



ACADEMIC SENATE  
for CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

*Celebrating 50 years*

## **54<sup>th</sup> FALL SESSION RESOLUTIONS**

### *Adopted Resolutions*

Resolutions Committee 2019-20

Geoffrey Dyer, ASCCC Area A Representative (Chair)

Julie Clark, Merced College, Area A

Nathaniel Donahue, ASCCC At-Large Representative, Area C

Maria Figueroa, Mira Costa College, Area D

Eric Narveson, Evergreen Valley College, Area B

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ADOPTED RESOLUTIONS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.01    F19 Align Terms of Office in Bylaws to Practice .....	1
1.02    F19 Adopt Instant Runoff Voting .....	1
1.03    F19 Rotate Plenary Between Areas .....	3
1.04    F19 Limit Nominations from the Floor .....	4
1.05    F19 Reverse the Order of the Area, North/South, and At-Large Representative Elections .....	5
1.06    F19 Term Limits of Three One-year Terms for Officers and Two Two-year Terms for Representatives .....	5
1.07    F19 Clarify Nomination Process and Eliminate “Trickling” .....	6
1.08    F19 Academic Senate Resources for Serving Students with Disabilities.....	7
1.09    F19 Academic Senate Caucus Restructuring.....	8
<b>3.0 DIVERSITY AND EQUITY .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.01    F19 Assessing Student Equity and Achievement Program Contribution to Guided Pathways Implementation .....	9
3.02    F19 Support Infusing Anti-Racism/No Hate Education in Community Colleges .....	10
3.03    F19 Replacing the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Inclusivity Statement .....	12
3.04    F19 Adopt the Paper Equity-Driven Systems: Student Equity and Achievement in the California Community Colleges.....	13
3.05    F19 Acknowledge Extended Opportunity Programs and Services’ 50 Years of Student Success .....	14
3.06    F19 Include Currently and Formerly Incarcerated Youth in Equity Plans ...	15
3.07    F19 Enable the Canvas Name Preference Option.....	16
<b>5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE.....</b>	<b>16</b>
5.01    F19 Adopt the Paper Budget Processes and the Faculty Role .....	16
5.02    F19 Extend the Hold-Harmless Provision of the Funding Formula .....	17
<b>6.0 STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES .....</b>	<b>18</b>
6.01    F19 Reversal of Position Regarding Baccalaureate Degrees and Removal of Pilot Designation.....	18
6.02    F19 Expansion of Baccalaureate Degree Programs in Allied Health .....	19
6.03    F19 Oppose Calbright’s College Center Placement within an Extant District and Program Duplication .....	19
<b>7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE .....</b>	<b>20</b>
7.01    F19 Academic Senate Involvement in Online Teaching Conference Planning .....	20
7.02    F19 Continued Advocacy for Substantive Participatory Governance with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office.....	21

<b>9.0 CURRICULUM .....</b>	<b>22</b>
9.01    F19 Local Determination of International Baccalaureate Credit at California Community Colleges .....	22
9.02    F19 Inclusion of Course Identification Numbers (C-ID) in College Catalogs and Student Transcripts.....	24
9.03    F19 Adopt Updated Course Basic (CB) 21 Rubrics for Coding English as a Second Language (ESL) Course Outcomes.....	24
9.04    F19 English as a Second Language (ESL) Course Basic (CB) 21 Rubric Coding of Multiple Courses to the Same CB21 Competency .....	25
9.05    F19 Provide Guidance with Respect to Ensuring Student Access to No-Cost Resources .....	26
9.06    F19 Consider Implications of Publisher-Developed Lower Cost “Inclusive Access” Strategies.....	27
9.07    F19 Clarify the Meaning of Fundamental Alteration When Providing Academic Accommodations .....	27
9.08    F19 Repeatability of Credit Co-Requisite Support Courses.....	28
9.09    F19 Ensuring Access and Opportunity for Success for All Students Through AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) Implementation .....	29
<b>10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST .....</b>	<b>30</b>
10.01    F19 Minimum Qualifications for Campus Americans with Disabilities Act Coordinators.....	30
<b>13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS .....</b>	<b>31</b>
13.01    F19 Collegial Consultation during Implementation of Guided Pathways ....	31
13.02    F19 Data Paper and Equity-Minded Practices .....	32
<b>15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES .....</b>	<b>32</b>
15.01    F19 Criteria and Training for the Evaluation and Approval of Advanced Credit English as a Second Language (ESL) Coursework for California State University General Education Breadth (CSU-GE) and the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC).....	32
<b>16.0 LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCES .....</b>	<b>34</b>
16.01    F19 Develop Standards of Practice Resource for Learning Assistance and Tutoring in the California Community Colleges, including the role of Learning Skills Coordinators or Instructors, and Tutoring Coordinators.....	34
<b>19.0 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS .....</b>	<b>35</b>
19.01    F19 Encourage Utilization of Career Technical Education Faculty Minimum Qualifications Toolkit Resources for Hiring in Career Technical Education Disciplines .....	35
<b>21.0 CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION.....</b>	<b>36</b>
21.01    F19 Update Chancellor’s Office Document Alternatives to In-Person Consultations: Cooperative Work Experience Education.....	36
<b>REFERRED RESOLUTIONS.....</b>	<b>38</b>

5.03	F19 Assess How Alignment of Timeframes for AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) and the Student Centered Funding Formula for ESL Students Inequitably Impact Funding for Colleges Serving High Percentages of ESL Students.....	38
5.03.01	F19 Amend Resolution 5.03 F19 .....	39
5.04	F19 Include Credit English as a Second Language (ESL) Courses Equivalent to Transfer-Level English in the Student Centered Funding Formula.....	39
7.03	F19 Include Credit English as a Second Language (ESL) in the Student Success Metrics (SSM).....	40
7.04	F19 Convene the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Assessment Committee for Credit English as a Second Language (ESL).....	41
<b>FAILED RESOLUTIONS</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>43</b>
1.10	F19 Limit “Trickling” in Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Elections.....	43
1.11	F19 Term Limits of Three One-year Terms for Officers and One Two-year Term for Representatives .....	43
3.07.01	F19 Amend Resolution 3.07 .....	45
<b>DELEGATES</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>46</b>

## **ADOPTED RESOLUTIONS**

### **1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE**

#### **1.01 F19 Align Terms of Office in Bylaws to Practice**

Whereas, The bylaws of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC), Section 2, currently indicate the beginning and ending dates for terms of elected members of the Executive Committee as commencing on June 1 and concluding on May 31 of each year;

Whereas, In practice the ASCCC Executive Committee's last meeting of the academic year occurs between May 25 and June 10 depending on site availability, calendar considerations, and scheduled professional development or consultative meetings; and,

Whereas, The final meeting of the ASCCC Executive Committee's academic year has traditionally been a business meeting concluding on Friday and orientation for the new Executive Committee beginning on Saturday morning, and the terms of service listed in the bylaws can create difficult procedural questions when action is required during the business meeting on Friday;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend its bylaws so that Article IV, Section 2 reads as follows:

*Section 2. Selection and Term*

*Terms of office shall commence at the start of the second day of the last Executive Committee meeting of the academic year or June 10, whichever occurs first.  
Terms of office shall conclude at the end of the first day of the last Executive Committee meeting of the academic year or June 9, whichever occurs first.*

Contact: Roy Shahbazian, Santa Ana College, Standards & Practices Committee

MSU

#### **1.02 F19 Adopt Instant Runoff Voting**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) currently uses majority voting for officers and representatives, and in each election, each delegate only votes once per ballot;

Whereas, Elections to the Executive Committee at the ASCCC spring plenary sessions often require multiple runoff elections, extending the time that delegates need to remain present on Saturdays of spring plenaries;

Whereas, The ASCCC's existing elections procedure disqualifies candidates who do not accrue enough votes to be included in the run-off, even though these candidates may have been the second choice of delegates who voted for a different candidate who also did not make the runoff; and

Whereas, Preferential elections procedures which incorporate instant runoff<sup>1</sup> have the potential to significantly expedite the elections process while also ensuring that each delegate has the ability to participate in the election of each officer and representative that the delegate is entitled to vote for;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in an effort to ensure the faculty voice is represented, amend section I. G of its rules to incorporate instant runoff voting and read as follows:

1. *The process by which the election will be conducted shall be distributed in writing prior to the day of the election.*
2. *Each ballot shall proceed as follows: Tellers shall distribute ballots to those ~~D~~delegates eligible to vote for the specific office being contested.*
  - a. *The ballot for each position will include the names of all candidates for the position.*
  - b. *The delegate shall indicate a preference for the candidate that the delegate most desires by marking that candidate's name with the number 1. The delegate shall also indicate a different candidate as a second choice with the number 2, and so on for all candidates as the delegate desires, in the order that the delegate prefers.*
  - c. ~~a.~~ *The ~~d~~delegate shall mark the ballot, sign it, seal it, and return it to the tellers.*
  - d. ~~b.~~ *The tellers shall retire to ~~another~~ a separate room and shall compare the signatures on each ballot against the signatures on the list of ~~D~~delegates eligible to vote, setting aside any ballots not submitted by a ~~D~~delegate eligible to vote. Any ballots which do not adhere to the rules or the published process shall be disqualified. Then, ~~a~~All ballots shall then be counted.*
  - e. *If any candidate receives a majority (greater than 50%) of number 1 votes, that candidate will be declared the winner. If none of the candidates for a position receives a majority of number 1 votes from the delegates present and voting, the candidate with the fewest number 1 votes will be removed from consideration. The number 2 vote on the ballots of those delegates who gave preference to the candidate no longer under consideration will then be applied. This iterative process will be applied from the ballots until one of the candidates reaches a majority.*
  - f. *If the final two candidates are tied as the result of preferential balloting, the candidate from the shared majority to whom the delegates*

---

<sup>1</sup> [Robert's Rules of Order on Instant Runoff Voting. Fair Vote.](#)

bestowed the most number 1 votes will be declared the winner. Iteratively, in the event that both of the candidates with the shared majority receive the same amount of number 1 votes, the candidate with the highest amount of number 2 votes will be the winner, and so on.

g. e. The specific process by which the election will be conducted, including the grounds and process for appeal of specific ballot results, shall be distributed in writing prior to the day of the election.

3. To be elected, a candidate must receive a vote from a majority of those delegates present and voting. A majority is greater than 50%.
4. In the event no candidate for a position receives a majority through the process in I.G.2.f, a run-off will be conducted but will be limited to the top two candidates with the largest number of votes, including all ties.
5. The order of the election shall be as follows: President, Vice-president, Secretary, Treasurer, Area Representatives, North Representative, South Representative, and At-Large Representative.
6. Any candidate may observe or select someone to observe the counting of votes for the ballot or ballots on which the candidate's name appears.
7. A candidate for election may not chair the Elections Committee or participate in the distribution, collection, or tallying of votes.
8. If a candidate runs unopposed, the candidate may be elected by acclamation . The motion to be elected by acclamation must be moved and seconded by ~~D~~delegates from the floor and must be approved by the body.
9. Ballots shall be kept in the Senate archives until the next election.

Contact: Roy Shahbazian, Santa Ana College, Standards & Practices Committee

MSC

### **1.03 F19 Rotate Plenary Between Areas**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges typically schedules elections in Areas B or A;

Whereas, The attendance at plenary sessions and, in particular, for the entire voting day might be larger for delegates living in closer proximity to the plenary location due to more travel flexibility;

Whereas, Holding elections consistently in the same areas might give a systematic advantage, or the perception thereof, to candidates from that area compared to candidates from other areas, especially for statewide at-large and officer positions, but rotating the location between the areas would give that advantage to all areas equally over time; and

Whereas, Although scheduling two consecutive plenary sessions in adjacent areas to accommodate rotation could be disadvantageous, rotation patterns that significantly increase the long-term geographic dispersion of plenaries could outweigh that disadvantage;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges rotate the location of plenary sessions among areas and ensure that spring plenaries—when elections are typically held—rotate through all areas as frequently as practicable, ideally every four years.

Contact: Roy Shahbazian, Santa Ana College, Standards & Practices Committee

MSC

#### **1.04 F19 Limit Nominations from the Floor**

Whereas, In certain circumstances the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) rules currently allow for nominations from the floor for positions to serve on the Executive Committee;

Whereas, Candidates nominated from the floor on Saturday of a plenary session are afforded the opportunity to present a candidate speech closer to the time of balloting, which may provide an advantage over those candidates who publicly presented their candidate speeches on Friday;

Whereas, Communication studies research on audience retention of messages reveals that after 24 hours approximately only 10% of the original message is retained<sup>2</sup>; and

Whereas, The ASCCC should promote fair and equitable competition;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges only call for and accept nominations from the floor on Saturday of a plenary session in the event that no candidate has been nominated; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend sections E.1-E.2 of its rules as follows:

##### *Nominations*

1. *Nominations may be made in two ways:*
  - a. *In writing and delivered to the Academic Senate Office;*
  - b. *From the floor at a general session designated for such floor action, regularly on Thursday of a plenary session but on Saturdays only if no candidates have declared intent to seek any given position. The general session for floor nominations on Thursday should be published in the agenda, and all nominations, other than those noted above, will be closed at the end of that general session.*
2. *Nominations may be ~~made~~ accepted only with the consent of the nominee.*

---

<sup>2</sup> Larry Barker and Kittie Watson, *Listen Up: What You've Never Heard About the Other Half of Every Conversation* (New York: St. Martin's, 2001), p.5.



Contact: Gregory Beyrer, Cosumnes River College, Area A

MSC

**1.05 F19 Reverse the Order of the Area, North/South, and At-Large Representative Elections**

Whereas, The Rules of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges specify an order for conducting elections as president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, area representatives, north representative, south representative, and at-large representative and allow nominees for elections to stand for other positions if they do not prevail for the first office nominated;

Whereas, Of the representative positions, the at-large representatives need to win the votes of the largest number of delegates, demonstrating more statewide support;

Whereas, If elections were held first for at-large, then north and south, and then area representatives, the elections would progress from larger constituency to smaller constituency and allow nominees who did not win statewide support to be considered for positions that can be won with a smaller number of votes from delegates in closer proximity; and

Whereas, Under the current order, if a nominee loses an area election, it could be perceived as counter-intuitive for that candidate to seek to be elected by or represent a larger constituency, but a consistent order would allow nominees to attempt to win support for positions requiring more support before standing for positions requiring fewer votes;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend section I.G.5 of its rules as follows:

*The order of the election shall be as follows: President, Vice-president, Secretary, Treasurer, ~~Area Representatives, North Representative, South Representative, and At-Large Representative~~ At-Large Representative, North Representative, South Representative, and Area Representatives.*

Contact: Roy Shahbazian, Santa Ana College, Standards & Practices Committee

MSC

**1.06 F19 Term Limits of Three One-year Terms for Officers and Two Two-year Terms for Representatives**

Whereas, Objective 2.2 of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Strategic Plan is to “Increase the diversity of faculty representation on committees of the ASCCC, including the Executive Committee, and other system consultation bodies to better reflect the diversity of California”;

Whereas, Attendees of ASCCC plenary sessions have expressed the perception that being elected to the Executive Committee is unreasonably difficult due in part to the longevity in office of some incumbents;

Whereas, The ASCCC bylaws currently only set limits for the office of president; and

Whereas, Establishing consistent term limits for all offices and positions would increase opportunities for a wider pool of candidates and thereby promote greater inclusion and participation by reducing the number of incumbents who might seek re-election in the same position or office;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend its Rules so that Section 1.C reads as follows:

*Terms of Office*

1) *Terms for Officers shall be one year.*

2) *Terms for representatives shall be two years.*

3) *Terms for representatives shall be staggered as follows. Even-numbered year elections will select the Area B and C representatives, one representative each from the North and South regions, and one of the At-Large representatives. Odd-numbered year elections will select the Areas A and D representatives, one representative each from the North and South regions, and one of the At-large representatives.*

4) *The officers shall serve no more than three consecutive elected one-year terms in the same office.*

5) *All members except the officers are limited to two consecutive two-year terms in any position. In the event that a representative or officer is elected to a position mid-cycle due to a resignation or election by prior incumbent to a different office or position within a normal cycle, the representative or officer may pursue re-election and be entitled to serve a full term of a normal cycle in the same position despite the previous mid-cycle service. For the purposes of this section and article, At-Large positions are considered the same position despite their staggered terms for election, and all North/South positions are considered the same position despite their staggered terms.*

Contact: Christopher Howerton, Woodland Community College, Standards & Practices Committee

MSC

**1.07 F19 Clarify Nomination Process and Eliminate “Trickling”**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) rules allow for candidates for officer and representative positions to be considered for any positions for which they qualify if they do not prevail in the election for the highest position they seek, a practice referred to as “trickling”;

Whereas, In spring of 2019, the ASCCC Standards & Practices committee, responding to concerns raised by various faculty regarding the fairness of trickling and the difficulty of being elected to the Executive Committee, recommended that trickling be eliminated;

Whereas, The current nomination process outlined in Section E.3. of the rules specifies that a nominee, once consenting to nomination, is allowed to indicate whether the nominee wishes to stand for other positions for which the nominee is eligible if the nominee does not prevail for the office nominated, resulting in an undemocratic nomination process; and

Whereas, Objective 2.2. of the ASCCC Strategic Plan is to “[i]ncrease the diversity of faculty representation on committees of the ASCCC, including the Executive Committee, and other system consultation bodies to better reflect the diversity of California”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges eliminate “trickling” and clarify the nomination process to make it more intentional and transparent by amending Section E.3 from its Rules to reflect the following change:

Nominees may be nominated for at most two positions for which they are eligible. In the case that the nominee consents to two nominations during the same Plenary session, the first election in which the candidate prevails will be the position the candidate subsequently assumes.

Contact: Manuel Velez, San Diego Mesa College

MSC

### **1.08 F19 Academic Senate Resources for Serving Students with Disabilities**

Whereas, Students with disabilities are legally entitled to equal access to education and are required to receive reasonable academic accommodations under federal and state law;

Whereas, While Title 5 section 56000<sup>3</sup> stipulates that academic accommodations may not result in fundamental alterations of curriculum, as defined in Title 5 section 56001<sup>4</sup>, yet

---

<sup>3</sup> See

[https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I0438A1F41C994288ADE3D1CD05ABAB52?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I0438A1F41C994288ADE3D1CD05ABAB52?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=(sc.Default))

<sup>4</sup>See

[https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/IFB07D3A5F96D4AEC84571FC3BF34A07C?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/IFB07D3A5F96D4AEC84571FC3BF34A07C?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=(sc.Default))

there are often disagreements between instructional faculty and Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) professionals on what constitutes fundamental alterations of curriculum, the roles of DSPS offices and instructional faculty in providing academic accommodations, and the rights of instructional faculty to challenge academic accommodations on the basis of fundamental alterations;

Whereas, Academic accommodations may impact instruction, regardless of whether or not an academic accommodation results in a fundamental alteration of curriculum and is a policy regarding student preparation and success, both of which make the provision of academic accommodations an academic and professional matter under the purview of local senates; and

Whereas, Given recent legislative changes that impact remedial or developmental education, local senates need additional resources and professional guidance on how to effectively serve students with disabilities from a faculty perspective;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges establish a new committee focused on serving students with disabilities, providing resources such as breakout sessions, *Rostrum* articles, and regional meetings on effective practices for serving students with disabilities to local senates.

Contact: Angela C. Echeverri, Los Angeles Community College District

MSC

### **1.09 F19 Academic Senate Caucus Restructuring**

Whereas, Caucuses are charged to serve a critical role in the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) by “serving as groups of independently organized faculty to meet, network, and deliberate collegially in order to form a collective voice on issues of common concern that caucus members feel are of vital importance to faculty and the success of students as they relate to academic and professional matters”;

Whereas, The ASCCC Caucuses struggle to meet the needs of their membership since the actions of caucuses are delimited in the Caucus Recognition Criteria so that the caucuses are not “duplicative of the work of standing ASCCC committees, existing caucuses, or other representative groups” and are “not intended to...meet the professional development needs of its membership” as well as further constrained by the Caucus Procedures and Guidelines regarding leadership and organizational structure;

Whereas, The scope of work of the ASCCC and the ASCCC Executive Committee has increased exponentially over the past few years as significant and numerous initiatives and programs have required increased participation and consultation at the state level with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, system-wide partners, stakeholders, and legislators as well as engaging in ongoing research projects, developing

tools and resources, establishing positions through official papers and resolutions; and enhancing support for local senates and faculty leaders; and

Whereas, The various ASCCC Caucuses, with memberships that include experienced, talented, and committed faculty leaders, might serve to provide much needed support to faculty colleagues across the state through networking, mentoring, and professional development activities, as complements to the services provided by ASCCC, and assist in fulfilling the ASCCC Strategic Plan, Goal 2, Objective 2.1: Increase leadership development opportunities to prepare diverse faculty to participate in and lead local and statewide conversations<sup>5</sup>;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) revise its Caucus Recognition Criteria and Procedures and Guidelines so that an ASCCC caucus may provide networking, mentoring, and professional development activities for its members; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) revise its Caucus Recognition Criteria and Procedures and Guidelines to incorporate flexibility so that the ASCCC caucuses may serve a distinct and significant role in assisting ASCCC to provide statewide and local leadership professional development for faculty leaders and provide expertise to the ASCCC Executive Committee.

Contact: Julie Bruno, Sierra College

MSU

### **3.0 DIVERSITY AND EQUITY**

#### **3.01 F19 Assessing Student Equity and Achievement Program Contribution to Guided Pathways Implementation**

Whereas, The Student Equity and Achievement Program was established to boost achievement by closing equity gaps through, among other things, implementing activities pursuant to the California Guided Pathways Award Program;<sup>6</sup>

Whereas, College districts must, as a condition of receiving the Student Equity and Achievement Program funds, maintain a Student Equity Plan that is developed with the active involvement of the local academic senate, other constituencies, and the community;<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> ASCCC Strategic Plan

([https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/ASCCC\\_Strategic\\_Plan\\_2018-2023\\_final.pdf](https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/ASCCC_Strategic_Plan_2018-2023_final.pdf))

<sup>6</sup> [California Education Code §78222](#) (a) (2):

<sup>7</sup> California Education Code §78222 (b) (1) and [§78220](#) (b):

Whereas, College districts must, as a condition of receiving the Student Equity and Achievement Program funds, provide an annual report detailing how funds were used and include an assessment of progress in advancing program goals, which includes implementing activities pursuant to the California Guided Pathways Award Program;<sup>8</sup> and

Whereas, Implementation and evaluation of a guided pathways framework and the Student Equity and Achievement Program are pertinent to several areas of academic senate purview, including but not limited to curriculum, educational program development, standards or policies for student preparation and success, and processes for institutional planning and budget development;<sup>9</sup>

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to develop guidance for college districts on including in their annual Student Equity and Achievement (SEA) Program report an assessment of how SEA Program funded activities contribute to local guided pathways implementation; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to participate in the annual report on Student Equity and Achievement Program and the assessment of how SEA Program funded activities contribute to local guided pathways implementation.

Contact: Jeffrey Hernandez, East Los Angeles College, Guided Pathways Task Force

MSC

### **3.02 F19 Support Infusing Anti-Racism/No Hate Education in Community Colleges**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement characterizes the California Community Colleges System as follows:

*As a collective community of individual colleges, we are invested in cultivating and maintaining a climate where equity and mutual respect are both intrinsic and explicit by valuing individuals and groups from all backgrounds, demographics, and experiences. Individual and group differences can include, but are not limited to the following dimensions: race, ethnicity, national origin or ancestry, citizenship, immigration status, sex, gender, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, registered domestic partner status, age, political beliefs, religion, creed, military or veteran status, socioeconomic status, and any other basis protected by federal, state or local law or ordinance or regulation;*

---

<sup>8</sup> [California Education Code §78222 \(b\) \(5\):](#)

<sup>9</sup> [California Code of Regulations §53200:](#)

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Inclusivity Statement

*recognizes the benefits to students, faculty, and the community college system gained from the variety of personal experiences, values, and views of a diverse group of individuals with different backgrounds. This diversity includes but is not limited to race, ethnicity, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability status, age, cultural background, veteran status, discipline or field, and experience. We also understand that the California Community College System itself is diverse in terms of the size, location, and student population of its colleges and districts, and we seek participation from faculty across the system. The Academic Senate respects and is committed to promoting equal opportunity and inclusion of diverse voices and opinions. We endeavor to have a diversity of talented faculty participate in Academic Senate activities and support local senates in recruiting and encouraging faculty with different backgrounds to serve on Academic Senate standing committees and task forces. In particular, the Academic Senate acknowledges the need to remove barriers to the recruitment and participation of talented faculty from historically excluded populations in society;<sup>10</sup>*

Whereas, To eliminate institutional discrimination, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strives to do the following:

1. To integrate an accurate portrayal of the roles and contributions of all groups throughout history across curricula, particularly groups that have been underrepresented historically,
2. To identify how bias, stereotyping, and discrimination have limited the roles and contributions of individuals and groups and how these limitations have challenged and continue to challenge our society,
3. To encourage all members of the educational community to examine assumptions and prejudices, including but not limited to racism, sexism, and homophobia, that might limit the opportunities and growth of students and employees,
4. To offer positive and diverse role models in our society, including the recruitment, hiring, and promotion of diverse employees in community colleges,
5. To coordinate with organizations and concerned agencies that promote the contributions, heritage, culture, history, and health and care needs of diverse population groups, and
6. To promote a safe and inclusive environment for all; and

Whereas, Racism and racial discrimination threaten human development because of the obstacles that they pose to the fulfillment to basic human rights to survival, security, development, and social participation, because racism has been shown to have negative cognitive, behavioral, affective, and relational effects on both child and adult victims nationally and globally, historically and contemporarily, and because racism, racial

---

<sup>10</sup> [ASCCC Inclusivity Statement](#)

discrimination, xenophobia, and related intolerance have been shown to be attitudes and behaviors that are learned;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges denounce racism for its negative psychological, social, educational, and economic effects on human development throughout the lifespan;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, to eliminate institutional discrimination, take steps to not only strive for a greater knowledge about and the celebration of diversity but also to support deeper training that reveals the inherent racism embedded in societal institutions in the United States, including the educational system, and asks individuals to examine their personal role in the support of racist structures and the commitment to work to dismantle structural racism; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges infuse Anti-Racism/No Hate Education in all its activities and professional development opportunities to the degree that doing so is feasible.

Contact: Karla Kirk, Fresno City College, Equity and Diversity Action Committee

MSC

### **3.03 F19 Replacing the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Inclusivity Statement**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) co-chaired the Board of Governors Vision for Success Faculty and Staff Diversity TaskForce and contributed to the creation of a system Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement;

Whereas, The ASCCC Executive Committee endorsed the California Community Colleges Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement at its August 2019 meeting to forward to the Board of Governors; and

Whereas, The Equity and Diversity Action Committee of the ASCCC evaluated the ASCCC's current Inclusivity Statement and endorsed the adoption of the system Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement as more aligned to the present goals and vision for the Academic Senate;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges replace its Inclusivity Statement with the following Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statement:

*With the goal of ensuring the equal educational opportunity of all students, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges embraces diversity among students, faculty, staff, and the communities we serve as an integral part of our history, a recognition of the complexity of our present state, and a call to action for a better future. Embracing diversity means that we must intentionally practice acceptance and respect towards one another and understand that discrimination*



*and prejudices create and sustain privileges for some while creating and sustaining disadvantages for others. In order to embrace diversity, we also acknowledge that institutional discrimination and implicit bias exist and that our goal is to eradicate those elements from our system. Our commitment to diversity requires that we strive to eliminate those barriers to equity and that we act deliberately to create a safe and inclusive environment where individual and group differences are valued and leveraged for our growth and understanding as an educational community.*

*To advance our goals of diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice for the success of students and employees, we must honor that each individual is unique and that our individual differences contribute to the ability of the colleges to prepare students on their educational journeys. This requires that we develop and implement policies and procedures, encourage individual and systemic change, continually reflect on our efforts, and hold ourselves accountable for the results of our efforts in accomplishing our goals. In service of these goals, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is committed to fostering an environment that offers equal employment opportunity for all.*

*As a collective community of individual colleges, we are invested in cultivating and maintaining a climate where equity and mutual respect are both intrinsic and explicit by valuing individuals and groups from all backgrounds, demographics, and experiences. Individual and group differences can include but are not limited to the following dimensions: race, ethnicity, national origin or ancestry, citizenship, immigration status, sex, gender, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, registered domestic partner status, age, political beliefs, religion, creed, military or veteran status, socioeconomic status, and any other basis protected by federal, state or local law or ordinance or regulation. We acknowledge that the concept of diversity and inclusion is ever evolving, and thus we create space to allow for our understanding to grow through the periodic review of this statement.<sup>11</sup>*

Contact: Jessica Ayo Alabi, Orange Coast College, Equity and Diversity Action Committee

Acclamation

### **3.04 F19 Adopt the Paper Equity-Driven Systems: Student Equity and Achievement in the California Community Colleges**

Whereas, Resolution 3.03 F17 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “revise the 2002 paper *Student Equity: Guidelines for Developing a Plan* and bring the revised paper to the Fall 2018 Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption”;

---

<sup>11</sup> Inclusivity statement passed by The Board of Governors on Sept. 17, 2019

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Equity-Driven Systems: Student Equity and Achievement in the California Community Colleges*<sup>12</sup> and disseminate the paper to local academic senates upon its adoption.

Contact: Luke Lara, MiraCosta College, Faculty Leadership Development Committee

Acclamation

### **3.05 F19 Acknowledge Extended Opportunity Programs and Services' 50 Years of Student Success**

Whereas, Amidst the struggle for civil rights and equality, California State Senate Bill 164 (Alquist) was put into law on September 4, 1969, establishing Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS);

Whereas, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services was established to “encourage local community colleges to establish and implement programs directed to identifying those students affected by language, social, and economic handicap...and to assist those students achieve their educational objectives and goals” (California Education Code §69640);

Whereas, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services has demonstrated its long-term success with a statewide retention rate of 88% and a statewide completion rate of 81%, consistently the highest of any large-scale student support program; and

Whereas, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services is present at 114 California Community Colleges, with EOPS having served more than 98,613 students statewide in the latest academic year in which complete data is available (Datamart – California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges hereby congratulate Extended Opportunity Programs and Services on its 50 years of serving students; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to foster awareness of EOPS at their colleges in order to promote student success.

Contact: Angela Echeverri, Los Angeles Community College District Academic Senate, Area C

Acclamation

---

<sup>12</sup> ASCCC. [Equity-Driven Systems: Student Equity and Achievement in the California Community Colleges](#) (also attached as appendix)

### **3.06 F19 Include Currently and Formerly Incarcerated Youth in Equity Plans**

Whereas, SB716 (2019, Mitchell) requires county probation departments across California to ensure that incarcerated youth with a high school diploma who are detained in a juvenile hall have access to public postsecondary academic and career technical courses and programs, and community colleges are the best equipped to offer the courses and provide programming on site at the juvenile detention facilities and on campus once students are released to continue their educational pathways;

Whereas, Implementing and sustaining programs serving current and formerly incarcerated youth in the community colleges is currently a challenge because this population is not presently identified as a special population under the California Community College State Chancellor's Office Equity Plan and incarcerated youth are currently aggregated within the incarcerated student population and data, making it difficult to assess this population's student success data and to identify potential opportunity gaps;

Whereas, Without designated special population status, advocacy for resources and funding at the local community college level can be a significant hurdle to create buy-in for allocating staff, courses, and materials needed to support one of the most vulnerable populations of students the community colleges serve, as current and formerly incarcerated youth are an umbrella population primarily comprised of all of the special populations listed under the current equity plan such as foster youth, students with disabilities, low income, African American, or Latinx; and

Whereas, Current and formerly incarcerated students face significant barriers to pursue their higher education as a result of unique factors impacting this population: disjointed educational experiences, significant trauma, economic and social stigma, legal policies and prejudice for current and formerly incarcerated individuals related to the inability to use Pell Grants, and challenges participating in Federal Work Study positions without intentional direct support and outreach;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to include current and formerly incarcerated youth as a special population in the system's equity plans;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to disaggregate incarcerated youth from the incarcerated student population in California community colleges' management information systems and in the colleges' equity plans; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that local senates work with their college administrators to include current and formerly incarcerated youth in their college equity plans.

Contact: Jeramy Wallace, San Mateo County Community College District

MSC

### **3.07 F19 Enable the Canvas Name Preference Option**

Whereas, Through the California Virtual Campus - Online Education Initiative, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office has facilitated Canvas as the course management system for California's community colleges, and participating colleges are using Canvas for online, hybrid and web-enhanced classes;

Whereas, Many LGBTQ+ students use a preferred name instead of their legal name and face discrimination or harm if forced to respond by their legal name;

Whereas, Canvas allows colleges to enable a preferred name option, which can be used to avoid the discrimination and harm endured by many LGTBQ+ students; and

Whereas, Title IX protects people from discrimination based on sex in education programs or activities that receive Federal financial assistance, stating "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance";

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to request that their colleges and districts enable the Canvas Name Preference Option and encourage their faculty to use the preferred name option with their students.

Contact: Mike Kalustian, Los Angeles City College

MSU

## **5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE**

### **5.01 F19 Adopt the Paper Budget Processes and the Faculty Role**

Whereas, Resolution 2.01 S08 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) to "review its paper *The Faculty Role in Planning and Budgeting* to determine whether any update or further action is warranted in light of the 2002 Accreditation Standards"; and

Whereas, Resolution 5.03 F18 directed the ASCCC to "update the paper *Budget Considerations – A Primer for Senate Leaders* (2009) with guidance regarding assessing and monitoring sources of information relevant to the Student Centered Funding Formula, including best practices for local budgeting processes, and bring the updated paper to the Spring 2020 Plenary Session for adoption";

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper *Budget Processes and the Faculty Role*<sup>13</sup> and disseminate the paper to local academic senates upon its adoption.

Contact: Celia Huston, San Bernardino College

MSU

## **5.02 F19 Extend the Hold-Harmless Provision of the Funding Formula**

Whereas, The Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) apportions funding based on enrollment, supplemental, and student success metrics as well as a hold-harmless provision, and the SCFF Oversight Committee expects to complete its recommendations by June 30, 2021<sup>14</sup> which may change the formula for subsequent fiscal years, after which districts will need time to adjust their budgets, programs, and staffing accordingly;

Whereas, Many colleges might need more time to prepare for imminent, significant drops in funding when the hold-harmless provision ends, and potential community college students do not always have the flexibility to travel to a distant campus with increasing funding rather than attend a nearby college facing imminent budget cuts;

Whereas, Unexpected reductions in Prop 98 property tax revenues, discrepancies in student-success and supplemental data, and other forecasting challenges have made it difficult for colleges to adopt accurate budgets in time for annual statutory deadlines, but extending the hold-harmless provision would allow colleges and districts to better plan for shifting funding among the California Community Colleges; and

Whereas, The California Legislature has asked the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) for its position on the SCFF, and ASCCC's response requested to "ensure funding stability and to support college exploration of how best to serve students."<sup>15</sup>;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the state Legislature, California Community College Chancellor's Office, and other appropriate entities to extend the end date of the hold-harmless provision preferably by two years but at least until 2022-23 unless an effective means of assisting or protecting districts operating under the hold-harmless provision is developed and implemented prior to that time.

---

<sup>13</sup> ASCCC. [Budget Processes and the Faculty Role](#). (also attached as appendix)

<sup>14</sup> [www.scffoversightcommittee.org/](http://www.scffoversightcommittee.org/)

<sup>15</sup>

[https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Revising%20the%20Student%20Centered%20Funding%20Formula%202.28.19\\_1.pdf](https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Revising%20the%20Student%20Centered%20Funding%20Formula%202.28.19_1.pdf)

Contact: Roy Shahbazian, Santa Ana College

MSC

## **6.0 STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES**

### **6.01 F19 Reversal of Position Regarding Baccalaureate Degrees and Removal of Pilot Designation**

Whereas, In 2010 legislation was introduced calling for the creation of baccalaureate degrees in the California Community College System, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) voted to oppose such an action for multiple reasons, including opposition to “any expansion of the California community college mission as proposed in AB 2400 (Anderson, March 2010)”<sup>16</sup>;

Whereas, While subsequent attempts to create baccalaureate degrees in the California Community College System were met with opposition from the ASCCC, SB 850 (Block, 2014) established a “statewide baccalaureate degree pilot program at not more than 15 community college districts, with one baccalaureate degree program each, to be determined by the chancellor and approved by the board of governors”<sup>17</sup> with a pilot sunset date of 2022-23 that was later extended to 2025-26;

Whereas, Initial reports from the baccalaureate pilot program colleges have demonstrated positive results, including over 200 graduates with baccalaureate degrees; and

Whereas, Students may be hesitant to enroll in baccalaureate programs at California community colleges if they believe that the programs will only continue through 2025-2026, despite the demonstrable success of such programs;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges remove its opposition to the creation of baccalaureate degrees in the California Community College system; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the removal of the designation of “pilot” from the baccalaureate degree programs.

Contact: Jolena Grande, Cypress College

MSC

---

<sup>16</sup> [ASCCC Resolution 6.01 S10: Opposition to Proposed Modification of the Community College Mission](#)

<sup>17</sup> [SB 850 \(Block, 2014\)](#)

## **6.02 F19 Expansion of Baccalaureate Degree Programs in Allied Health**

Whereas, SB 850 (Block, 2014) established a pilot program to create baccalaureate degrees in 15 districts within the California Community Colleges system, based in part on concerns regarding the potential gap in the number of students needing baccalaureate degrees by 2030 and beyond;

Whereas, The 15 pilot programs have succeeded in graduating more than 200 students in the first two years of the pilot, with hundreds more currently in courses leading to a baccalaureate degree, particularly in those programs related to allied health;

Whereas, A demonstrated economic and professional need exists in local communities and professions that baccalaureate degree graduates in allied health would be able to fill, and external national accreditation standards in allied health have raised the expected educational attainment of future workers in allied health fields; and

Whereas, The California State University System continues to be impacted in allied health and other fields, preventing students from accessing public post-secondary educational options for baccalaureate degrees and encouraging the proliferation of for-profit allied health programs and the erosion of available clinical rotation sites available for California community college students;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the expansion of baccalaureate degree programs in the California community colleges in disciplines and communities that best serve the students of the California Community Colleges; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the prioritization of programs in allied health fields in the expansion of baccalaureate degree programs.

Contact: Jennifer Johnson, Bakersfield College, California Community Colleges Curriculum Committee

MSC

## **6.03 F19 Oppose Calbright's College Center Placement within an Extant District and Program Duplication**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) and the California Community Colleges Board of Governors, with the support of the state legislature, approved a fully online community college, now named Calbright;

Whereas, At the Spring 2018 Plenary Session, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges opposed the creation of the online community college—now

Calbright—by acclamation in Resolution 6.02 S18<sup>18</sup>, as have other California community college associations<sup>19 20</sup>, in a clear rejection of this educational institution, noting that it is bad for both faculty and students in California;

Whereas, Despite valid criticisms and serious concerns from all major community college faculty organizations in the state of California over the past two years, Calbright is now being referred to by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office as the 115<sup>th</sup> community college, the recent passage of state legislation requires the college to have courses available by October 2019 fully online<sup>21</sup>, and local and statewide news outlets have reported that Calbright College has opened a Downtown Oakland California “Center” to provide support for students and house offices for the Calbright administrators; and

Whereas, While the 2018 state budget act creating Calbright forbade the college from duplicating the efforts of the existing 72 districts, Calbright’s publicized curriculum—medical coding, information technology support and cybersecurity—currently exists as both physical and fully online programs in California community colleges;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose the placement of a Calbright College Center within the boundaries of any extant district service area; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose Calbright teaching courses that are currently taught, regardless of modality, format, and scheduling, within the California Community Colleges.

Contact: Donald Moore, Peralta College

MSC

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

### **7.01 F19 Academic Senate Involvement in Online Teaching Conference Planning**

Whereas, The Online Teaching Conference is organized and coordinated by California Community Colleges TechConnect;

---

<sup>18</sup> Opposition to the Proposed California Online Community College District, Resolution 6.02 S18, <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/opposition-proposed-california-online-community-college-district>

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.cft.org/post/vote-no-confidence-community-college-chancellor>

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2019/05/14/california-community-colleges-faculty-vote-no-confidence-chancellor>

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.educationdive.com/news/can-calbright-reinvent-online-community-college/562147/>



Whereas, Program development for the Online Teaching Conference, “a non-profit event funded under a California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office grant,”<sup>22</sup> should involve California community college faculty and staff who are engaged in teaching online;

Whereas, The Online Teaching Conference is “an inter-segmental conference focused on curriculum, pedagogy and technology to improve online instruction, learning, and student success”; and

Whereas, The Online Teaching Conference “is an opportunity for educators to network with colleagues, connect, share knowledge, impart and receive best practices, and develop professionally,”<sup>23</sup> subject matter that is clearly within the academic and professional matters that are the purview of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges under Title 5 section 53200;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to include ASCCC representatives in the development and presentation of content in the Online Teaching Conference.

Contact: Julie Clark, Merced College

MSU

## **7.02 F19 Continued Advocacy for Substantive Participatory Governance with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office**

Whereas, The principle of participatory governance in the California Community Colleges has long been established in practice and codified in law (California Education Code §70901 et seq.), which provides the framework whereby California’s community colleges actively practice and teach democracy;

Whereas, Concerns regarding the functioning of participatory governance between the California Community Colleges Chancellor and the faculty are documented through votes of no confidence by seventeen local senates, five local union groups, one student senate, the Faculty Association for California Community Colleges (FACCC, Summer 2019), and the California Federation of Teachers (CFT, Summer 2019), all with concerns about the lack of participatory governance between system stakeholders and the system office, but these representative constituent voices were disregarded by the Board of Governors when they authorized a four-year contract extension for Chancellor Eloy Oakley in July 2019; and

Whereas, The March 18, 2019 memorandum from the President of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, “Improving Participatory Governance with the

---

<sup>22</sup> <http://onlineteachingconference.org/about/>

<sup>23</sup> *ibid*

Chancellor of the California Community Colleges”, which responded to Resolution 07.03 F18, recognized continuing challenges in the consultative process with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s office in many areas, including the implementation of statewide initiatives (AB 705 [Irwin, 2017], Guided Pathways, Student Equity and Achievement) and, most notably, with respect to two areas “often cited as the most egregious”—the California online community college, Calbright, and the Student-Centered Funding Formula— which the memorandum specifies was “not addressed by the work this year;”<sup>24</sup>

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges express to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Governors its ongoing concerns regarding engagement in collegial consultation and effective participation by Chancellor Eloy Oakley and his staff;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide another report to the Spring 2020 Area meetings detailing the ways in which the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office has or has not continued to address the concerns articulated in this resolution or resolution 7.03 F18; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges continue to explore avenues for addressing failures to engage in collegial consultation and effective participation and recommend, as necessary, further action with clear and measurable criteria to address these issues at the Spring 2020 Plenary Session.

Contact: Manuel Vélez, San Diego Mesa College

MSC

## **9.0 CURRICULUM**

### **9.01 F19 Local Determination of International Baccalaureate Credit at California Community Colleges**

Whereas, AB 1985 (Williams, 2016) required that the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges develop a uniform policy to award course credit to any student who passes an Advanced Placement (AP) examination, and that policy mandated that all community colleges grant course credit for any student who earns a score of three or higher on an AP exam;

Whereas, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Resolution 18.03 SP 2016 “Local Determination of Advanced Placement Credit at California Community Colleges” stated that “determination of appropriate credit for AP exam results is a

---

24

[https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/3.18.19%20Improving%20Participatory%20Governance%20with%20the%20Chancellor%20of%20the%20California%20Community%20Colleges\\_3.pdf](https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/3.18.19%20Improving%20Participatory%20Governance%20with%20the%20Chancellor%20of%20the%20California%20Community%20Colleges_3.pdf).

curricular matter over which local faculty have purview,” yet, by mandating that all community colleges grant course credit for any student who earns a score of three or higher on an AP Exam, AB 1985 (Williams, 2016) contradicted that resolution;

Whereas, AB 1512 (Carillo, 2019), using AB 1985 (Williams, 2016) as precedent, aimed to mandate that the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges develop a uniform policy to award course credit to any student who passes an International Baccalaureate (IB) examination and require each community college district to adopt and implement the policy, and that policy would mandate that all community colleges grant course credit for any student who earns a score of four or higher on an IB exam; and

Whereas, In addition to instituting AP policies at all California community colleges as required by AB 1985, the California Community Colleges, California State University, and University of California Systems offer credit for International Baccalaureate scores of 4 or more and College Level Examination Program (CLEP) scores of 50 or more, yet how IB and CLEP scores are evaluated and course credit awarded is determined inconsistently across the California community colleges, causing confusion and other issues for students;

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

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to prepare a model policy to be considered for adoption by all colleges that establishes a consistent standard for awarding of course credit for specific levels of performance on International Baccalaureate exams as a proactive response to intent of members of the California Legislature;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to prepare a model policy to be considered for adoption by all colleges that establishes a consistent standard for awarding of course credit for specific levels of performance on College Level Examination Program exams; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local colleges to regularly review policies and practices regarding the awarding of credit for external examinations like AP, IB, and CLEP due to the continually developing nature of external examination content and structure.

Contact: Jennifer Johnson, Bakersfield College, California Community Colleges Curriculum Committee

MSU

### **9.02 F19 Inclusion of Course Identification Numbers (C-ID) in College Catalogs and Student Transcripts**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has urged local academic senates and curriculum committees to include information about courses that have received C-ID designations in their college catalogs, either as a single list, at the end of each course's description, or both (Resolution 13.01 F15);

Whereas, C-ID's role as a means of identifying comparable courses has increased in importance as a consequence of the implementation of Associate Degrees for Transfer, the efforts of the California Virtual Campus – Online Education Initiative (CVC-OEI) to simplify cross-college enrollments, and the work of the ASCCC Open Educational Resources Initiative to identify or develop openly licensed course materials; and

Whereas, Many colleges have yet to make any visible efforts to include C-ID references in student-facing course descriptions;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges remind local academic senates of the value of referencing C-ID designations in catalogs, schedules, and transcripts; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to work with their administrations to include C-ID designations that are included in associate degrees for transfer or in courses listed on the California Virtual Campus – Online Education Initiative into public-facing course descriptions such as course catalogs and student transcripts.

Contact: Michelle Pilati, Rio Hondo College, Open Educational Resources Initiative  
Faculty Lead

MSU

### **9.03 F19 Adopt Updated Course Basic (CB) 21 Rubrics for Coding English as a Second Language (ESL) Course Outcomes**

Whereas, Accountability efforts, such as those related to AB 705 (Irwin, 2017), AB 1805 (Irwin, 2018), and others, rely on drawing information about students and colleges from coded elements that were not constructed to accurately calculate and align with these current, high-stakes needs;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, West Ed, and the Research and Planning Group worked on the AB 705 Data Revision Project to create and update Management Information System data elements to more accurately code transfer-level English, mathematics, quantitative reasoning, and English as a Second Language (ESL) courses as well as pre-transfer credit and noncredit courses; and

Whereas, ESL faculty drafted the updated CB21 rubrics using the original rubrics, the federal educational functioning levels currently used by noncredit and adult education practitioners for data reporting purposes for funding and student educational level gains, and results of ESL placement level work developed as part of the Common Assessment Initiative; and

Whereas, Credit, noncredit, and adult education English as a Second Language faculty statewide vetted the Course Basic (CB) 21 rubrics during three September 2019 AB 705 ESL Data Revision Project Recoding Regional Meetings and in response to a survey distributed September 25-October 3, 2019;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges approve the updated CB21 rubric for ESL<sup>25</sup> and endorse its use for coding ESL course levels based on outcomes for local college credit, noncredit, and adult education.

Contact: Kathy Wada, Cypress College

MSC

#### **9.04 F19 English as a Second Language (ESL) Course Basic (CB) 21 Rubric Coding of Multiple Courses to the Same CB21 Competency**

Whereas, The CB21 rubric for noncredit and credit English as a Second Language (ESL) courses has been revised in part to align with the six competencies of the Educational Functioning Levels (EFLs), thereby resulting in CB21 coding options of six letters to represent a range of competencies;

Whereas, The re-coding of existing ESL courses may result in circumstances where more than one course is appropriately coded to the same CB21 code;

Whereas, Re-coding to the new CB21 rubric may impact the data which is displayed for noncredit ESL in the Student Success Metrics, Datamart, and the Adult Education Pipeline and may impact the data reported for successful completion of transfer-level English composition or a credit ESL course equivalent to transfer-level composition from credit ESL courses; and

Whereas, The re-coding of ESL courses will result in new control numbers for those courses which may impact cohort tracking and other data displays;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to support ongoing research analyzing the impact of CB21 changes on noncredit and credit ESL student data displayed in state dashboards;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to provide guidance to encourage

---

<sup>25</sup> [English as a Second Language Levels by Domain, Sept. 25, 2019 Draft](#) (also attached as appendix)

colleges to work closely with their ESL faculty and researchers to understand the impact of the changes in CB21 at their institutions;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to provide guidance to encourage colleges to mitigate any unanticipated consequences for noncredit and/or credit ESL programs at their colleges due to changes in their data; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to request that a window, or grace period, be allowed for colleges to submit revisions to CB21 codes on existing courses without triggering a new control number.

Contact: Kathy Wada, Cypress College

MSC

#### **9.05 F19 Provide Guidance with Respect to Ensuring Student Access to No-Cost Resources**

Whereas, SB 1359 (Block, 2016) requires all segments of public higher education in California to “Clearly highlight, by means that may include a symbol or logo in a conspicuous place on the online campus course schedule, the courses that exclusively use digital course materials that are free of charge to students and may have a low-cost option for print versions” (California Education Code §66406.9) as of January, 2018;

Whereas, The Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 requires that each postsecondary institution in the United States that participates in Title IV student aid programs post a net price calculator on its Web site that uses institutional data to provide estimated net price information to current and prospective students and their families based on a student’s individual circumstances; and

Whereas, All students should have access to course materials prior to the course start date, and inequities are created by practices that ensure immediate access to commercial texts but do not provide complete information regarding the resources made available to students at no cost;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates to work with their administrations to ensure that accurate information regarding no-cost resources and low-cost print versions of such resources are equally available as resources available for purchase from a vendor; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide guidance to colleges with respect to making digital resources available in digital and print formats.

Contact: Michelle Pilati, Rio Hondo College

MSU

**9.06 F19 Consider Implications of Publisher-Developed Lower Cost “Inclusive Access” Strategies**

Whereas, Publishers have been developing approaches to monetize open educational resources and, in some instances, are providing textbook solutions that dramatically decrease the costs of such resources but may have unintended negative consequences;

Whereas, “Inclusive access” strategies have been introduced by publishers in various formats as an approach to decrease the cost of course resources by providing access to low-cost digital resources;

Whereas, Some implementations of inclusive access strategies are “opt-in,” requiring students to purchase resources at the time of registration and limiting students’ access to such resources for a specific time period; and

Whereas, The implementation of inclusive access strategies by publishers may serve to eliminate the used textbook market and may ultimately increase costs for students;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide guidance to local senates regarding the potential impact of inclusive access and questions to be asked about such programs if locally proposed;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognize the benefits and value of the used textbook market as a source of low-cost and lasting texts; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Colleges encourage faculty and colleges to carefully consider the impact of inclusive access and recognize that while such programs may address immediate student needs, they may not work in students’ long-term interest.

Contact: Jennifer Moses, Pierce College

MSU

**9.07 F19 Clarify the Meaning of Fundamental Alteration When Providing Academic Accommodations**

Whereas, Title 5 §56000(e) states that academic accommodations for students with disabilities may “not include any change to curriculum or course of study that is so significant that it alters the required objectives or content of the curriculum in the approved course outline, thereby causing a fundamental alteration,” and Title 5 §56001(b) defines a fundamental alteration as “any change to a course curriculum or course of study that is so significant that it alters the required objectives or content of the curriculum in the approved course outline of the course;”

Whereas, While the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office guidance document Implementing Guidelines for Title 5 Regulations (v. 3.0, April 11, 2019)<sup>26</sup> suggests that fundamental alterations include changes to program requirements, the Title 5 definition of fundamental alterations focuses on course outlines of record, and the scenarios provided in the guidance document focus on course requirements;

Whereas, Course substitutions for degree or certificate requirements may be so significant that they also result in fundamental alterations of curriculum that adversely affect students with disabilities in their efforts to seek transfer and/or employment; and

Whereas, Many programs, such as allied health, child care, and apprenticeship programs in the construction trades, are governed by statutory and regulatory requirements that require the completion of specific coursework in order to obtain the licenses required in those fields, thus making certain course substitutions infeasible;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges clarify that the definition of fundamental alterations encompasses both course and program requirements;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, the California Association for Postsecondary Education and Disability, and other system partners to review, clarify, and revise as needed the regulatory language on “fundamental alterations” as found in Title 5 sec. 56000 et sequitur; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO), the California Association for Postsecondary Education and Disability, and other system partners to update the CCCCCO publication “Implementation Guidelines for Title 5 Disabled Students Program & Services Regulations” (version 3.0, April 11, 2019).

Contact: Angela C. Echeverri, Los Angeles Community College District

MSU

### **9.08 F19 Repeatability of Credit Co-Requisite Support Courses**

Whereas, In response to the implementation of the requirements of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) colleges are creating credit and noncredit support courses for English and mathematics, including required credit co-requisite courses;

---

<sup>26</sup> These guidelines are available on the DSPS Solutions website at [http://www.dspssolutions.org/sites/default/files/files/Implementing\\_Guidelines\\_Rev\\_April\\_2019-acc-04.11.19\\_07.29.19.docx](http://www.dspssolutions.org/sites/default/files/files/Implementing_Guidelines_Rev_April_2019-acc-04.11.19_07.29.19.docx)



Whereas, The regulatory language in Title 5 section 55041 on repeatable courses did not foresee the requirements of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017), and thus does not address the repeatability of credit support courses for English and mathematics;

Whereas, If a student needs to repeat an English or mathematics class because of an earned substandard grade, that student cannot repeat a required co-requisite support class unless he or she also earned a substandard grade in the co-requisite support course; and

Whereas, Noncredit support courses in English and mathematics may not be a viable option for all colleges for a variety of reasons;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to explore options to allow for credit co-requisite course repeatability, including possible changes to Title 5 section 55041, to address repetition of credit co-requisite support courses for English and mathematics.

Contact: Angela C. Echeverri, Los Angeles Community College District

MSC

### **9.09 F19 Ensuring Access and Opportunity for Success for All Students Through AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) Implementation**

Whereas, The mission of California Community Colleges specifically includes providing remedial education for those in need of it (Education Code Section 66010.4);

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) explicitly refers to students who seek a goal other than transfer and who are in certificate or degree programs with specific requirements that are not met with transfer-level coursework, and stipulates that a community college district or college maximize the probability that a student will enter and complete the required college-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe (Education Code Section 78213);

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) implementation does not require the elimination of developmental or pre-transfer courses that could provide access and foundational skills to many underprepared students, yet in response to the legislation many colleges have eliminated all or most of their credit developmental mathematics, English, and basic skills courses, which could deny access and impede success for many students seeking to obtain a higher education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges remind all stakeholders that the mission of California Community Colleges and the intent of AB 705 is to serve all students, including those who seek a goal other than transfer and those who may benefit from developmental coursework;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that local senates work with their Chief Instructional Officers to ensure that sufficient developmental, remedial, pretransfer, and/or basic skills courses continue to be offered in order to ensure access and opportunity for success for all students; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request that the California Community College Chancellor's Office provide further guidance and clarification to colleges in order to ensure that AB 705 is implemented accurately and in accordance with their mission, so that all students have access to a community college education regardless of their educational goals or level of preparation.

Contact: Angela C. Echeverri, Los Angeles Community College District

MSC

## **10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST**

### **10.01 F19 Minimum Qualifications for Campus Americans with Disabilities Act Coordinators**

Whereas, Title 5 section 56048 requires, as a condition of receiving Disabled Student Program & Services (DSPS) funds, DSPS Coordinators must meet the minimum qualifications for DSPS faculty stated in Title 5 section 53414 or be academic administrators that "meet the minimum qualifications for academic administrators in Title 5 section 53420 and, in addition, have two (2) years full-time experience or the equivalent within the last four (4) years in one or more of the following fields:

- (1) instruction or counseling or both in a higher education program for students with disabilities;
- (2) administration of a program for students with disabilities in an institution of higher education;
- (3) teaching, counseling or administration in secondary education, working predominantly or exclusively in programs for students with disabilities; or
- (4) administrative or supervisory experience in industry, government, public agencies, the military, or private social welfare organizations, in which the responsibilities of the position were predominantly or exclusively related to persons with disabilities";

Whereas, Students with disabilities have a right to equal access to education, regardless of whether or not they choose to utilize campus DSPS services, and campus Section 504/Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator/Compliance Officers, for whom there are no minimum qualifications, are typically permitted to determine accommodations for students with disabilities who choose not to use DSPS services;

Whereas, Title 5 section 56027 requires that colleges establish policies and procedures for providing academic adjustments in a timely manner, and that "procedure shall also permit the Section 504/ADA Coordinator/Compliance Officer, or other designated

district official with knowledge of accommodation requirements, to make an interim decision pending a final resolution”; and

Whereas, Allowing Section 504/ADA Coordinator/Compliance Officers, who may have little understanding of how to provide appropriate academic adjustments, to make decisions on accommodations can adversely affect instruction and harm the education of students with disabilities who choose not to use DSPS services;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that the phrase in Title 5 section 56027 “or other designated district official with knowledge of accommodation requirements” means that the Disabled Student Program & Services coordinator may be designated as the person who is authorized to make interim decisions on academic adjustments; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, the California Association for Postsecondary Education and Disability, and other system partners to develop minimum qualification requirements for campus Section 504/Americans with Disabilities Act Coordinator/Compliance Officer so that all students with disabilities are well served.

Contact: Angela C. Echeverri, Los Angeles Community College District

MSC

### **13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS**

#### **13.01 F19 Collegial Consultation during Implementation of Guided Pathways**

Whereas, The Guided Pathways Award Program, as described in legislation, relies on collegial consultation with faculty and the existence of grassroots governance at every level for successful implementation;

Whereas, The principles and tenets of guided pathways address academic and professional matters, including counseling, curriculum, and program processes to clarify pathways that lead to employment, assist students to select and enter chosen pathways, provide support on the pathways, and ensure learning is taking place; and

Whereas, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Resolution 17.02 F17 “affirm[s] the right of local academic senates and senate leaders to play central roles in the development of all elements of a guided pathways framework at their college that are relevant to academic and professional matters”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that guided pathways efforts such as course mapping and meta major design are integral to implementing a guided pathways framework and fall within academic and professional matters; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges conduct a survey to evaluate the extent to which collegial consultation has been used to implement the areas of guided pathways that fall within academic and professional matters and use the results of the survey to create professional development training on Governance and Guided Pathways implementation to meet identified needs.

Contact: Ty Simpson, San Bernardino Valley College, Guided Pathways Task Force

MSU

### **13.02 F19 Data Paper and Equity-Minded Practices**

Whereas, Data can help to expose and address systemic barriers that impede the practice of equity on college campuses;

Whereas, Data is critical for faculty to understand and utilize so that they may best assist students in achieving their educational goals;

Whereas, In February 2010, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Executive Committee published *Data 101 Guiding Principles for Faculty*, which delineated ten foundational principles for the use of data; and

Whereas, Current initiatives and trends require faculty to consider and utilize data in dynamic and novel ways that are dramatically different from the practices of the past;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a resource, whether a paper or in some other form, in collaboration with systemwide partners to evaluate the current use of data and recommend effective practices; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges explore and identify web resources that include promising practices for data analysis that faculty can utilize to better serve students and advance equity on college campuses.

Contact: Manuel J. Vélez, San Diego Mesa College, Educational Policies Committee

MSU

## **15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES**

### **15.01 F19 Criteria and Training for the Evaluation and Approval of Advanced Credit English as a Second Language (ESL) Coursework for California State University General Education Breadth (CSU-GE) and the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)**

Whereas, AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) and AB 1805 (Irwin, 2018) recognize that “Instruction in English as a second language (ESL) is distinct from remediation in English” and that

English Language Learners (ELLs) “enrolled in credit ESL coursework are foreign language learners who require additional language training in English, require support to successfully complete degree and transfer requirements in English, or require both of the above”<sup>27</sup>;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted Resolution 15.02 F18 “Approval and Backdating of CSU-GE Area C2 and IGETC Area 3B Submissions of Advanced ESL Coursework for Fall 2018”<sup>28</sup> in support of the approval of ESL courses to satisfy transfer general education (GE) requirements; and

Whereas, Many advanced ESL courses contain high rigor and richness of cultural content and demand of ELLs a level of engagement that meets and often far exceeds that of courses for native English speakers in elementary or intermediate foreign language courses, and are therefore appropriate to satisfy the expectation for transfer general education credit as acknowledged in the October, 2018 *Guiding Notes for General Education Course Reviewers*: “Courses in English as a Second Language may – despite their focus on proficiency and the acquisition of skills – be advanced enough to meet the objectives of the CSU-GE Humanities Subarea C2 and IGETC Area 3B.”; and

Whereas, Recent submissions of credit ESL courses for fulfillment of transfer GE have resulted in approvals for some colleges and the denials for other colleges with substantially similar course outlines under seemingly inconsistent review that does not seem to align with the *Guiding Notes for General Education Course Reviewers* for credit ESL courses, thereby causing concern for equitable evaluation of all courses to ensure that no students are unduly harmed;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges work with representatives from the California State University and University of California to establish clear criteria to ensure consistency in applying the Guiding Notes for the approvals of advanced credit English as a Second Language courses for general education fulfillment; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges work with representatives of the California State University and University of California to ensure the proper training of course evaluators and to ensure that established criteria are applied in a manner consistent with those applied to the approvals of elementary or intermediate foreign language courses.

Contact: Kathy Wada, Cypress College

MSU

---

<sup>27</sup> Assembly Bill AB 705 (Irwin), Section 1(a)(7). Retrieved from [https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180AB705](https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB705)

<sup>28</sup> *Approval and Backdating of CSU Area C2 and IGETC Area 3B Submissions of Advanced ESL Coursework for Fall 2018*. Retrieved from <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/approval-and-backdating-csu-area-c2-and-igetc-area-3b-submissions-advanced-es>

## 16.0 LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCES

### 16.01 F19 Develop Standards of Practice Resource for Learning Assistance and Tutoring in the California Community Colleges, including the role of Learning Skills Coordinators or Instructors, and Tutoring Coordinators

Whereas, The field of learning assistance has evolved since the last Academic Senate resolutions in 2008 (10.01 F08)<sup>29</sup> and 2011 (10.12 S11)<sup>30</sup> that addressed minimum qualifications and a 2011 article about separating learning assistance and tutoring<sup>31</sup>;

Whereas, The minimum qualifications for learning skills coordinators or instructors specify only qualifications for faculty in tutoring or learning assistance offerings collecting apportionment,<sup>32</sup> and any learning assistance and tutoring center constitutes a space comparable to a classroom or library and should be overseen, at least in partnership with staff or administration, by qualified faculty whether or not it is collecting apportionment;

Whereas, A great need has been created in the current context of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017), guided pathways, equity, and culturally responsive teaching for understanding of learning assistance as a field and how it fits into the context of the California community colleges not in a secondary role but in a symbiotic partnership for student learning and as a site like the classroom and library for student learning; and

Whereas, “Specific standards for” learning assistance and tutoring “have appeared piecemeal as Education Code sections, accreditation guidelines, professional guidelines, and ethics statements, but nowhere have these standards been collected, reviewed, and presented systematically to the California community colleges with specific application to the roles of” learning skills coordinators or instructors, and tutoring coordinators “in the California community colleges”;<sup>33</sup>

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a standards of practice resource, such as a paper, web resource, or guidebook, for learning assistance and tutoring in the California Community Colleges, including the role of learning skills coordinators or instructors and tutoring coordinators by July 30, 2021.

Contact: Ted Blake, Mt. San Jacinto College, Area D

---

<sup>29</sup> [ASCCC Resolution 10.01 F08: Minimum Qualifications for Learning Assistance Coordinators and Instructors](#)

<sup>30</sup> [ASCCC Resolution 10.02 S11: Supplemental Learning Assistance and Tutoring center Coordinator Minimum Qualifications](#)

<sup>31</sup> [Sanchez, R. \(2011\) Separating Learning Assistance and Tutoring. \*Rostrum\*. ASCCC. g](#)

<sup>32</sup> [Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in the California Community Colleges](#)

<sup>33</sup> [ASCCC Resolution 16.01 S09: Develop Standards of Practice Paper for Library Services](#)

MSU

## **19.0 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS**

### **19.01 F19 Encourage Utilization of Career Technical Education Faculty Minimum Qualifications Toolkit Resources for Hiring in Career Technical Education Disciplines**

Whereas, Use of equivalency to minimum qualifications for employment is allowed by California Education Code §87359, and the “agreed upon process shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the governing board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate to determine that each individual faculty member employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications”;

Whereas, The subjective nature of evaluating a candidate’s experience and training against the degrees and professional experience required to meet minimum qualifications makes it difficult for colleges to confidently apply the equivalency process to candidates with little to no formal academic education, especially in career technical education disciplines where industry professionals may be experts in their fields without having completed an associate’s degree;

Whereas, Equivalency processes at California community colleges are locally established, vary widely, may or may not include a means for evaluating equivalency to the general education component of the associate’s degree, and may or may not include discipline faculty input or input from faculty qualified in related disciplines, particularly when hiring in CTE disciplines; and

Whereas, ASCCC Resolution 10.05 SP 2017 called for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges “to develop and disseminate resources that empower local senates to evaluate and assess” the qualifications of faculty with significant professional experience but not necessarily sufficient academic preparation, and 2017-2019 collaborations within the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Career Technical Education Minimum Qualifications Task Force resulted in development and release of the Career Technical Education Faculty Minimum Qualifications Toolkit<sup>34</sup> to aid colleges in determining equivalencies to the associate’s degree;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with faculty, equivalency committees, and other stakeholders to promote dissemination of equivalency resources within the Career Technical Education Faculty Minimum Qualifications Toolkit, including general education equivalency examples and effective equivalency practices; and

---

<sup>34</sup> [Career Technical Education Faculty Minimum Qualifications Toolkit](#)

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with faculty, equivalency committees, and other stakeholders to provide technical assistance to local academic senates and equivalency committees to aid in implementation of effective equivalency practices for determining equivalencies to the associate's degree when hiring in career technical education disciplines.

Contact: Rebecca Eikey, College of the Canyons

MSC

## **21.0 CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

### **21.01 F19 Update Chancellor's Office Document Alternatives to In-Person Consultations: Cooperative Work Experience Education**

Whereas, Title 5 §55255(a)(1-3) refers to in-person consultations with students and with employers as a responsibility of cooperative work experience instructor/coordinators and a requirement of cooperative work experience programs;

Whereas, Title 5 §55255(c) states, "In certain limited situations that will be defined in guidelines issued by the Chancellor, the district may substitute approved alternatives to 'in person' consultations. The guidelines will specify the types of alternatives which districts may approve and the circumstances under which they may be used. In establishing and maintaining guidelines on such alternatives, the Chancellor shall consult with, and rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the statewide Academic Senate and shall provide a reasonable opportunity for comment by other statewide and regional representative groups", and the Chancellor's Office document *Alternatives to In-Person Consultations: Cooperative Work Experience Education*<sup>35</sup> was published in May 2009 in response to this regulation but has not been updated since; and

Whereas, Synchronous video conference applications have evolved significantly in the ten years since the document was last updated and can be used to effectively conduct meetings between cooperative work experience instructors/coordinators, students, and supervisors, particularly in situations where distance makes in-person consultations difficult or the familiarity of the student or supervisors with college cooperative work experience instructors/coordinators lessens the need to consult in person;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the California Internship and Work Experience Association to update the May 2009 document *Alternatives to In-Person Consultation: Cooperative Work Experience Education* by December 2020 and disseminate the updated information widely.

Contact: Cheryl Aschenbach, Lassen College

---

<sup>35</sup> [https://www.mendocino.edu/sites/default/files/docs/work-experience/Report on Alternative to InPerson Consultations 4-09.pdf](https://www.mendocino.edu/sites/default/files/docs/work-experience/Report%20on%20Alternative%20to%20InPerson%20Consultations%204-09.pdf)



MSU

## REFERRED RESOLUTIONS

### **5.03 F19 Assess How Alignment of Timeframes for AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) and the Student Centered Funding Formula for ESL Students Inequitably Impact Funding for Colleges Serving High Percentages of ESL Students**

Whereas, Under Assembly Bill 705 (Irwin, 2017), a California community college student enrolled in English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction has a timeframe of three years to enter and complete degree and transfer requirements in English and has a one-year timeframe to enter and complete transfer-level coursework in mathematics;

Whereas, Under the Student Centered Funding Formula (California Education Code Section 84750.4), Student Success Allocation, a California community college will receive three points for each student who successfully completes transfer-level mathematics and English courses within the student's first academic year of enrollment;

Whereas, An ESL student could choose to take ESL coursework in the first academic year of enrollment and then successfully complete transfer-level mathematics and English courses in the second academic year of enrollment, but the college would not receive a Student Success Allocation funding point since the student did not complete transfer-level mathematics and English courses within the first academic year of enrollment despite successfully meeting the mandates of AB 705; and

Whereas, Based on these factors, the Student Success Allocation might be disproportionately lower for California community colleges with a greater percentage of ESL students than the average California community college;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to assess the financial impact of the Student Centered Funding Formula on colleges with large populations of ESL students; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges clarify for the legislature the inequitable impact of the Student Centered Funding Formula on colleges serving large percentages of ESL students and request a comprehensive adjustment to the success allocation funding portion for ESL students be aligned with Education Code §78213.<sup>36</sup>

Contact: Piper Rooney, Glendale Community College

MSR: Referred to the Executive Committee to research conflicts within and report back to the body and take appropriate action by spring of 2020.

---

<sup>36</sup> Sources: AB 705 and the SCFF are legislation. AB 705 is Ed Code §78213 and the SCFF is in the 2019-20 enacted Budget

### 5.03.01 F19 Amend Resolution 5.03 F19

Amend the title:

**Assess How Alignment of Timeframes for AB 705 and the Student Centered Funding Formula for ESL Students ~~Inequitably~~ Impact Funding for Colleges Serving High Percentages of ESL Students**

Amend the second resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges clarify for the legislature the ~~inequitable~~ impact of the Student Centered Funding Formula on colleges serving large percentages of ESL students if data reveals disproportionate impact among ESL students, and request a comprehensive adjustment to the success allocation funding portion for ESL students be aligned with Education Code §78213.16.

Contact: Gayle Pitman, Sacramento City College

MSR: Referred to the Executive Committee to research conflicts within and report back to the body and take appropriate action by spring of 2020.

### 5.04 F19 Include Credit English as a Second Language (ESL) Courses Equivalent to Transfer-Level English in the Student Centered Funding Formula

Whereas, Memo AA 18-41<sup>37</sup> (July 20, 2018) jointly issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) strongly encouraged colleges to “[e]xplore credit ESL pathways to transfer-level English that allow for credit ESL faculty to ... create a credit ESL course that is the equivalent of transfer-level English” and Memo AA 19-20<sup>38</sup> (April 18, 2019) jointly issued by the CCCCCO and ASCCC likewise strongly encouraged colleges to explore the “[c]reation of a credit ESL course that is the equivalent of transfer-level English”;

Whereas, The Student Centered Funding Formula describes the calculations for the student success allocation concerning completion of “Transfer Level English and Mathematics” to count “[w]here Course-TOP code for English has CB03 equal to 150100 or 152000”;

---

37

[https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a565796692ebefb3ec5526e/t/5b68e1ba70a6add62b06a9a9/1533600186421/AA+18-41+AB+705+Initial+Guidance+Language+for+Credit+ESL\\_.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a565796692ebefb3ec5526e/t/5b68e1ba70a6add62b06a9a9/1533600186421/AA+18-41+AB+705+Initial+Guidance+Language+for+Credit+ESL_.pdf)

38

<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a565796692ebefb3ec5526e/t/5c3ba33ac652deab55b0afcb/1555706796861/AA+19-20+AB+705+and+1805+Spring+2019+Guidance+Language+for+Credit+ESL.pdf>

Whereas, The Student Success Allocation Measures as currently configured as of October 2019 exclude completion of credit English as a Second Language (ESL) courses which are coded with a CB03 ESL TOP code but are equivalent to transfer-level English courses; and

Whereas, The inclusion of the credit ESL equivalent to transfer-level English is not an addition to the Student Success Allocation Measures, but rather it is a correction of an omission within the existing student success calculation;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to recognize the successful completion of an ESL transfer-level composition course as equivalent to the successful completion of transfer-level English composition in various state metrics such as the Student Success Allocation Measures and the Student Success Metrics.

Contact: Kathy Wada, Cypress College

MSR: Referred to the Executive Committee to research conflicts within and report back to the body and take appropriate action by spring of 2020.

### **7.03 F19 Include Credit English as a Second Language (ESL) in the Student Success Metrics (SSM)**

Whereas, Memo AA 18-41<sup>39</sup> (July 20, 2018) jointly issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) strongly encouraged colleges to “[e]xplore credit ESL pathways to transfer-level English that allow for credit ESL faculty to ... create a credit ESL course that is the equivalent of transfer-level English,” and Memo AA 19-20<sup>40</sup> (April 18, 2019) jointly issued by the CCCCCO and ASCCC likewise strongly encouraged colleges to explore the “[c]reation of a credit ESL course that is the equivalent of transfer-level English”;

Whereas, The *Student Success Metrics Dashboard, Second Build, 01.18.19 Data Element Dictionary*<sup>41</sup> Notes for each learning progress metric stipulate that “Courses outside of math and English Taxonomy of Program (TOP) codes are not included in this metric,” thereby excluding credit English as a Second Language (ESL) courses equivalent to Transfer-Level English; and

---

39

[https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a565796692ebefb3ec5526e/t/5b68e1ba70a6add62b06a9a9/1533600186421/AA+18-41+AB+705+Initial+Guidance+Language+for+Credit+ESL\\_.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a565796692ebefb3ec5526e/t/5b68e1ba70a6add62b06a9a9/1533600186421/AA+18-41+AB+705+Initial+Guidance+Language+for+Credit+ESL_.pdf)

40

[https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a565796692ebefb3ec5526e/t/5cba33ac652deab55b0afcb/1555706796861/AA+19-20+AB+705+and+1805+Spring+2019+Guidance+Language+for+Credit+ESL\\_.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a565796692ebefb3ec5526e/t/5cba33ac652deab55b0afcb/1555706796861/AA+19-20+AB+705+and+1805+Spring+2019+Guidance+Language+for+Credit+ESL_.pdf)

<sup>41</sup> <https://digitalfutures.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Documents/data-element-dictionary.pdf>

Whereas, Assembly Bill 705 (Irwin, 2017) allows credit ESL students a three-year time frame to complete transfer-level coursework in English<sup>42</sup>;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to include credit ESL courses equivalent to transfer-level English in the Learning Progress metrics; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to include completion of transfer-level English within a three-year time frame for students who begin in credit ESL coursework in the learning progress metrics.

Contact: Kathy Wada, Cypress College

MSR: Referred to the Executive Committee to research conflicts within and report back to the body and take appropriate action by spring of 2020.

#### **7.04 F19 Convene the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Assessment Committee for Credit English as a Second Language (ESL)**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted Resolution 07.07 S18<sup>43</sup> in support of maintaining assessment tests as one of the multiple measures used to place students into credit ESL courses;

Whereas, The California Community College Chancellor's Office Assessment Committee has not been evaluating assessments since the beginning of the Common Assessment Initiative in 2014;

Whereas, Colleges are prohibited from using any assessment instruments other than those approved by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors; and

Whereas, Memo AA 19-43<sup>44</sup> (September 26, 2019) jointly issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges expressly clarifies that "credit ESL is distinct from instruction in remedial English; ESL, like foreign language, relies on assessment for placement as an essential component for student success. AB 705 recognizes the necessity of a reliable means to accurately assess and place language learners into ESL classes;"

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to convene the Chancellor's Office Assessment Committee to support colleges in implementing assessment and placement processes for credit ESL which are compliant with the requirements of Education Code and the California Code of Regulations;

---

<sup>42</sup> [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180AB705](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB705)

<sup>43</sup> <https://asccc.org/resolutions/maintain-language-placement-tests-multiple-measure-option-english-second-language-esl>

<sup>44</sup> [https://www.mjc.edu/governance/curriculum/documents/aa\\_19-43\\_ab705\\_credit\\_esl\\_guidance.pdf](https://www.mjc.edu/governance/curriculum/documents/aa_19-43_ab705_credit_esl_guidance.pdf)

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request that the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office direct the Assessment Committee to review and recommend for approval assessment instruments and tools for credit ESL, including but not limited to quality standardized assessment tests, local assessment instruments, and local assessment instruments awaiting reapproval; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request that the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office direct the Assessment Committee to develop parameters for the use of guided placement and/or self-placement processes and the review of such processes, particularly in regards to credit ESL.

Contact: Kathy Wada, Cypress College

MSR: Referred to the Executive Committee to research conflicts within and report back to the body and take appropriate action by spring of 2020.

## FAILED RESOLUTIONS

### **1.10 F19 Limit “Trickling” in Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Elections**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) rules allow for candidates for officer and representative positions to be considered for any positions for which they qualify if they do not prevail in the election for the highest position they seek, a practice referred to as “trickling”;

Whereas, In spring of 2019, the ASCCC Standards & Practices committee recommended that trickling be eliminated as a means of promoting inclusion on the Executive Committee;

Whereas, Some attendees have expressed the perception that being elected to the Executive Committee is unreasonably difficult as a result of the trickle; and

Whereas, Competition is healthy, and providing more options for delegates is a means of promoting inclusion;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges limit the number of additional positions for which a candidate may be considered if the candidate does not prevail in the election for the position for which the candidate was nominated to a maximum of two positions plus any positions that may become available during voting as the result of a mid-cycle incumbent being elected to a higher position and amend section E.3 of its rules to reflect this change as follows:

*Nominees shall indicate whether they wish to stand for other positions for which they are eligible if they do not prevail for the office for which they were nominated. Nominees may only indicate two additional positions plus any available positions for which they qualify that become available during voting as the result of mid-cycle incumbents being elected to higher offices, resigning, or otherwise leaving office before the end of their term.*

Contact: Angela Echeverri, Los Angeles Mission College, Standards & Practices Committee

MSF

### **1.11 F19 Term Limits of Three One-year Terms for Officers and One Two-year Term for Representatives**

Whereas, Objective 2.2 of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Strategic Plan is to “Increase the diversity of faculty representation on committees of the ASCCC, including the Executive Committee, and other system consultation bodies to better reflect the diversity of California”;

Whereas, Attendees of ASCCC plenary sessions have expressed the perception that being elected to the Executive Committee is unreasonably difficult due in part to the longevity in office of some incumbents;

Whereas, The ASCCC bylaws currently only set limits for the office of president; and

Whereas, Establishing consistent term limits for all offices and positions would increase opportunities for a wider pool of candidates and thereby promote greater inclusion and participation by reducing the number of incumbents who might seek re-election in the same position or office;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend its bylaws so that Article III, Section 3 reads as follows:

### ***Section 3. President's Term***

*The President shall serve no more than ~~two~~ three consecutive elected one-year terms; and*

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend its rules so that Section 1. C. reads as follows:

#### *Terms of Office*

- 1) Terms for ~~Officers~~ shall be one year.*
- 2) Terms for representatives shall be two years.*
- 3) Terms for representatives shall be staggered as follows. Even-numbered year elections will select the Area B and C representatives, one representative each from the North and South regions, and one of the At-Large representatives. Odd-numbered year elections will select the Areas A and D representatives, one representative each from the North and South regions, and one of the At-large representatives.*
- 4) Officers shall serve no more than three consecutive elected one-year terms in the same office.*
- 5) All members except the officers are limited to one two-year term in any position. In the event that a representative or officer is elected to a position mid-cycle due to a resignation or election of a prior incumbent to a different office or position within a normal cycle, the representative or officer may pursue re-election and be entitled to serve a full term of a normal cycle in the same position despite the previous mid-cycle service. For the purposes of this section and article, At-Large positions are considered the same position despite their staggered terms for elections, and all North/South positions are considered the same position despite their staggered terms.*

Contact: Eric Thompson, Santa Rosa Junior College, Standards & Practices Committee



MSF

**3.07.01 F19 Amend Resolution 3.07**

Amend the Resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to work with their local information technology departments to enable the appearance of students' preferred names in Canvas. ~~request that their colleges and districts enable the Canvas Name Preference Option and encourage their faculty to use the preferred name option with their students.~~

Contact: Gregory Beyrer, Cosumnes River College

MSF

## DELEGATES

COLLEGE	NAME / SIGNATURE
Alameda, College of	Matthew Goldstein
Allan Hancock College	Trevor Passage
American River College	Alisa Shubb
Antelope Valley College	Van Rider
Bakersfield College	Lisa Harding
Barstow College	Nance Nunes-Gill
Berkeley City College	Kelly Pernell
Butte College	Kenneth Bearden
Cabrillo College	Robin McFarland
Canada College	Diana Tedone
Canyons, College of the	Rebecca Eikey
Cerritos College	April Griffen
Cerro Coso College	Ben Beshwate
Chabot College	Miguel Colon
Chaffey College	Nicole DeRose
Citrus College	Nick Shaw
Clovis College	Elizabeth Romero
Coastline College	Ann Holliday
Columbia College	Pam Guerra-Schmidt
Contra Costa College	Patrick Moe
Copper Mountain College	Heidi Gibbons-Pieper
Cosumnes River College	Gregory Beyrer
Crafton Hills College	Mark D. McConnell
Cuesta College	Roland Finger
Cuyamaca College	Kim Dudzik
Cypress College	Craig Goralski
De Anza College	Karen Chow
Desert, College of the	Kim Dozier
Diablo Valley College	John Freytag
East Los Angeles College	Jeffrey Hernandez
El Camino College	Darcie McClelland
Evergreen Valley College	Randy Pratt
Folsom Lake College	Paula Haug
Foothill College	Isaac Escoto
Foothill DeAnza CCD	Mary Pape
Fresno City College	Karla Kirk
Fullerton College	Kimberly Orlijan
Gavilan College	Nikki Dequin
Glendale College	Piper Rooney
Golden West College	Martie Ramm Engle
Grossmont College	Denise Schulmeyer
Hartnell College	Lisa Storm
Imperial Valley College	Rick Epps
Irvine Valley College	June McLaughlin
Laney College	Fred Bourgoin
Las Positas	Sarah Thompson
Lassen College	Roxana Haynes
Los Angeles CCD	Angela Echeverri
Los Angeles City College	Mike Kalustian
Los Angeles Mission College	Carole Akl
Los Angeles Pierce College	Jennifer Moses
Los Angeles Southwest College	Robert L Stewart
Los Angeles Trade Tech College	Eboni McDuffie
Los Angeles Valley College	Chauncey Maddren

Los Rios CCD	Gary Aquilar
Madera/Oakhurst College	Kari Johnson
Marin, College of	Meg Pasquel
Merced College	Julie Clark
Merritt College	Thomas Renbarger
MiraCosta College	Maria Figueroa
Mission College	Aram Shepherd
Modesto Junior College	Shelley Circle
Monterey Peninsula College	Frank Rivera
Moorpark College	Eric Reese
Moreno Valley College	Jennifer Floerke
Mt. San Antonio College	Kelly Rivera
Mt. San Jacinto College	Ted Blake
Napa Valley College	Eileene Tejada
Norco College	Quentin Bemiller
North Orange (School of CE)	Kimberley Stiemke
Orange Coast College	Loren Sachs
Oxnard College	Diane Eberhardy
Palomar College	Craig Thompson
Pasadena City College	Matt Henes
Peralta CCD	Donald Moore
Rancho Santiago CCD	Stephanie Clark
Reedley College	Rebecca Snyder
Rio Hondo College	Adam Wetsman
Riverside CCD	Mark Sellick
Riverside College	Mary Margarita Legner
Sacramento City College	Gayle Pittman
Saddleback College	Margot Lovett
San Bernardino Valley College	Celia Huston
San Diego City College	Jennifer Boots
San Diego Continuing Ed	John Bromma
San Diego Mesa College	Manuel Velez
San Diego Miramar College	Laura Murphy
San Francisco, City College of	Alexis Litzky
San Joaquin Delta College	Kathleen Bruce
San Jose City College	Heather Jellison
San Jose -Evergreen CCD	Jesus Covarrubias
San Mateo CCD	Jeremy Wallace
San Mateo, College of	Arielle Smith
Santa Ana College	Roy Shahbazian
Santa Barbara City College	Kathy O'Connor
Santa Monica College	Elisa Meyer
Santa Rosa Junior College	Eric Thompson
Santiago Canyon College	Michael DeCarbo
Sequoias, College of the	Sondra Bergen
Shasta College	Jim Bigelow
Sierra College	Soni Verma
Siskiyou, College of the	Jayne Turk
Skyline College	Kathryn Williams Browne
Solano College	Lanae Jaimez
Southwestern College	Caree Lesh
Taft College	Vicki Jacobi
Ventura College	Lydia Morales
Victor Valley College	Harry Bennett
West Los Angeles College	Marcela Hernandez

West Valley College	Gretchen Ehlers
Woodland College	Christopher Howerton
Yuba College	Christopher Noffsinger
<b>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</b>	
President	John Stankas
Vice President	Dolores Davison
Secretary	Cheryl Aschenbach
Treasurer	Virginia "Ginni" May
Area A	Geoffrey Robert Dyer
Area B	Mayra Cruz
Area C	Michelle Bean
Area D	LaTonya Parker
North Rep	Stephanie Curry
North Rep	Carrie Roberson
South Rep	Anna Bruzzese
South Rep	Sam Foster
At Large Rep	Nathaniel Donahue
At Large Rep	Silvester Henderson