u></p>
9.03		F10	<p>Faculty Responsibilities for CB and SP Codes Stephanie Dumont, Golden West College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, The System Advisory Committee on Curriculum (SACC) is undertaking a review of Course Data Elements (CB) and Student Program Awards (SP) codes to ensure that they accurately reflect program and curriculum development and intention, and faculty around the state will want to contribute to the final results of any significant changes to the codes;</p> <p>Whereas, CB and SP codes are used to track student performance and college curriculum work, and as was seen with changes to CB 21 and 22, correct coding can greatly affect perceptions about student achievement;</p> <p>Whereas, The validity of these coding elements is dependent on faculty knowledge of and correct use of coding and how it is applied locally, as well as regular faculty review of the elements; and</p> <p>Whereas, Local curriculum committees should also be aware of the importance of the codes and how selecting a code can change how a course is tracked, funded or used;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local faculty participation in review of any proposed changes to Course Data Elements (CB) or Student Program Awards (SP) codes that significantly affect curriculum and program development or tracking; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local curriculum committees to review CB codes and to correctly apply them to courses.</p>

9.03	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 9.03 F10 Barbara Croteau, Santa Rosa Junior College, Area B</p> <p>Amend the second resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local curriculum committees to review <u>and monitor the application of</u> CB codes and <u>provide them with guidance as to how to</u> correctly apply them to a course.</p>
9.04		F10	<p>College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Exam Applicability to Associate Degree General Education Requirements Estela Narrie, Santa Monica College, Transfer and Articulation Committee</p> <p>Whereas, California community college students may only receive associate's degree general education credit for a College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam if equivalency for a course or an associate degree general education area has been locally established;</p> <p>Whereas, Many students attend more than one California community college, and CLEP course equivalencies may not exist or may vary greatly among the California community colleges;</p> <p>Whereas, For many enlisted military personnel, completing formal college courses may be difficult due to deployments, work schedules, and other factors, and CLEP exams have made earning college credits a realistic possibility for these individuals; and</p> <p>Whereas, CLEP general education subject area applicability exists system-wide for students completing CSU GE Breadth, but the UC system does not accept CLEP exams for credit under the IGETC pattern;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges research the feasibility of a system-wide policy template regarding the use of CLEP exams for meeting associate degree general education requirements;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a system-wide policy template regarding the use of CLEP exams for meeting associate degree general education requirements; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the University of California and California State University systems to consider accepting CLEP exams for credit under the IGETC pattern in order to facilitate student transfer.</p>

9.04	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 9.04 F10 Jon Drinnon, Merritt College, Area B</p> <p>Amend the second resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a system-wide policy template regarding the use of CLEP exams for meeting associate degree general education requirements <u>if the research shows it to be feasible</u>; and</p>
9.04	.02	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 9.04 F10 Dave DeGroot, Allan Hancock College, Area C</p> <p>Amend the fourth whereas:</p> <p>Whereas, CLEP general education subject area applicability exists system-wide for students completing CSU GE Breadth, but the UC system does not accept CLEP exams for credit, <u>and the UC and CSU do not accept CLEP exams</u> under the IGETC pattern;</p> <p>Strike first resolve.</p>
9.05		F10	<p>Adopt and Publicize California Community College International Baccalaureate List and Template Christie Jamshidnejad, Diablo Valley College, Transfer and Articulation Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Resolution 9.01 S10 "International Baccalaureate (IB) Exam Applicability to Associate Degree General Education Requirements" called for the development of a suggested system-wide policy template regarding the use of International Baccalaureate scores for meeting associate degree general education requirements for local consideration and potential adoption;</p> <p>Whereas, Title 5 outlines specific general education area requirements that each college must include for the associate degree (Title 5 55063, Minimum Requirements for the Associate Degree), and an increasing number of students are requesting general education credit based on IB scores; and</p> <p>Whereas, Articulation Officers throughout the California Community College System support the development of a California community college general education IB score equivalency list that is aligned with the CSU GE and IGETC IB score equivalency lists;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to consider adoption and implementation of the proposed</p>

			<p>California Community College General Education International Baccalaureate (IB) score equivalency list; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates to use the proposed California Community College General Education International Baccalaureate score equivalency list to publish the California community college general education, California State University GE and Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) International Baccalaureate score equivalency lists in college catalogs, schedules, and websites.</p> <p>See Appendix B.</p>
9.06		F10	<p>Adopt the Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment Paper David Morse, Long Beach City College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Faculty at many California community colleges have struggled to develop and implement effective practices for student learning outcomes (SLO) assessment while feeling pressure from both college administrations and outside forces to conduct SLO assessment in ways that may be ineffective and even counter-productive;</p> <p>Whereas, SLO assessment, when conducted thoughtfully and effectively through processes developed and led by faculty, can be both beneficial and productive for faculty and students; and</p> <p>Whereas, Academic Senate resolution 2.03 S08 called for the Senate to “research and communicate guiding principles of good practice in the collection, analysis, and use of assessment data”;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper <i>Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment</i>.</p> <p>See Appendix C.</p>
9.07		F10	<p>Expediting the Flexibility in Approval of SB 1440 Degrees Beth Smith, Grossmont College, Curriculum Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Intersegmental faculty discipline groups are meeting to determine major preparation for SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) degrees, and these groups will meet throughout the year;</p> <p>Whereas, Local processes may not be able to accommodate the time schedules for development and approval of these degrees; and</p> <p>Whereas, Flexibility within local processes will help curriculum committees in the approval process of these new degrees;</p>

			<p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges inform local curriculum committees that SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) degrees may be developed late in the year and that flexibility within the local approval process will benefit students; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senate presidents to inform their boards that SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) degrees will be under development during the year and recommend that any accommodations and flexibility that can expedite degree approval throughout the year will be beneficial for students.</p>
9.08		F10	<p>Credit by Exam Processes Nancy Persons, Santa Rosa Junior College, Curriculum Committee</p> <p>Whereas, National and state interest in decreasing time to degree completion and increasing degree production has resulted in an interest in finding novel ways to meet these goals;</p> <p>Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has been active in determining whether and how existing competency-based exams (e.g., CLEP, IB, AP) can be translated into course credit; and</p> <p>Whereas, “Credit by exam” is a mechanism long in existence that can be used to award credit for demonstrated learning;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community develop and disseminate information to local academic senates regarding effective practices for using credit by exam to recognize learning gained through alternative mechanisms;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to ensure that students are aware of the existing mechanisms for earning credit through exam processes; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that local academic senates consider the needs of their local communities and strive to ensure that all appropriate exam opportunities are available.</p>
9.09		F10	<p>Golden Four Grades in New Transfer Degrees Michelle Pilati, Rio Hondo College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Senate Bill (SB) 1440 (Padilla, 2010) has been signed into law, with one of its primary goals to decrease student accumulation of units as they complete a degree and prepare to transfer;</p>

		<p>Whereas, Resolution 4.03 S10 recognized that a “transfer degree” was imminent and called for the Academic Senate to “strongly encourage all local senates to ensure that students are provided with the degree options that meet their needs, be that aligning degree requirements with transfer institutions or offering degrees that serve as preparation for work”; and</p> <p>Whereas, The California State University currently requires completion in the areas of the “Golden Four” with a minimum grade of “C” for transfer admission (i.e., A3--critical thinking, A1--communication, A2--English composition, and B4--quantitative reasoning) but not included in SB 1440;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly urge requiring a minimum grade of “C” in the “Golden Four” in any associate degree for transfer.</p>
<p>9.10</p>	<p>F10</p>	<p>Double-Counting GE and Major Courses in New Transfer Degrees Paul Setziol, De Anza College, Educational Policies Committee</p> <p>Whereas, The practice commonly referred to as “double-counting” allows students to count a qualifying course toward both general education and major/area of emphasis requirements;</p> <p>Whereas, Double-counting is common practice in the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) systems, and the majority of California community colleges;</p> <p>Whereas, SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) rewards students for completing both lower division GE patterns (IGETC or CSU GE, which amount to approximately 35 semester units) and 18 units of major preparation prior to transfer; and</p> <p>Whereas, One obvious and academically appropriate means of decreasing “unit accumulation” is the practice of “double-counting,” and some California community colleges disallow double-counting, which will make it more difficult for their students to benefit from SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010);</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly urge local senates to review and, as often as possible, reform local policy to allow double-counting to qualify a course toward both general education and major/area of emphasis requirements.</p>

<p>9.11</p>		<p>F10</p>	<p>Adopt Paper Student Success: The Case for Establishing Prerequisites Through Content Review Beth Smith, Grossmont College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Efforts to establish prerequisites through content review are underway, and interest in content review has increased around the state;</p> <p>Whereas, In order to support state and local discussions, a resource with rationale for rigorous content review for establishing prerequisites and supporting ideologies for student success will assist local senates and leaders across the state; and</p> <p>Whereas, Content review, as a method to establish prerequisites, involves discipline faculty and curriculum committees in an objective review of the knowledge and skills students must acquire in order to achieve success, and a detailed examination of the course outline of record in the content review process will re-establish the standards and expectations for maintaining quality instruction;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper <i>Student Success: The Case for Establishing Prerequisites Through Content Review</i>.</p> <p>See Appendix D.</p>
<p>9.12</p>		<p>F10</p>	<p>SB 1440 – Universal CSU Transferability Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College, Area D</p> <p>Whereas, It is the intent of SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) to improve student transfer by decreasing the complexity of transfer and the unique requirements of the 23 California State University (CSU) campuses that are a primary source of confusion for students preparing to transfer;</p> <p>Whereas, SB 1440 permits each of the 112 California community colleges to develop a variety of unique degrees which would not provide the opportunity to develop programs based on statewide coordination (i.e., the ability to transfer to any CSU where that major or a similar major exists) where possible; and</p> <p>Whereas, SB 1440 does not prohibit the development of model curriculum in each transfer major;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support encouraging transfer model curriculum in each major through C-ID.</p>

9.12	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 9.12 F10 Eric Oifer, Santa Monica College</p> <p>Add first resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the development of model curricula in majors and areas of emphasis through the C-ID project.</p>
9.13		F10	<p>Study of the 18-Unit Major/Area of Emphasis Requirement for an Associate Degree David Beaulieu, Los Angeles Community College District</p> <p>Whereas, The 18-semester-unit minimum requirement in a major or area of emphasis for an associate degree was adopted in Title 5 in the early 1980s, and since that time there has been no reexamination by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges regarding the need for this specific minimum unit total;</p> <p>Whereas, The Fall 2005 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges paper “What Is the Meaning of a California Community College Degree?” did not mention a specific major unit total, but spoke generally about students acquiring focused study in an academic area as an aspect of an associate degree;</p> <p>Whereas, With the recent passage of SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010), California community colleges are required to have associate degrees for transfer to the California State University in place by fall 2011, and the 18-unit minimum requirement in a major or area of emphasis could force students who change majors to take a significant number of courses not needed to complete their transfer; and</p> <p>Whereas, The California Community Colleges Transfer Center Directors’ organization and many CCC Articulation Officers, the faculty most expert in the area of transfer, have registered serious reservations as to the wisdom of maintaining 18 units in a major or area of emphasis;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges form a task force, including transfer center directors and articulation officers, to conduct a focused study of the 18-semester-unit major or area of emphasis requirement for an associate degree and report the findings and recommendations of the task force at the Spring 2011 Plenary session.</p>

<p>9.14</p>		<p>F10</p>	<p>Support of Maintaining Academic Standards for Alcohol and Drug Academic Program Barbara Croteau, Santa Rosa Junior College</p> <p>Whereas, The California Association of Alcohol and Drug Educators has for the last 25 years been funded by the California Department of Alcohol and Drugs to provide high academic education standards for over 40 community colleges;</p> <p>Whereas, An effective alcohol and drug academic program in community college provides students with the highest level of education available, and a faculty that ascribes to those high standards is necessary to maintain the level of academic quality; and</p> <p>Whereas, Current state legislative policy discussions would permit the use of lower academic standards within the field of alcohol and drug education;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Association of Alcohol and Drug Educators to ensure faculty participation in any changes to academic programs in alcohol and drug education; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Department of Alcohol and Drugs to ensure that any changes in academic standards meet both the Academic Senate and the Chancellor’s Office minimum faculty qualifications and curriculum standards.</p>
<p>10.0</p>			<p>DISCIPLINES LIST</p>
<p>10.01</p>			<p>Reconsideration for Adding Art History to the Disciplines List Bob Grill, College of Alameda, Area B</p> <p>Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges voted down a previous proposal for the creation of Art History as a separate discipline on the 2007 Disciplines List and the current Academic Senate process requires that resubmitted proposals provide substantively different rationale and come forward either as a resolution from a Senate area meeting or as a resolution from the floor of plenary session;</p> <p>Whereas, The previous proposal failed because of the potential impact on smaller colleges in assigning disciplines; however, adding Art History to the Disciplines List does not require local senates to assign any courses to the new discipline but, rather, allows local colleges with larger programs in Art History to assign courses to that discipline and to hire, retain, and promote qualified faculty to develop and teach courses and degrees in Art History at a level commensurate with other systems of higher education where students are likely to transfer upon completion of lower division major transfer preparation at a community college;</p>

		<p>Whereas, The MFA in studio arts is insufficient academic preparation to teach Art History courses, as a student earning an MFA in the CSU or UC system can do so by completing an average minimum of 12 semester units—out of the 180 - 210 semester units required for a BA/BFA, MFA sequence—in Art History across both their baccalaureate and masters programs; and</p> <p>Whereas, The College Art Association, the primary professional association for art history and studio arts, in 2009 revised their “Standards of Retention and Tenure of Art Historians” to include specific standards for Art Historians at two-year colleges that are reflected in this proposal;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges include in its current Discipline List Revision process a recommendation to the Board of Governors to add Art History as a separate discipline for inclusion in the “Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges” based on the rationale outlined in the attached proposal.</p> <p>See Attachment A.</p>
12.0		FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
12.01	F10	<p>Developing Goals for Faculty Development Committees Jon Drinnon, Merritt College</p> <p>Whereas, Due to the state budget crisis, funds for professional development are being routinely slashed for colleges across the state, and as a result faculty development opportunities and activities, which are the lifeblood of our faculty and a major component of student success, are being cut;</p> <p>Whereas, Re-educating and enriching faculty professionally is an essential component of faculty growth and student success and a key component of AB 1725;</p> <p>Whereas, According to a survey conducted by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 75% of 58 colleges responding indicated that they had no stated goals or outcomes for their professional development committees; and</p> <p>Whereas, In order to restore funding to appropriate levels now or in the future we need to mount a unified movement for appropriate professional development funding among all our constituent groups;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to require that their faculty development committees create outcomes and goals for their committees;</p>

			<p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates and faculty development committees to work with their administrations to make faculty development a high priority on their campuses and to look for creative alternatives to provide professional development funding for faculty; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create a coalition of Faculty Development groups inviting participation of the following: the Faculty Association for California Community Colleges (FACCC) faculty development committee, California Community College Council for Staff, Program and Organizational Development (4C/SD), the faculty unions, the Chancellor’s Office, and other interested parties with liaisons between the groups to develop a strategy to push for the 2% level of faculty development funding that was guaranteed by passage of AB 1725.</p>
13.0		F10	GENERAL CONCERNS
13.01		F10	<p>Fostering Dialog between Adult Education and Noncredit Rey Ortiz, College of the Desert, Noncredit Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Just as adult education and noncredit programs share a common origin, both having emerged from the K-12 system in response to the particular needs of adult learners, the future of these programs is also intertwined;</p> <p>Whereas, Both adult education and noncredit programs are being threatened, with all state adult education funds now open to “flexibility” usage by underfunded K-12 districts and noncredit courses and programs that do not fall under career development and college preparation receiving lesser funding;</p> <p>Whereas, In some communities either the community college or the unified school district(s) has the dominant adult education/noncredit program, while in others significant adult education/noncredit programs are offered by both entities, which has raised legislative questions about possible duplication in the objectives of adult education and noncredit programs; and</p> <p>Whereas, There is a need for adult education and noncredit faculty to discuss their shared future;</p> <p>Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage the involvement of noncredit faculty and the members of the Academic Senate’s Noncredit Committee in discussion with representatives of the California Department of Education’s Adult Education Division about the future of adult education/noncredit programs in the State of California.</p>

13.01	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 13.01 F10 Cathy Cox, Mission College</p> <p>Amend first and second whereases:</p> <p>Whereas, Just as Aadult education and noncredit <u>community college noncredit</u> programs share a common origin, both having emerged from the K-12 system in response to the particular needs of adult learners <u>for educational options that are not part of credit programs and</u>; the future of these <u>two types of programs</u> is also intertwined;</p> <p>Whereas, Both adult education and noncredit <u>community college noncredit</u> programs are being threatened <u>face similar funding challenges</u>, with all state adult education funds now open to “flexibility” usage by underfunded K-12 districts and noncredit courses and programs that do not fall under career development and college preparation receiving lesser funding;</p> <p>Replace third and fourth whereases:</p> <p><u>Whereas, Both K-12 adult education and community college noncredit serve adult learners, which has given rise to a wide variety of locally-determined approaches to serving this specific student population in their communities and which needs to be recognized by and included in the California Department of Education’s strategic plan for adult education; and</u></p> <p><u>Whereas, Improved communication and coordination between adult education instructors and community college noncredit faculty are essential in order to better serve the needs of local communities and to respond to challenges, including budgetary reductions;</u></p> <p>Amend resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage the involvement of noncredit faculty <u>statewide</u> and the members of the Academic Senate’s Noncredit Committee <u>to engage</u> in discussion with representatives of the California Department of Education’s Adult Education Division about the future of adult education/noncredit programs in the State of California.</p>
13.02		F10	<p>SB 1143 – Defining Student Success Wheeler North, San Diego Miramar College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, SB 1143 (Liu, 2010) requires the Board of Governors (BOG) to adopt a plan for promoting and improving student success within the California community colleges and to establish a taskforce to examine specified best practices and models for accomplishing student success;</p>

			<p>Whereas, SB 1143 (Liu, 2010) requires the taskforce to develop and present specified recommendations to the BOG for incorporation into a plan to improve student success and completion within the California community colleges; and</p> <p>Whereas, Faculty are central to student success and student completion and are best positioned to develop metrics used to establish and measure student success that are critical to the development of a system-wide plan for student success;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges define student success and identify best practices and models for accomplishing student success;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert the primacy of our definition of student success to the Board of Governors; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges ensure faculty primacy in the identification, development and/or adoption of metrics used to establish and measure student success.</p>
13.02	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 13.02 F10 Thom Watkins, Solano College, Area B</p> <p>Insert a second resolve:</p> <p><u>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges include student input and perspectives in the development of student success metrics;</u></p>
13.03		F10	<p>Academic Freedom: New Recommendations Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, In the Garcetti v. Caballos court decision of 2006, the U.S. Supreme Court majority ruled that when public employees such as faculty speak, “pursuant to their official duties, the employees are not speaking as citizens for First Amendment purposes, and the Constitution does not insulate their communications from employer discipline”;</p> <p>Whereas, In response to the above case and the more recent cases of Hong v. Grant, Renken v. Gregory, and Gorum v. Sessions the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) created a subcommittee in 2006 for the purpose of “surveying the landscape of legal and professional protections for academic freedom at public colleges and universities”; and</p>

Whereas, The AAUP's subcommittee has recommended three options of proposed policy language that may be incorporated in faculty handbooks as follows:

1. Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write without institutional discipline or restraint on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to professional duties and the functioning of the University. Academic responsibility implies the faithful performance of professional duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that when one is speaking on matters of public interest, one is not speaking for the institution.
2. Academic freedom is the freedom to teach, both in and outside the classroom, to conduct research and to publish the results of those investigations, to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance. Professors should also have the freedom to address the larger community with regard to any matter of social, political, economic, or other interests, without institutional discipline or restraint, save in response to fundamental violation of professional ethics or statements that suggest disciplinary incompetence; or
3. Academic freedom is the freedom to teach, both in and outside the classroom, to conduct research and to publish the results of those investigations, and to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance. Professors should also have the freedom to speak to any matter of social, political, economic, or other interest to the larger community, subject to the academic standard of conduct applicable to each. (AAUP, 2010, pp. 87 -88)

Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that local senates review their current policy on academic freedom to determine if it is aligned with the latest AAUP perspective;

Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates to refine and/or develop a policy on academic freedom that reflects the current AAUP perspective; and

Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates to include such a policy in faculty handbooks and

		<p>board policies, and collaborate with unions to ensure that the rights delineated in such policies are protected.</p> <p>See AAUP 2010 Document at: http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/protectvoice/actionitems/.</p>
13.04	F10	<p>Basic Skills Advisory Committee Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' Basic Skills Committee is responsible for reviewing and recommending positions and actions on issues related to under-prepared students and is responsible for gathering information on best practices to provide instruction and support services to underprepared students and conveying this information to the field;</p> <p>Whereas, The Chancellor's Office has established a new Basic Skills Advisory Committee that will advise the Chancellor's Office on the direction for basic skills efforts within the state; and</p> <p>Whereas, Meeting the needs of underprepared/basic skills students is a priority for both the Academic Senate Basic Skills Committee and the Chancellor's Office Basic Skills Advisory Committee;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the Academic Senate Basic Skills Committee chair be an active participant on the Chancellor's Office Basic Skills Advisory Committee to ensure a clear connection between the work of the Chancellor's Office Basic Skills Advisory Committee and the Academic Senate; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to facilitate a connection between the Academic Senate Basic Skills Committee and the work by the Chancellor's Office to coordinate efforts related to basic skills.</p>
13.05	F10	<p>Providing Part-time Faculty with Adequate Resources and Support Jon Drinnon, Merritt College, Area B</p> <p>Whereas, Community college budgets have been cut and resources and support limited for all faculty;</p> <p>Whereas, Part-time faculty are particularly vulnerable to resource and support cuts since they have limited presence on campuses and often limited political power to protect and maintain an adequate level of resources and support; and</p>

			<p>Whereas, Colleges and districts have a duty to protect academic integrity by maintaining the resources and support that all faculty, both full- and part-time, need to be effective educators;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with its educational partners to advocate for a level of resources and support for part-time faculty that can maintain an adequate teaching environment for them and learning environment for our community college students.</p>
13.05	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 13.05 F10 Joe DeSantis, Copper Mountain College</p> <p>Amend first whereas and resolve:</p> <p>Whereas, Part-time faculty are particularly <u>uniquely</u> vulnerable to resource and support cuts since they have <u>due to their limited presence on campuses and often limited political power to protect and maintain an adequate level of in college and district decision making processes, particularly decisions regarding resources allocations and availability of support;</u> and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with <u>local senates, faculty and student associations, the Chancellor’s Office, and other educational partners</u> its educational partners to advocate for a level of resources and support for part-time faculty <u>in order to that can maintain an adequate teaching environment for them and learning environment for our community college students a professional and educational environment necessary for student success.</u></p>
13.05	.02	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 13.05 F10 Darwin Smith, Compton Education Center</p> <p>Add second whereas:</p> <p><u>Whereas, California community colleges are progressively relying more on part-time faculty to resolve their faculty workload problems;</u></p>
13.06		F10	<p>Develop a Faculty Definition of Student Success Kale Braden, Cosumnes River College, Area A</p> <p>Whereas, SB 1143 (Liu, 2010) mandates that the California Community College system “establish a taskforce to examine specified best practices and models for accomplishing student success,” and the work of this task force is already in progress;</p>

		<p>Whereas, Myriad forces from both within and without the California Community College System have attempted to define and suggest measurements for student success, leading to varying understandings and definitions of the term;</p> <p>Whereas, Models and definitions developed in other states may not transfer effectively or appropriately to the California Community College system; and</p> <p>Whereas, Community college Boards of Trustees are required to rely primarily on or mutually agree with the academic senate in matters relating to student success;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct its Executive Committee to develop working definitions of student success based on input from faculty throughout the California Community College system and carry those definitions into discussions related to SB 1143 (Liu, 2010) and other appropriate venues.</p>
13.07	F10	<p>CCLC Board Policy Templates Steve Leone, Cuesta College, Area C</p> <p>Whereas, Local senates and boards must consult collegially for board policy development with regard to academic and professional matters;</p> <p>Whereas, Some districts subscribe to the board policy templates offered by the Community College League of California (CCLC) which are intended to be a starting point for local policy development;</p> <p>Whereas, The CCLC templates provide technical assistance for the development of local board policies but creation of these policy templates without Academic Senate input can make local policy development more challenging and can lead to policies out of compliance with local senate purview; and</p> <p>Whereas, Many if not all of the current CCLC board policy templates do not reflect the primary and mutual agreement responsibilities of the senate;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges ask CCLC to involve the state Academic Senate in the development and updating of board policy templates regarding academic and professional matters;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges review the content of the current CCLC board policy templates that are focused on topics within the purview of the academic senates as established</p>

			<p>by Education Code and Title 5 regulations and make recommendations for changes to the templates to reflect the responsibilities of local senates; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges encourage local senates to be actively involved in adapting the CCLC board policy templates to local community needs and culture.</p>
13.08		F10	<p>Executive Order 1048, CSU Student Remediation David Morse, Long Beach City College, Area D</p> <p>Whereas, California State University Executive Order 1048, “Early Start Program,” requires that beginning in “summer 2012, incoming freshmen who have not demonstrated proficiency in English and/or mathematics will be required to begin remediation prior to the term for which they have been admitted, e.g., summer prior to fall”;</p> <p>Whereas, Executive Order 1048 further allows that each individual CSU campus “will design a program for incoming freshmen to develop proficiency in mathematics and/or English before they enroll as matriculated freshmen”;</p> <p>Whereas, one of the most commonly proposed responses to Executive Order 1048 at the CSU campuses is to have students needing remediation attend community college in the summer; and</p> <p>Whereas, in the current economic climate and with limited summer resources, such an influx of CSU students could have a significant impact on access to classes in summer for native community college students;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work in close consultation with the California State University System to ensure that responses to California State University Executive Order 1048 regarding remediation of underprepared incoming students do not unduly and negatively impact the California community colleges or community college students.</p>
13.09		F10	<p>Best Practices: Integrating Part-time Faculty into Shared-Governance Brian Sos, San Diego City College</p> <p>Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is committed to professionalism for all faculty as an essential element in providing students with excellent educational opportunities, services, and instruction as recommended in “Part-Time Faculty: A Principled Perspective” (adopted Spring 2002); and</p>

			<p>Whereas, The Academic Senate is committed to integrating part-time faculty into senate activities at the local and state level as stated in "Part-Time Faculty: A Principled Perspective" (2002); and</p> <p>Whereas, The Educational Policy Committee (2008) found that most academic senates across the state appear to provide dedicated representation for part-time faculty (72.7%), but "Part-time Faculty: Where Are We Now?" (<i>Rostrum</i>, December 2008) noted that the presence of one or two part-time faculty serving on a local senates is a far cry from meaningful involvement of part-time faculty in the intellectual life of the institution; and</p> <p>Whereas, No guidelines have been provided by the Academic Senate to aid local senates in developing by-laws that encourages recruitment, retention, and mentoring for integrating part-time faculty into senate activities;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges administer a comprehensive survey soliciting quantitative and qualitative information about local senates' by-laws and best practices regarding the recruitment, encouragement, and inclusion of part-time faculty in the voice of the academic senate through such means as local senate executive committee participation, department representation, compensation, voting or non-voting status, and inclusion on senate and local committees; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges compile and disseminate information regarding participation of part-time faculty via a paper, <i>Rostrum</i> articles, or other appropriate venues.</p>
13.09	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 13.09 F10 Denise Cabanel-Bleuer, Orange Coast College</p> <p>Amend final resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges compile and disseminate information regarding participation of part-time faculty via a paper, <i>Rostrum</i> articles, or other appropriate venues, <u>and report on the progress of the resolution at the 2011 Fall Plenary Session.</u></p>
13.10		F10	<p>Support for Distance Learning Coordinators Cathy Cox, Mission College</p> <p>Whereas, Distance Learning is recognized as a valid instructional modality in Title 5, and increasing numbers of courses are offered in this manner by community colleges statewide both to meet the needs of students and to respond to identified administrative concerns about facilities, budget, or scheduling;</p>

			<p>Whereas, The Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) recently released a paper (<i>The Master Plan at 50: Using Distance Education to Increase College Access and Efficiency</i>) proposing the widespread use of distance education to alleviate perceived problems with access to community colleges;</p> <p>Whereas, Distance Learning courses are subject to legislative and reporting requirements, many of which include matters of compliance that could affect college apportionment or accreditation status; and</p> <p>Whereas, Compliance with these legislative and reporting requirements place a large burden on distance learning coordinators when they are not provided adequate administrative and classified staff support due to budget constraints including limitations imposed by the 50% law;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to work with their college administrations in developing policies, procedures, and methods to provide adequate support for distance learning coordinators to ensure academic integrity and compliance with all relevant regulations and external mandates.</p>
13.10	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 13.10 F10 Mark Wade Lieu, Ohlone College</p> <p>Amend fourth whereas:</p> <p>Whereas, Compliance with these legislative and reporting requirements place a large burden on distance learning coordinators when they are not provided adequate administrative and classified staff support due to budget constraints including limitations imposed by the 50% law;</p>
13.11		F10	<p>Increasing Faculty Voice Dianna Chiabotti, Napa Valley College</p> <p>Whereas, The general public is bombarded with news articles and commentary about the failure of the California community colleges;</p> <p>Whereas, Many individuals and organizations, based on their perspectives, have determined reasons for the failures of our colleges;</p> <p>Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges president and committees are vigilant in presenting the perspectives of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, which are based on sound educational principles; and</p> <p>Whereas, The voice of faculty needs to be more emphatic and more vigorous in presenting the successes of colleges and the role of faculty in meeting</p>

			<p>student needs and supporting student success;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide local academic senates with recommendations for advocating for the purview of faculty and the relevance of faculty voice in academic and professional matters;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop talking points on the successes of community colleges and identify important documents for referring administrators and local politicians to; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge district and college academic senates to increase their vigilance and the volume of their voice by countering attacks with arguments based on sound academic principles so that each attack is met with a counter, increasing the likelihood that the general population will understand the true state of California community colleges, including the challenges and successes.</p>
15.0			INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES
15.01		F10	<p>Use C-ID to Determine Similarity of CCC and CSU Courses Beth Smith, Grossmont College</p> <p>Whereas, Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla, 2010) restricts the California State University from requiring students to repeat courses at California State University that are “similar” to courses taken as part of a degree developed in response to SB 1440;</p> <p>Whereas, Similar courses were not defined in the law resulting from SB 1440, and any determination of curricular similarity must be made by faculty; and</p> <p>Whereas, The Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) provides descriptors for California Community College courses that commonly transfer;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the use of C-ID processes as a means of determining whether California Community Colleges and California State University courses are similar; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Academic Senate of the California State University to establish a mechanism by which such determinations are made.</p>

15.01	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 15.01 F10 Denise Cabanel-Bleuer, Orange Coast College</p> <p>Strike second resolve.</p>
16.0			LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCES
16.01		F10	<p>Adopt Paper Standards of Practice for California Community College Library Faculty and Programs Kevin Bontenbal, Cuesta College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Resolution 16.01 S09 called for the development of a paper addressing standards of practice for California community college libraries; and</p> <p>Whereas, specific standards for library services have appeared piecemeal in various regulations and guidelines, but nowhere have these standards been collected, reviewed, and presented systematically with specific application to the roles of librarians in the California community colleges;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper <i>Standards of Practice for California Community College Library Faculty and Programs</i>.</p> <p>See Appendix E.</p>
17.0			LOCAL SENATES
17.01		F10	<p>Responses to Violations of Law, Policy, and Procedure David Morse, Long Beach City College</p> <p>Whereas, Education Code, Title 5, and local policies and procedures are either legal directives or collaborative agreements that should be respected at all levels of the community college system;</p> <p>Whereas, Faculty at the district and local level have been frustrated by administrative violations of such directives and agreements; and</p> <p>Whereas, Local academic senates would benefit from assistance and advice in dealing with situations in which administrations fail to respect either statewide mandates or local agreements, including counsel regarding effective documentation of administrative policy and procedure violations and when and how to escalate complaints regarding such administrative actions;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a resource document to provide guidance to local senates in reacting to and dealing with administrative violations of state and local policies and regulations.</p>

19.0			PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS
19.01		F10	<p>Academic and Professional Matters Purview Kathy Kelley, Chabot College, Area B</p> <p>Whereas, Title 5 and Education Code clearly define faculty purview relative to academic and professional matters;</p> <p>Whereas, Other organizations are submitting proposals and plans to change, alter, and revise aspects of the California community colleges that are clearly academic and professional matters; and</p> <p>Whereas, Current legislation and proposed legislation are increasingly impinging upon the purview of faculty and academic senates;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges engage local faculty to participate in statewide conversations outside of plenary sessions regarding the erosion of Title 5 and Education Code mandates; and</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a plan to respond to the current attacks on the rights and responsibilities guaranteed to faculty in AB1725.</p>
20.0			STUDENTS
20.01		F10	<p>Admissions Priorities and Practices Regarding Out-of-State and International Students Don Gauthier, Los Angeles Valley College, Educational Policies Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Restrictive and inadequate funding from the state and enrollments caps have forced colleges to seek alternate sources of revenue;</p> <p>Whereas, Out of state and international students pay higher fees, are guaranteed 12 units and are given priority enrollment; and</p> <p>Whereas, Many colleges give enrollment priority to out of state and international students, thereby depriving resident students of access in spite of their contributions to California higher education;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to review local admissions priorities and practices regarding out-of-state and international applicants to ensure that they provide access for California resident students.</p>

20.01	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 20.01 F10 Cathy Cox, Mission College</p> <p>Amend second whereas:</p> <p>Whereas, Out of state and international students pay higher fees <u>and in many colleges</u> are guaranteed 12 units and are given priority enrollment; and</p> <p>Insert first and second resolves:</p> <p><u>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges research and gather data from local colleges and districts on the impact of priority registration of out-of-state and international students on access for resident students; and</u></p> <p><u>Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges also research, summarize, and report to the body ways of integrating out-of-state and international student programs into colleges and districts ways that provide documented benefits to all students; and</u></p>
20.02		F10	<p>Prioritization of Resident Students Dolores Davison, Foothill College, Executive Committee</p> <p>Whereas, Current demand on California community colleges is at an all time high due to economic and employment factors;</p> <p>Whereas, Because of limited resources many colleges are actively pursuing the creation of international centers outside of the country to attract and serve its students; and</p> <p>Whereas, The primary responsibility of California community colleges apportionment-based instruction and services should be primarily focused on resident students;</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges urge colleges to identify local priorities regarding international centers and enrollment, taking into consideration the effects on instruction, services, and resources needed to educate resident students.</p>
20.02	.01	F10	<p>Amend Resolution 20.02 F10 Bob Grill, College of Alameda, Area B</p> <p>Amend the resolve:</p> <p>Resolved, That the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges urge colleges to identify local priorities regarding <u>instruction and sites in</u></p>

			<u>other countries</u> international centers and enrollment , taking into consideration the effects on instruction, services and resources needed to educate resident students.
--	--	--	--