



**Academic Senate**  
for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

# **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS**

**OCTOBER 21 – 22, 2011**

*Disclaimer: The enclosed resolutions do not reflect the position of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, its Executive Committee, or standing committees. They are presented for the purpose of discussion by the field, and to be debated and voted on by academic senate delegates at Academic Senate Fall Plenary Session held November 3 – 5, 2011 in San Diego.*

2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE.....3**  
1.01 F11 Changing Bylaws on the Number of General Sessions Requirements .....3

**5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE .....3**  
5.01 F11 Oppose Student Success Task Force Recommendation on Basic Skills Funding .....3

**6.0 STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES .....4**  
6.01 F11 General Fund Dollar Support for Community Service Courses .....4  
6.02 F11 Proportional Audit Fee Increases .....5  
6.03 F11 Assign Responsibility for Adult Education to California Community Colleges .....5  
6.04 F11 Limit Taxpayer-funded, Need-Based Financial Aid to Public and Private Nonprofit Colleges Only .....6  
6.05 F11 Allow Community Colleges to Subsidize Credit Instruction with Not-For-Credit Class Fees .....6

**7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE .....7**  
7.01 F11 Revisit Mission of California Community Colleges .....7  
7.02 F11 Modification to the Requirements of the Board of Governors (BOG) Fee Waiver .....8

**8.0 COUNSELING .....8**  
8.01 F11 Update Senate Paper *Role of Counseling Faculty in California Community Colleges* .....8

**9.0 CURRICULUM .....9**  
9.01 F11 Encourage Local Flexibility and Innovation in Revision of Basic Skills Delivery .....9  
9.02 F11 Defining Credit and Noncredit Basic Skills and Basic Skills Apportionment .....10  
9.03 F11 Amend and Endorse “Recommendations Regarding Repeatability” .....10  
9.04 F11 Endorse “Recommendations Regarding Repeatability” .....11

**13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS.....12**  
13.01 F11 Supporting Student Access .....12  
13.02 F11 Opposition to the Elimination of Non-CDCP Noncredit Classes .....12  
13.03 F11 Support Centralized Assessment Instrument for Placement .....13  
13.04 F11 Course Scheduling and Enrollment Priorities .....14  
13.05 F11 Support for Student Success Courses .....14  
13.06 F11 Provide Guidelines on “Significant Lapse of Time” .....15  
13.07 F11 Implementation of Student Success Task Force Recommendations .....15  
13.08 F11 Responding to the Student Success Task Force Recommendations .....16

2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

**15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES ..... 16**  
15.01 F11 Faculty Primacy in Alignment of Standards with K-12 ..... 16

**19.0 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS..... 17**  
19.01 F11 Electronic Materials and Best Practices ..... 17  
19.02 F11 Teachers Using E-instructional Materials ..... 18  
19.03 F11 Uphold Local Control of Professional Development Activities..... 18  
19.04 F11 Full-Time Faculty and Student Success ..... 19  
19.05 F11 Faculty Evaluations Processes ..... 20

Appendix A: California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success

Appendix B: Education Code §66010.4

Appendix C: Recommendations Regarding Repeatability

Appendix D: Literature the Role of Full-time Faculty in Student Success

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

### **1.0 ACADEMIC SENATE**

#### **1.01 F11 Changing Bylaws on the Number of General Sessions Requirements**

**Jon Drinnon, Merritt College, Standards and Practices**

Whereas, Article 1, Section 1, subsection I of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' Bylaws states "General Session: A single scheduled meeting held during the plenary session. There are five general sessions during the plenary session"; and

Whereas, Requiring five general sessions for all plenaries in the Academic Senate Bylaws unnecessarily restricts the ability to structure the plenary activities around what the Executive Committee sees as in the best interests of the attendees and the Academic Senate;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges change Article 1, Section 1, subsection I of the Senate's Bylaws to read "General Session: A single scheduled meeting held during the plenary session. ~~There are five general sessions during the each plenary session.~~ The number of General Sessions during a plenary session will be based on need."

### **5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE**

#### **5.01 F11 Oppose Student Success Task Force Recommendation on Basic Skills Funding**

**Anne Argyriou, De Anza College, Basic Skills/Noncredit Committee**

Whereas, The draft recommendations (dated September 30, 2011) of the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (established in response to Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010) state that the California Community College System will "establish an alternative funding model to encourage innovation and flexibility in the delivery of basic skills instruction";

Whereas, While the intent of this recommendation may be to encourage innovation and flexibility in the revision of basic skills curriculum, the connection of such revisions to funding could well lead to inappropriate pressure on faculty to revise curriculum for the financial benefit of the college rather than for qualitative or pedagogical reasons;

Whereas, Funding based upon student progress can lead to institutional practices that do not benefit students as institutions attempt to maximize funding even when such funding models attempt to incentivize pedagogical improvement; and

Whereas, A structure that offers financial rewards to colleges based on student progression as determined by an assessment test is a form of performance-based funding, a concept that has not been endorsed by the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success or approved in any form for the California Community College System;

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, while supporting efforts to improve student learning skills and success through sound research and effective innovation in all curriculum development and implementation, oppose the alternative funding model for basic skills as outlined in the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success recommendation 8.3 (as of September 30, 2011).

Appendix A: California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success

### **6.0 STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES**

#### **6.01 F11 General Fund Dollar Support for Community Service Courses Dan Crump, American River College, Executive Committee**

Whereas, California Education Code §78300(c) states,

Governing boards shall not expend General Fund moneys to establish and maintain community service classes. Governing boards may charge students enrolled in community service classes a fee not to exceed the cost of maintaining community service classes... and shall maintain uniform accounting procedures to ensure that General Fund moneys are not used for community services classes;

Whereas, Discussions of repeatable courses, maintaining access, and alternative curricular solutions to student success have provided reasons why this section of Education Code should be carefully revised;

Whereas, When students from community services classes are joined with students in noncredit, certificate, degree, and transfer courses, all students can benefit from the opportunity to learn from each other; and

Whereas, In order for credit students to earn credit, the instructor of record of a course must be a faculty member who meets minimum qualifications for the course and teaches to the course of record as approved by local curriculum committees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that if students from community service classes, noncredit, and credit courses are taught by the same faculty member in the same class, the faculty member must meet minimum qualifications for the credit course;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend changing California Education Code §78300(c) to allow General Fund moneys be used for community service classes when those classes support degree and transfer students and programs; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge faculty who teach courses with combinations of students from credit, noncredit, and community service to explain to their students the specifics of their enrollment, i.e., that community service and noncredit students do not earn college credit for these classes.

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

### **6.02 F11 Proportional Audit Fee Increases** **Kale Braden, Cosumnes River College, Futures Committee**

Whereas, California Education Code §76370 states,

- (a) If a fee for auditing is charged, it shall not exceed fifteen dollars (\$15) per unit per semester [boards may charge fees proportionally for quarter system courses, summer, intersessions or short term classes].
- (b) Students enrolled in classes to receive credit for 10 or more semester credit units shall not be charged a fee to audit three or fewer semester units per semester.
- (c) No student auditing a course shall be permitted to change his or her enrollment in that course to receive credit for the course.
- (d) Priority in class enrollment shall be given to students desiring to take the course for credit towards degree or certificate.
- (e) Classroom attendance of students auditing a course shall not be included in computing the apportionment due a community college district;

Whereas, Discussions of repeatable courses, maintaining access, and alternative curricular solutions to student success have provided reasons why this section of Education Code should be carefully revised; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate has taken positions over the years opposing fees for students, but as fees continue to rise, the community college system needs an audit fee structure that is proportional to regular student fees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend a change to California Education Code §76370 to make the fee for auditing courses proportional to the fees charged per credit unit of instruction.

### **6.03 F11 Assign Responsibility for Adult Education to California Community Colleges** **Esther Matthew, San Diego Continuing Education, Basic Skills/ Noncredit Committee**

Whereas, The responsibility for adult education in California is inconsistently applied throughout the state, in some cases being assumed by the K-12 system and in others by community colleges;

Whereas, The K-12 system has shifted millions of dollars in adult education funds to support other K-12 categorical programs that had experienced deep funding cuts, leading to a transfer of more than \$400 million out of adult education programs;

Whereas, the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010) draft recommendations (as of September 30, 2011) indicate that the State of California should develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing basic skills instruction, including providing for adult education; and

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, California community colleges are best suited to provide adult education throughout the state but cannot properly fulfill this function due to budgetary constraints;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the Board of Governors urge the Legislature to assign responsibility for adult education to the California community colleges but only if sufficient funding to address this mission is provided.

### Appendix A: California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success

#### **6.04 F11 Limit Taxpayer-funded, Need-Based Financial Aid to Public and Private Nonprofit Colleges Only Phil Smith, American River College, Executive Committee**

Whereas, Need-based financial aid is awarded to students on the basis of financial necessity rather than merit;

Whereas, Historically, the vast majority of students have attended public or private nonprofit colleges and, thus, need-based financial aid from taxpayer dollars was thought to be an investment in individuals for the good of society and not for the benefit of private investors; and

Whereas, The expansion of and aggressive marketing by for-profit colleges and universities create a situation in which need-based financial aid is additionally used to make a profit for corporate investors directly from taxpayer dollars;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support legislation and policy directives that limit need-based financial aid packages to public and private nonprofit colleges only.

#### **6.05 F11 Allow Community Colleges to Subsidize Credit Instruction with Not-For-Credit Class Fees Phil Smith, American River College, Executive Committee**

Whereas, Current Education Code §78300 and Title 5 regulation §55002 allow community colleges to offer not-for-credit, self-supporting community services classes provided that community colleges offer them only at cost;

Whereas, These courses are optional and offered for personal knowledge and enrichment and are not central to the community colleges' primary mission to prepare students for the workforce and for transfer to a four-year college;

Whereas, Due to the current budget contraction, greater and greater numbers of degree- and job-seeking students are being denied the credit courses they need to complete vocational programs or to prepare for transfer; and

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, In challenging budget times, taxpayers may reasonably ask individuals to pay more for optional personal enrichment experiences in order to enhance opportunities for students to enroll in needed credit courses;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support legislation allowing colleges and districts to charge more than the cost for not-for-credit classes and to use the proceeds solely to fund additional sections of credit courses and support services for vocational and transfer programs of study.

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

#### **7.01 F11 Revisit Mission of California Community Colleges David Morse, Long Beach City College, Futures Committee**

Whereas, Education Code §66010.4 (a) states, “The California Community Colleges shall, as a primary mission, offer academic and vocational instruction at the lower division level for both younger and older students, including those persons returning to school” and “A primary mission of the California Community Colleges is to advance California's economic growth and global competitiveness through education, training, and services that contribute to continuous work force improvement”;

Whereas, Education Code §66010.4 establishes that in addition to its primary mission, the California community colleges will also provide as important functions “remedial instruction for those in need of it and, in conjunction with the school districts, instruction in English as a second language, adult noncredit instruction, and support services which help students succeed at the postsecondary level” and “The provision of adult noncredit education curricula in areas defined as being in the state's interest is an essential and important function of the community colleges”;

Whereas, While the mission of the California community colleges was established nearly 50 years ago and therefore might merit reexamination and revision, any changes to that mission should be determined through explicit dialog and consultation rather than in a piecemeal and informal fashion; and

Whereas, Recent and current economic conditions have led to Chancellor's Office directives regarding core priorities and to reports or statements from other bodies that have, without formal action or authorization, redefined the primary mission of California community colleges;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges initiate discussions in the Consultation Council and other appropriate venues to either reconfirm as written or formally revise as appropriate the mission of the California community colleges.

See Appendix B: Education Code §66010.4



## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

### **7.02 F11 Modification to the Requirements of the Board of Governors (BOG) Fee Waiver Linda Retterath, Mission College, Basic Skills/Noncredit Committee**

Whereas, One of the largest expenditures of public funds to the community college system is the fee waiver granted by the Board of Governors (BOG) for students meeting specific criteria;

Whereas, Financial aid eligibility is commonly conditional upon satisfactory progress toward academic goals, but the BOG waiver does not require satisfactory progress;

Whereas, The perception that BOG waivers encourage students to accumulate units but not complete certificates or degrees at the California community colleges is not substantiated by the Community College League for California (CCLC), which has pointed out in “A Defining Moment,” CCLC message, September 8, 2011, that only 9.8% of BOG waiver students have more than 90 units; and

Whereas, CCLC’s message “A Defining Moment” also includes data indicating that 33% of BOG waiver students have less than a 2.0 grade point average, 38% fail to complete one-third of the units they undertake, and 43% of African-American BOG waiver students have less than a 2.0 grade point average;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges affirm the importance and value of the BOG waiver in promoting student access and student equity to our colleges; and

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to define appropriate conditions, including considerations of impact on equity and access, that would allow students with financial need to continue receiving a BOG fee waiver that would be based on satisfactory progress toward academic goals.

## **8.0 COUNSELING**

### **8.01 F11 Update Senate Paper *Role of Counseling Faculty in California Community Colleges* Jesse Ortiz, Woodland College, CLFIC/TAC**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community College’s 1994 paper *The Role of Counseling Faculty in California Community Colleges* describes a range of activities performed by counseling faculty which are still appropriate for counseling in the 21<sup>st</sup> century but do not include how the role of counseling has evolved with the introduction of technology;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted the 2003 *Consultation Council Task Force on Counseling Report*, as well as the new minimum qualifications for the counseling discipline, neither of which are reflected in the existing paper;

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, In Spring 2008 the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges passed resolution 8.01 (Support for Online Counseling Services) which in part called upon the Academic Senate to “develop written documents describing effective practices for the provision of online student services in the California community colleges”; and

Whereas, Colleges continue to hire paraprofessionals without regard to the guidelines outlined in the 1994 paper or subsequent resolutions approved by the Academic Senate calling for colleges to adhere to the principles set forth in both the *Role of Counseling Faculty in California Community Colleges* and the *Standards of Practice for California Community College Counseling Faculty and Programs* adopted papers;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update the paper *The Role of Counseling Faculty in California Community Colleges* to include current minimum qualifications and information from the *Consultation Council Task Force on Counseling Report*, effective practices for the provision of online counseling, and other student service practices under the scope of responsibility of counseling faculty.

### **9.0 CURRICULUM**

#### **9.01 F11 Encourage Local Flexibility and Innovation in Revision of Basic Skills Delivery**

**Melynie Schiel, Copper Mountain College, Curriculum Committee**

Whereas, Innovation in basic skills instruction has become a high profile issue both state- and nationwide, and various external and internal bodies, including the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010), have called for California community colleges to develop and implement alternatives to traditional basic skills curriculum, sometimes with the proposal of incentives or benefits to colleges that would encourage curricular revision and innovation;

Whereas, Creativity and innovation in the delivery of basic skills instruction are important aspects of curricular revision that rightfully should be encouraged throughout the California Community College system;

Whereas, Various attempts have been made to promote specific approaches to the revision of basic skills delivery across the community college system, often privileging time to completion over quality of instruction and leading to an attempt at standardization through a “one size fits all” model; and

Whereas, California community colleges have tremendously diverse student populations, community needs, and local cultures and must therefore be allowed to develop or adopt the most appropriate approaches to basic skills instruction for their own local

circumstances without having a specific model imposed on them or being pressured to adopt specific practices;

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the intent of the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success recommendations (as of September 30, 2011) to encourage and incentivize innovation in the delivery of basic skills instruction; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request that the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success modify its recommendations to emphasize consideration of all approaches for revising basic skills instruction without promoting adoption of any specific model or approach.

Appendix A: California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success

**9.02 F11 Defining Credit and Noncredit Basic Skills and Basic Skills Apportionment  
John Stankas, San Bernardino Valley College, Basic Skills/Noncredit Committee**

Whereas, The distinction between credit and noncredit basic skills courses is locally determined and inconsistent across the state;

Whereas, Local decision-making regarding the placement of courses in credit or noncredit categories may be financially driven, versus pedagogically driven, as credit apportionment is currently greater than enhanced non-credit apportionment;

Whereas, Data clarification and alignment in CB21 coding have assisted faculty in the categorization of basic skills levels below transfer; and

Whereas, The acquisition of basic skills is essential to the mission of the California community colleges, and the outcomes and goals of both noncredit or credit basic skills are the same;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges initiate an exploration of the appropriate division of credit and noncredit basic skills classes; and

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support funding noncredit basic skills classes at the same apportionment rate as credit classes.

**9.03 F11 Amend and Endorse “Recommendations Regarding Repeatability”  
Kim Harrell, Folsom Lake College, SACC**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges’ Board of Governors and Chancellor’s Office have expressed a commitment to changing Title 5 §55041 regarding repeatable courses;

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, Repeatable courses are a curricular matter, and both Education Code §70902 (b) (7) and Title 5 §53200 indicate that recommendations regarding curriculum are the purview of local academic senates;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has worked throughout 2011 to gather input from discipline faculty and other interested parties regarding possible changes to repeatable courses and led the Repeatability Task Force that developed the document “Recommendations Regarding Repeatability”; and

Whereas, The document “Recommendations Regarding Repeatability” contains unnecessary limitations on both the number of ensemble performance courses and on physical education courses in general that students may take for course credit;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend the document “Recommendations Regarding Repeatability” by striking the phrase “and students to a total of 16 units of performance courses” which places a non-curricular based limit on student course-taking;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges amend the document “Recommendations Regarding Repeatability” by striking the recommendation to “Limit students to a total of 8 PE courses”; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse the document “Recommendations Regarding Repeatability” and its recommendations as amended.

See Appendix C: Recommendations Regarding Repeatability

### **9.04 F11 Endorse “Recommendations Regarding Repeatability” Aimee Myers, Sierra College, SACC**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges’ Board of Governors and Chancellor’s Office have expressed a commitment to changing Title 5 §55041 regarding repeatable courses;

Whereas, Repeatable courses are a curricular matter, and both Education Code §70902 (b) (7) and Title 5 §53200 indicate that recommendations regarding curriculum are the purview of local academic senates; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has worked throughout 2011 to gather input from discipline faculty and other interested parties regarding possible changes to repeatable courses and led the Repeatability Task Force that developed the document “Recommendations Regarding Repeatability”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges endorse the document “Recommendations Regarding Repeatability” and all recommendations contained therein.

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

See Appendix C: Recommendations Regarding Repeatability

### **13.0 GENERAL CONCERNS**

#### **13.01 F11 Supporting Student Access**

**Esther Matthew, San Diego Continuing Education, Basic Skills/Noncredit Committee**

Whereas, An overlap exists between California community college's noncredit and the California Department of Education's (CDE) adult education programs;

Whereas, Community college noncredit education provides educational access to those students who are interested but lack the knowledge needed to gain entrance to college or do not see themselves as college capable and, while informing and engaging these students, noncredit education develops their capabilities and perceptions towards becoming college capable;

Whereas, Unlike CDE adult education students, students who attend California community college noncredit courses are, by default, attending institutions of higher education and thus are more likely to shift their perceptions about their college-going abilities by engaging in strategically planned pathways and by proximity and physical access to the college environs; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has positions in support of the need for noncredit programs and increased funding for noncredit (6.02 S98 and 5.03 S06);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge that any efforts to reduce or transfer any community college noncredit courses to California Department of Education's adult education programs be done in conjunction with the Academic Senate and local senates such that college pathways are continued or developed and that student progress is not hindered.

#### **13.02 F11 Opposition to the Elimination of Non-CDCP Noncredit Classes**

**Esther Matthew, San Diego Continuing Education, Basic Skills/Noncredit Committee**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2011) recommendation 4.1 (as of September 30, 2011) calls to "Amend statute to limit the scope of allowable noncredit classes to only those identified as Career Development or College Preparatory (CDCP)";

Whereas, Contrary to the current political pressure defining community college success solely as improved employability, community colleges exist to serve their communities and do so by providing diverse opportunities for all Californians to enhance the quality of their lives in a variety of ways; and

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, Discussions in numerous contexts, including those concerning repeatability, have demonstrated that noncredit courses may be an appropriate curricular option in various disciplines outside CDCP;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose the limiting of noncredit offerings to only career development or college preparatory classes.

Appendix A: California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success

### **13.03 F11 Support Centralized Assessment Instrument for Placement Debbie Klein, Gavilan College, Futures Committee**

Whereas, California community colleges use an array of assessment for placement instruments, potentially resulting in duplicative costs and the needless retesting of students;

Whereas, The use of a standardized assessment for placement instrument for all community colleges would ensure the portability of assessment scores, yet permit local determination of cut scores, application of multiple measures, and additional assessment measures (e.g., a written component for an English placement);

Whereas, Increased interest in innovative approaches to basic skills curricular offerings highlights the importance of allowing course placements to be determined at the local level in support of local curricular practices; and

Whereas California community colleges must identify appropriate ways to leverage resources in a manner that better serves students and increases the spending power of the state's dollars, and a centralized common assessment is a viable option for accomplishing this goal;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges maintain the importance of faculty primacy with respect to the use of assessment for placement scores and the application of multiple measures; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the establishment of a centralized standard assessment for placement as an option and encourage local senates to support selection of this assessment option for local use.

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

### **13.04 F11 Course Scheduling and Enrollment Priorities** **Phil Smith, American River College, Executive Committee**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges are facing an unprecedented demand for courses and are being forced both to prioritize course offerings and to alter enrollment practices in ways that offer advantages to some students over others;

Whereas, Growing concern exists among some groups and individuals regarding the appropriateness of California community college course offerings—as demonstrated by the rhetoric of the Legislative Analyst’s Office and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges System, as well as the recommendations (as of September 30, 2011) made by the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010); and

Whereas, Course development and course offerings should be guided by demonstrated student and community educational need, as well as be fiscally and academically responsible;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to provide guidelines to their faculty to ensure that course development and offerings are appropriately determined by documented educational need and further refined by fiscal considerations.

Appendix A: California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success

### **13.05 F11 Support for Student Success Courses** **Craig Rutan, Santiago Canyon College, Curriculum Committee**

Whereas, Many students lack effective time management and study skills when entering California community colleges;

Whereas, Student success courses provide students with valuable instruction in such areas as study skills, time management, and other student success behaviors; and

Whereas, Students without these skills often struggle to complete courses, and research<sup>1</sup> has shown that completing a student success course improves student persistence and aids in the transition from basic skills to college level courses;

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Laura Hope’s “Literature Review of Student Success Courses,” produced by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement Of Teaching, or Santa Monica College’s “Examining the Relationship between Freshman Seminars, Student Achievement, and Persistence: A Study of First-Time Santa Monica College Students Enrolled in Counseling 20.”

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to work with their counseling departments and other faculty to actively encourage all students to enroll in a student success course during their first term at the college; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to work with their administrations to ensure additional resources are allocated to provide student success courses for all students who can benefit.

### **13.06 F11 Provide Guidelines on Significant Lapse of Time Craig Rutan, Santiago Canyon College, Curriculum Committee**

Whereas, Title 5 §55043 allows districts to “permit or require repetition of a course where the student received a satisfactory grade the last time he or she took the course but the district determines that there has been a significant lapse of time since that grade was obtained”;

Whereas, No guidelines currently exist to help districts determine reasonable standards for course repetition due to a significant lapse of time, and therefore this concept is applied inconsistently throughout California community colleges; and

Whereas, Recent changes to other sections of Title 5, especially those regarding repeatable courses, may lead to increased requests to allow course repetition due to significant lapse of time;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to develop and provide guidance for local districts and colleges regarding policies on course repetition due to a significant lapse of time.

### **13.07 F11 Implementation of Student Success Task Force Recommendations Cynthia Rico-Bravo, San Diego Mesa College, Futures Committee**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has supported for years all educationally sound strategies and mechanisms for improving student success, including many of the recommendations (as of September 30, 2011) in the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010) draft recommendations;

Whereas, Strategic implementation of the recommendations will permit the state and California community colleges to assess the results of these recommendations, including the effectiveness in improving student success, in closing the achievement gap, and in increasing student attainment of certificates, degrees, and transfer; and

Whereas, Parties remain interested in performance-based funding for community colleges, and, without reliable data that can be easily studied to see which



## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

recommendations created the most positive change, the state will not be able to make informed decisions about the future of student success measures or subsequent funding;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support a phased approach to any implementation of the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success recommendations which has controls for multiple variables and can lead to validated conclusions about the effectiveness of the recommendations; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that efforts to improve student success in California community colleges do not end with the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success recommendations but are dynamic and evolve to focus on the endeavors that work and on newer strategies and recommendations.

Appendix A: California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success

### **13.08 F11 Responding to the Student Success Task Force Recommendations Jane Patton, Mission College, Futures Committee**

Whereas, The draft recommendations (as of September 30, 2011) of the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010) propose a complex package of integrated changes to the way the California community colleges currently function;

Whereas, Student success, specifically, and academic and professional matters more generally are areas in which primary responsibility has been granted to the academic senate; and

Whereas, Faculty commitment to student success has always been a given and faculty are in the best position to provide an in-depth analysis of changes proposed to impact success, as well as to provide alternative approaches to student success;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop a response to the recommendations of the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010) provides an analysis of the proposed changes and, where appropriate, prioritizes, delineates options, and provides alternatives.

Appendix A: California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success

### **15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES**

#### **15.01 F11 Faculty Primacy in Alignment of Standards with K-12 Carolyn Holcroft, Foothill College, Curriculum Committee**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010) recommends (as of September 30, 2011) that the California

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

Community College System collaborate with the K-12 system to align high school exit standards with community college standards of college readiness;

Whereas, Title 5 §53200 (b) designates “Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success” as an academic and professional matter that falls under the purview of the academic senate, and therefore community college faculty should be the primary leaders of any revision of academic standards;

Whereas, While alignment of standards between the K-12 and the California Community College System may enhance college preparedness and increase student success, such alignment must be led by community college faculty in order to ensure that pre-established Common Core Standards adopted by the K-12 system are not imposed on community colleges; and

Whereas, Any meaningful dialog regarding alignment of standards between the K-12 and the California Community College System will require significant human and financial resources to enable full participation of all appropriate parties;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges study the K-12 Common Core Standards and consider the degree to which those standards might align with community college readiness standards; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges insist that any discussion of alignment of standards between the K-12 and the California Community College System be a faculty-led initiative with sufficient support provided by the community college and K-12 system offices.

Appendix A: California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success

### **19.0 PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS**

#### **19.01 F11 Electronic Materials and Best Practices**

**Dustin Hanvey, Pasadena City College, Distance Education Ad Hoc Committee**

Whereas, Electronic instructional materials have become increasingly common in both online and face-to-face courses in California community colleges;

Whereas, Interest in these materials is increasing, in part because they frequently cost less than traditional print materials; and

Whereas, Many faculty currently using and those who are interested in using these materials do not have enough information available to them regarding effective practices for how these materials should be used;

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges disseminate information to faculty, including recommendations, on the effective uses of instructional e-materials.

**19.02 F11 Teachers Using E-instructional Materials**  
**Danielle Martino, Santiago Canyon College, Distance Education**  
**Ad Hoc Committee**

Whereas, E-instructional materials can provide useful learning tools that also monitor student progress, include instantaneous feedback to both students and faculty, and often offer comprehensive tracking and grading tools that are costly and difficult to duplicate;

Whereas, Many e-instruction materials include assessment and grading programs for evaluating student mastery of the course content and/or required skills;

Whereas, The effectiveness of such assessment and grading components, in general, remains unproven and the specific components of e-materials varies considerably between different publishers; and

Whereas, No electronic system can replace the guidance provided by faculty directly to students when learning course content and being assessed in the knowledge of the content;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that local senates review the e-instructional materials in use on their campus and remind faculty of their responsibility to assess learning and assign grades according to Education Code §76224(a) and Title 5 §55002; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to develop policies encouraging instructors to carefully consider their responsibility in assessing, communicating about, and grading student work effectively before adopting electronic systems that claim to easily replace or replicate this crucial work of faculty.

**19.03 F11 Uphold Local Control of Professional Development Activities**  
**Dolores Davison, Foothill College, Executive Committee**

Whereas, The draft recommendations (as of September 30, 2011) of the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010) suggest that statute or regulations should be amended to allow the California Community College Chancellor's Office or Board of Governors to mandate specific purposes for flex day activities presented by individual colleges or districts;

Whereas, Title 5 §53200 (c) lists "policies for faculty professional development activities" as an academic and professional matter under the purview of the academic senate;

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

Whereas, Faculty expertise and knowledge regarding instruction and professional standards is necessary for determining appropriate faculty professional development activities and procedures, and thus the current assignment of such issues to the academic senate's purview is appropriate and should not be changed; and

Whereas, Local college and district academic senates are in the best position to assess their own faculty professional development needs at any specific time or for any given flex day and therefore should be allowed the freedom to determine the most appropriate use of professional development activities and resources;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges communicate to the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010) the importance of local control over faculty professional development activities and resources and the importance of respecting the purview of the academic senate regarding faculty professional development activities as specified under Title 5 §53200 (c).

Appendix A: California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success

### **19.04 F11 Full-Time Faculty and Student Success** **Beth Smith, Grossmont College, Executive Committee**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges stands on the principle that full-time faculty are essential to and an unequalled component of any effort to increase student success;

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010) proposes a variety of recommendations (as of September 30, 2011) to increase student success but omits this key element to overall student success and achievement that plays a significant role in addressing the equity gaps at momentum points and completion measures;

Whereas, Full-time faculty now teach about 56% of all instructional hours within the state, woefully shy of the public policy goal of 75%; and

Whereas, Any recommendations that seek to transform the California Community College System toward greater student success yet do not include increasing the number of full-time faculty in the colleges are incomplete and deny an obvious fact identified in research and literature reviews, see Appendix D;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly recommend that the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success (Senate Bill 1143, Liu, 2010) amend its recommendations (as of September 30, 2011) to include a policy statement and implementation steps to increase the number of full-time community college faculty in the state.

## 2011 Fall Executive Committee Resolutions

### Appendix A: California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success

#### **19.05 F11 Faculty Evaluations Processes** **Kevin Bontenbal, Cuesta College, Executive Committee**

Whereas, Education Code and Title 5 Regulations clearly define the academic senate's purview relative to academic and professional matters, and the evaluation of faculty, including counselors and librarians, is a professional matter negotiated by local unions after consultation with academic senates (Education Code §87610.1);

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocates for quality evaluations and evaluation procedures but has not recently surveyed local senates about the types of evaluation processes currently in use across the state and has not updated its 1990 paper *Guidelines for Developing a Faculty Evaluation Process*; and

Whereas, Many changes in teaching and service delivery have occurred in the last 20 years (i.e., distance education, hybrid courses, web-based databases and online student faculty interactions) which require modified or new evaluation techniques and processes;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges survey districts on the processes and criteria used for faculty evaluation and work with statewide bargaining organizations to analyze the results and identify and formulate best practices for the purpose of updating the 1990 paper *Guidelines for Developing a Faculty Evaluation Process*.