Riverside City College Academic Senate

Agenda

Monday, 9 December 2024 • 3:00 - 4:15 PM
Meeting Location: The RCC Hall of Fame Room
YouTube link for viewing:
https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC9tCDF4RDXCqzrUS0QfO09A/featured

3:00	I.	**Call to Order**
3:05	II.	**Approval of the Agenda**
3:05	III.	**Approval of the Minutes:** Nov. 18
3:10	IV.	**Public Comments**
3:20	V.	**Committee or Council Updates**

    A. EPOC faculty co-chair Wendy McKeen or designee will present the Fall 2024 prioritization process results for RCCAS ratification (information + action)

    B. Faculty Development faculty co-chair Melissa Harman or designee will provide a semester recap and preview of Spring FLEX (information)

3:30	VI.	**Ongoing Business**

    A. Senate leadership will share the final packet of ASCCC resolutions ratified at Fall 2024 Plenary (information)

    B. Dr. Mary Rankin and Kevin Wurtz from Student Health & Psychological Services will invite faculty to share feedback regarding ongoing needs for support (discussion)

3:45	VII.	**New Business**

    A. President Scott-Coe or designee will provide an overview of the proposed Course Caps process drafted by the cross-district workgroup (information + first read)

    B. Ratification of new and ongoing appointments: President Scott-Coe or designee will present candidates (action)

        a. District Resources Committee faculty representative from RDAS

        b. Faculty Development Rep. for Faculty Guide/Handbook Team (Winter SPRs)

        c. Faculty Co-Chair for SAS

3:55	VIII.	**Officer Reports**

    A. President Scott-Coe and Secretary Treasurer Wiggs will provide any end-of-semester updates (information)

4:00	IX.	**Closed Session**

    A. Pursuant to Government Code 54957(b)(1), Public Employee Performance Evaluation Title: College President

4:15	X.	**Adjourn**

Next RCCAS Meeting: Monday 3 March 2025
Agenda items due Tuesday 25 Feb. 2025 at noon

Consistent with Executive Order N-29-20 and Government Code sections 54953.2, 54954.1, 54954.2, and 54957.5, the Riverside City College Academic Senate will swiftly provide to individuals with disabilities reasonable modification or accommodation including an alternate, accessible version of all meeting materials. To request an accommodation, please contact Office of Diversity, Equity, & Compliance at 951-222-8039.

Riverside City College Academic Senate
November 18, 2024 • 3:00 - 5:00 PM • Hall of Fame

3:00 I. Call to Order at 3:01 pm, quorum met

Roll Call

Academic Senate Officers (Term ending 2026)
<u>President</u>: Jo Scott-Coe
<u>Vice President</u>: Ajené Wilcoxson
<u>Secretary-Treasurer</u>: Micherri Wiggs

Department Senators (Term ending 2025)
<u>Applied Technology</u>: Patrick Scullin (arrived 3:45pm)
<u>Behavioral Science</u>: Eddie Perez
<u>Business, Law & CIS</u>: Skip Berry (not present)
<u>Communication Studies</u>: Lucretia Rose
<u>English</u>: Christine Sandoval
<u>History/Philosophy/Humanities/Ethnic Studies</u>: Daniel Borses (not present)
<u>Library & Learning Resources</u>: Sally Ellis
<u>Life Sciences</u>: Lisa Thompson-Eagle
<u>Mathematics</u>: Evan Enright (not present)
<u>Music</u>: Steve Mahpar
<u>World Languages</u>: Araceli Calderón

Department Senators (Term ending 2026)
<u>Art</u>: Will Kim
<u>Chemistry</u>: Leo Truttmann
<u>Cosmetology</u>: Rebecca Kessler
<u>Counseling</u>: Sal Soto
<u>Dance and Theatre</u>: Jason Buuck
<u>Economics/Geography/Political Science</u>: Kendralyn Webber
<u>Kinesiology</u>: Jim Elton
<u>Nursing Education</u>: Lee Nelson (not present)
<u>Physical Science</u>: James Cheney
<u>School of Education & Teacher Preparation</u>: Emily Philippsen

Associate Faculty Senator
Lindsay Weiler

Ex-Officio Senators
<u>TLLC</u>: Lashonda Carter (not present)
<u>ASC</u>: Jacquie Lesch
<u>EPOC</u>: Wendy McKeen (arrived 3:13pm)
<u>GEMQLC</u>: Wendy McKeen (arrived 3:13pm)
<u>RDASLC</u>: Patrick Scullin (arrived 3:45pm)
<u>SAS LC</u>: Vacant
<u>Curriculum</u>: Kelly Douglass (departed 4pm)
<u>Parliamentarian</u>: Sal Soto

RCCD Faculty Association
Emily Philippsen

Administrative Representatives
<u>College President</u>: Claire Oliveros (departed 3:47pm)
<u>VP Academic Affairs</u>: Lynn Wright
<u>VP Business Services</u>: Kristine DiMemmo (not present)
<u>VP Planning and Development</u>: Kristi Woods (not present)
<u>VP Student Services</u>: Thomas Cruz Soto, Interim (not present)

ASRCC Representative
Vacant

Recorder of Minutes
Sydney Minter

Guests
Natalie Halsell, Professional Development Coordinator, Planning & Development
Kevin Wurtz, Student Health & Psychological Services
Maurice Bowers, Student Equity Grant Specialist, Equity/Inclusion/Engagement
Breanne Soto, Life Reporter, RCC Viewpoints

3:05   II. Approval of the Agenda: M/S/C: (Soto/Calderon) to approve the agenda with minor modification moving item VIB to VIID. Passed unanimously.

3:05   III. Approval of the Minutes: Oct. 21 and Nov. 4
- M/S/C:(Phillipsen/Sandoval) to approve the October 21 minutes. Passed unanimously.
- M/S/C: (Soto/Elton) to approve the November 4 minutes. Passed unanimously.

3:06   IV. Public Comments
- Kevin Wurtz, Mental Health Supervisor at RCC, shared mental health resources and supports for faculty and students.

3:10   V. Liaison Reports

A. RCCD Faculty Association
  - Faculty Association had a Town Hall meeting last Friday that was well attended.
  - Perris Skills Center - Not a lot of transparency from the district in relation to the project and faculty are experiencing frustration about that.
  - 65 people are taking the golden handshake, 23 are faculty.
  - Faculty are encouraged to read the weekly Faculty Association minutes about retirement and other pertinent information.

B. College President
  - Thank you to those who attended the 1st LHSS cozy corner coffee chat. There were 30 plus individuals who participated and we appreciated hearing the students' questions, thoughts and ideas.

- o On December 5th or 12^{th,} the president will meet in La Casa and have a conversation with the HACU (Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities) team that participated at the National Convening.
- o Save the date: Tuesday, December 10th from 12pm-2pm for retiree winter gathering in the cafeteria. Thank you to all the faculty that took the golden handshake spring and mid semester.

C. ASRCC
- o No report at this time.

VI. Committee or Council Updates

A. Curriculum co-chair Kelly Douglass will provide an update about timely curriculum items (information)

- Two massive changes due to legislation
  - o Every ADT had to have the language updated to reflect Cal GETC as opposed to CSU or UC general education. There was also a local change where any ADT that had Math, or PSY/SOC had to be edited because PSY 48 increased units. – These were all approved in a special DCC (District Curriculum Committee) meeting. All will go to the BOT (Board of Trustees) in December.
  - o AB1111 (Common Course Numbering, CCN) is a law that compels the community colleges to have common course numbering system shared amongst the California Community Colleges. The State Chancellor's Office and ASCCC saw this as an opportunity to forge new alignment between community colleges and the CSUs/UCs. The focus was on easier articulation of courses from one institution to another. We have to align 76 or more classes by 2027, which will be addressed in different phases. The timeline is very difficult, as we know. The CSUs and UCs are under no legal timeline and they do not have CORs (Course Outlines of Record) as we do in the CC system.
    - Phase 1 is 6 classes in fall 2025; phase 2 is 20 classes fall of 2026 and phase 3 is 50 classes.
    - We are in the middle of CCN phase II at the state level. Group 1 met the last week in October, Group 2 is meeting this week, and Group 3 will be meeting the first week in December.
    - ASCCC is asking faculty to weigh in on a post survey for the course template in addition to the pre-survey already requested. The survey opened Nov. 14 and will stay open until Dec. 4. It is suggested to include department chairs when sending out the survey, beyond just the senate president and curriculum representatives.
    - Part one of the template document is required language and part two is any local additional information.
    - There were questions about what will happen with older course articulations, and how associate faculty can contribute to the process.

VII. Ongoing Business

A. VP Wilcoxson and the Senate Nominating Committee will lead a vote on replacement for RCCAS Vice President (term of Spring 2025-Spring 2026) (action)

- M/S/C (Perez/Weiler) to accept Star Taylor as the VP of Academic Senate, completing VP Wilcoxson's term, from Spring 2025 to Spring 2026. Passed unanimously with 20 votes.

B. EPOC faculty co-chair Wendy McKeen will review the committee's proposed updates to Tiger Pride Values and a proposed tri-chair model (second read, discussion, + action)
   o Tiger Pride Values: Changed "and minoritized" to "or minoritized" in the equity portion of the Tiger Values. Discussion about using "historically excluded" for future edits. Concern expressed about RCC needing to embody the values. M/S/C: (Sandoval/Calderon) to approve the Tiger Pride Values as presented. Passed unanimously.
   o Proposed Tri-Chair Model: M/S/C (Weiler/Thompson-Eagle) to add a classified tri-chair to join the EPOC administrative and faculty chairs. Passed unanimously.

C. VP Wilcoxson will share a report about ASCCC Fall 2024 Plenary (information + discussion)
   o ASCCC final resolutions should be out in time for the final meeting RCCAS meeting. Highlights offered:
      ▪ Adopt using outcomes for the course outline of record--failed
      ▪ Advocacy to restore student language in English and math--passed
      ▪ Support of faculty for the implementation of AB1111--passed
      ▪ Nutrition science as Cal GETC passed
      ▪ Designation for an official Native American holiday for California -- passed by acclimation
      ▪ Encouraging transparency about automatic bill practices in course material access--passed
      ▪ UC transferability of English for speakers of other languages and all communication courses- -passed
      ▪ Acknowledge (EOPS) Extend Opportunities Programs and Services and implementation without articulation to safeguard student success for future course numbering phases--passed
      ▪ Delay public facing implementation of course numbering until chapter agreements are established—passed
   o The ASCCC finalized resolutions packet did not make RCCAS agenda deadline; the document will be included for our last meeting this term.

D. RDAS Faculty Co-Chair Patrick Scullin will provide a second update on the RCC/RCCD faculty List Serv proposals (discussion + action)
   o The district is looking for RCCAS to approve the List Serv language for RCC-Faculty. We are asked to decide to leave it unmoderated or have it moderated by a faculty member.
   o In the old List Serv system, faculty names had to be manually entered to permit access. The new system will automatically populate who belongs on the list. The same rules will apply throughout the district depending on which groups one belongs to. If approved, the new list-servs would be turned on

subsequently (perhaps sometime during the spring semester). M/S/C: (Perez/Sandoval) to approve RCC-Faculty be an unmoderated List Serv. Failed unanimously. Discussion points/questions suggested RCCAS is not yet ready to vote one way or another.

- o Lingering areas of confusion included understanding implications for timeline and communications for the shift to new list-servs and away from old ones, concerns about whether district would be modifying messages (and who would be in that role), associate faculty access considerations, motivation for the changes overall, precise definition of "moderation," and a question of who moderates lists now vs. if we opted into moderation with the new lists?
  - o Senate would like to revisit this topic with more clarity.

VIII. New Business

A. President Scott-Coe or designee will share an update about faculty Emeritus status procedures under AP 2000 (see Section 2 G) for faculty who are planning their retirements (information + discussion)
- o Everyone was directed to page 3 of AP 2000 for reference.
- o The issue was raised earlier this semester by members of the nursing department because we have a golden handshake happening, and some faculty seek to initiate the Emeritus process before they retire.
- o People who are in the process of retiring can request a recommendation for Emeritus status. This status can be beneficial if they are planning to be published, attend conferences, etc. Essentially, an Emeritus faculty member becomes a kind of ambassador for their discipline and the college.
- o Emeritus status can be granted to a faculty member who has earned retirement and it will be based on their academic rank at the time of their retirement.
- o The Chancellor has indicated his desire that Emeritus status should be more rigorous and should not be automatically granted. But that change would require an update/revision to our current procedure in place.
- o President Scott-Coe has reached out to those faculty who were officially identified (thus far) as retiring to inquire if they would like to be put forward. If you know someone in your department who did not receive an email from President Scott-Coe, please have them reach out to her directly.
- o For any faculty who are interested in Emeritus status but do not say so in December, they can still be considered after their retirement is official.

B. Ratification of new and ongoing appointments: President Scott-Coe or designee will present candidates (action)
a. CCN Phase II Convenings: Additional Faculty Nominees if needed
- o Nothing new to report
b. Faculty Guide/Handbook Team (so far) for Winter SPRs
- o Gratitude expressed to Senator Thompson-Eagle for pointing out the need for updating the Faculty Guide/Handbook.
- o M/SC: (Thompson-Eagle/Rose) to support winter special projects for 4 team members updating the Faculty Guide and Handbook. Faculty volunteers thus far are Brit Osgood-Treston—TLLC; Mark Haines—DLC; and Emily

Phillipsen--FA. Still pending one representative from Faculty Development. Passed Unanimously.
- o Will start the updating project in the winter term. It would be ideal to have a senator present.
- c. Faculty Co-Chair for SAS
  - o Continued conversation on SAS and how it will be constructed, and how that will impact faculty chair recruitment

IX. Officer Reports
- A. Secretary
  - o Survey out for IETTC. The survey came out from Vice Chancellor Bishop on Wednesday, November 13th. Please complete it and encourage faculty to do so as well.
  - o Reminder: Senate meeting on December 9th to finalize some unfinished business. There will be no standing guest reports or officer reports. The seating arrangement in the Hall of Fame will also be set up differently in preparation for the Faculty Retiree Celebration.
  - o The Faculty Retiree Celebration is being co-hosted by senate and the Faculty Association and will directly follow our Senate meeting from 5-6:30pm. Please RSVP if you have not already.
  - o RCC's IRB was a topic of interest in the last few weeks. IRB = Institutional Review Board, which is a committee that reviews research studies involving human subjects to ensure they meet ethical standards, comply with regulations, and protect participants. VP Wilcoxson and Secretary-Treasurer Wiggs have had several meetings with faculty and administration about RCC's IRB.
    - ▪ As a quick history, RCC's IRB was established in 2015 when Dr. Isaac was the college president. The IRB was determined to be a confidential committee of only faculty voting members, with the intention at that time to have divisional representation. The IRB was, initially, only receiving about 4 applications for research per year, but applications have been increasing, with 2024 seeing about 15 so far.
    - ▪ What's clear at this time is that there is shared faculty interest in addressing what we collectively foresee for IRB in the future including its composition, reporting structure, maintaining confidentiality or being public, and whether/how the same group should evaluate proposed external and graduate level research as well as RCC student research.
    - ▪ Please anticipate hearing more about this in the spring.
  - o Today is VP Wilcoxson's final senate meeting. It has been an honor to serve and learn alongside VP Wilcoxson. He will be missed.

- B. President
- o We will bring Kevin Wurtz back on our Senate meeting on December 9th for a listening session regarding faculty's concerns about mental health supports for students and community.

- o Dr. Rankin sent out an email regarding events providing post-election support for students, faculty, and classified professionals on November 21st. There will be two virtual workshops. The workshops for students are at 12:30pm and at 4:30pm for classified, faculty, and managers.
- o Meeting with Interim Chief of Police DiMaggio was last Wednesday, November 13th to create a connection to Academic Senate. He is open to coming to Senate in the spring to listen about faculty concerns.
- o HRER task force. One department chair from each college joined the taskforce which is focused on addressing systemic reform. Some suggestions are being made that colleges should adjust the prioritization schedules; faculty voices are crucial.
- o Security audit update. Many RCC faculty participated in the electronic survey; 83 of 95 faculty respondents were from RCC, 11 were from COIL, and one from Culinary. The focus groups did not go as we carefully planned and hoped for, with only 4 faculty able to participate. Communication/emails issues were identified as the problem by district and the consultants, and this affected the timeline and faculty ability to contribute. We still do not know when the security audit presentation will come to the board. Details to follow.
- o Course caps workgroup has been an ongoing project for at least 2 years. The cross-district workgroup has done a significant lift to draft a procedure that will come to Academic Senate for a first read at our next meeting on Dec 9. As this topic has been historically a source of anxiety, confusion, and even intimidation, it will be an important milestone to review and finalize a vote on this procedure in spring.
- o Procedural Clarification. The senate is permitted to agendize closed sessions to seek input from members of the body for items permissible for Academic Senates under the Brown Act and according to Government Code 54957(b)(1). Faculty should not read any connotations, positive or negative, into the appearance of such an item on any upcoming agenda.
- o Be on the lookout for forums and collaboration with constituency groups on important college-wide subjects and themes in the spring semester.

- C. Vice President
- o Senate leadership has our 2nd meeting on Thursday, 11/21 with the interim Vice President of Planning and Development Dr. Kristi Woods.
- o A team will present to the Board of Trustees on ESCALA on Tuesday, 11/19.
- o It is critical that we continue to push for an appropriate and clear definition for HY-FLEX.

X. Open Hearing

- o Faculty are not getting support for Canvas and they are not getting any response or support when they are logging onto their online courses. What can we do to make sure this does not happen as we prepare for the winter and spring semesters?

- o The RCC President still has not assembled her Advisory Council on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility, Antiracism, and Belonging for Social and Economic Justice.
- o Faculty members emphasized that 4 faculty participants were inadequate for the security audit.
- o One senator shared the concern that she was meant to be involved in the focus group but that she was excluded. Her input would have been invaluable because of ongoing experiences of harassment she documented last spring, as well as a lack of administrative support or follow-through since a police report in May 2024.
- o One faculty member indicated the focus groups were not really a group at all. In the meeting she attended, she was the only person (faculty member) present.
- o The laptops that were purchased from COVID, which are down to about 400, are falling apart. How do we address the issue of access for our students when so much of their work is online?
- o EPOC successfully completed the prioritization process. There has been some delay in announcement, but the regular process is moving forward. Be on the lookout for the email from Riv-All.

XI. Learn, Share, Do

- Please encourage faculty to continue reading Faculty Association minutes
- There is a holiday party and retiree celebration Tuesday, December 10th from 12-2. This is an all-college celebration.
- Please continue to talk to faculty about AB1111 (CCN) even if it has not hit your department yet so there is less confusion when it does. Please inform faculty in phase 2 that there is now a pre-survey AND a post-survey.
- Let faculty know Star Taylor will be new Vice President of Academic Senate.
- Please encourage retiring faculty to reach out to President Scott-Co for Emeritus Status
- Please encourage faculty to respond IETCC survey sent by Vice Chancellor Bishop.
- Please come to the faculty retiree celebration on December 9 from 5-6:30pm after Academic Senate meeting. Please RSVP.
- The last District Academic Senate meeting is after the Thanksgiving break on December 2nd. Please come if you've not been able to make a District Academic Senate meeting yet this semester.
- There are a few more chances to a fall RCC sporting event since we have some teams entering the championships. Please attend if you have not been able to make a sporting event yet this semester. **Question**: On what List Serv might we learn about sporting events? Everyone may not be seeing all announcements.
- Please RSVP to the events promoted by Dr. Rankin in an email on November 14th for post-election support.
- Looking for a senator to be on the winter Faculty Guide Update Group.

XII. Adjourn at 4:55pm M/S/C (Perez/Philippsen) to adjourn. Passed unanimously.

Fall 2024 Prioritization Results

Initiative Rankings These initiatives are listed in the order of highest priority(most number of votes) to lowest priority (least number of votes)

1. VPAA 6: Cosmetology Operations Assistant
2. VPAA 2: Support for Math Learning Center
3. VPSS 2: Veteran's Resource Center Staffing
4. VPAA 1: Associate Dean for Languages, Humanities, and Social Sciences Division
5. VPPD 1: Support for La Casa
6. VPAA 4: Chemistry Part-Time Lab Technician
7. VPSS 1: Student Activities Office Staffing
8. VPPD 4: Support for UMOJA
9. VPAA 3: Educational Partnerships – Growing Dual Enrollment through Outreach
10. VPBS 2: Two New Custodial Positions
11. VPPD 7: Rainbow Engagement Center
12. VPAA 5: COIL/Music Support Staffing
13. VPPD 2: Guided Pathways Support Enhancement (Counseling)
14. VPPD 3: Reconfigure MLK Space
15. VPPD 5: Application Support Technician for Professional Development Programs
16. VPPD 8: Institutionalize Director, Institutional Research
17. VPPD 6: Classified Professional Leadership Academy
18. VPBS 4: Landis HVAC Controls
19. VPBS 1: Purchase New Golf Carts to meet Facilities and Grounds need
20. VPBS 5: Meeting Room Audiovisual Equipment Lifecycle
21. VPBS 3: Turf Removal Project

Faculty Prioritization Results These positions are listed in the order of highest priority(most number of votes) to lowest priority (least number of votes)

1. Communication Studies 1
2. Ethnic Studies
3. Communication Studies 2
4. Counseling 5 La Casa
5. Counseling 1 General
6. Computer Information Systems
7. Counseling 4 Career Center
8. Communication Studies 3
9. Counseling 2 General
10. Communication Studies 4
11. Counseling 3 Athletics

*note: English was originally ranked in the 5th position. This position was removed from the ranking because it was confirmed to be a replacement position. It was put into Program Review because the College did not have a process at the time to replace one existing faculty position with another faculty position in the discipline. The replacement of a Reading faculty(teaching English courses) with an English faculty has already been approved by a newly defined process outside of Prioritization.

ACADEMIC SENATE
for California Community Colleges
LEADERSHIP · EMPOWERMENT · VOICE

2024 Fall Plenary Session

Adopted Resolutions

ASCCC 2024-2025 Resolutions Committee

Robert L. Stewart, Jr, ASCCC Resolutions Chair, Area C
Dr. Karen Chow, ASCCC At-Large Representative, Area B
Davena Burns-Peters, San Bernardino Valley College, Area D
Nikki Grose, Feather River College, Area A
Yuting Lin, Sierra College, Area A
Krystinne Mica, ASCCC Executive Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RECORDING RESOLUTIONS VOTING

Final results of voting on resolutions are recorded using the following, based on the *Resolutions Handbook* (page 12):

- MSC: Moved, Seconded, Carried
- MSF: Moved, Seconded, Failed
- MSR: Moved, Seconded, Referred
- MSU: Moved, Seconded, Unanimous (including consent calendar & unanimous consent)
- Acclamation: Moved, Seconded, Acclamation

RESOLUTIONS CATEGORIES

New resolutions categories that more closely align with the purview of the ASCCC were piloted for the 2024 Spring Plenary Session and approved for post-pilot use by the ASCCC Executive Committee at its May 2024 meeting. Numbering of these new categories begins from 101 for the first category, 102 for the second category, and so forth to distinguish them from the old categories. The approved new categories are as follows:

101. Curriculum
102. Degree and Certificate Requirements
103. Grading Policies
104. Educational Program Development
105. Student Preparation and Success
106. Governance Structures
107. Accreditation
108. Professional Development
109. Program Review
110. Institutional Planning and Budget Development
111. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
112. Hiring, Minimum Qualifications, Equivalency, and Evaluations
113. Legislation and Advocacy
114. Consultation with the Chancellor's Office

ADOPTED RESOLUTIONS

101 CURRICULUM

101.01 F24 Nutrition Science Integration in General Education Curriculum as a Cal-GETC Subject Area 5B Course

Whereas, Nutrition has historically been combined with culinary arts and consumer & family studies, but the study of nutrition has evolved to emphasize human nutrition, which integrates many subjects within biological sciences;

Whereas, Nutrition courses are appropriate for inclusion in the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) Subject Area 5B as evidenced by the required topics including the scientific method and its application, cellular and molecular biology, anatomy and physiology, biochemistry, biotechnology, microbiology, metabolism, immunology, public health, endocrinology, sustainability, and chemistry;

Whereas, Some California universities recognize nutrition is not narrow in focus and have therefore appropriately placed it in their local university GE pattern as evidenced by UC Berkeley recognizing that its own Introduction to Human Nutrition (NUSCTX 10) meets UC Berkeley Biological Science, Letters and Science (L&S) Breadth and CSU Long Beach recognizing its own Introductory Nutrition (NUTR 132) meets CSULB's local GE Category B - Science, Technology and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning; and

Whereas, Cal-GETC Standards Version 1.0 (May 2023)[1] states that nutrition courses are determined to have a narrow or applied focus and therefore are unacceptable for inclusion in Subject Area 5: Physical or Biological Sciences, and though Cal-GETC Standards Version 1.2 (May 2024)[2] no longer contains the exclusion language, nutrition course proposals continue to be denied with the reason cited that the proposal is too narrow in focus;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge and collaborate with the University of California Academic Senate to update the UC Transfer Eligibility Standards for Science to allow nutrition courses to be considered science courses for UC admission purposes; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge and work with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates to update the Cal-GETC standards to include guidance for allowing nutrition classes to be considered as courses eligible for Cal-GETC Subject Area 5B Biological Sciences.

---

[1] https://icas-ca.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Cal-GETC_Standards_1v0_2023.pdf
[2] https://icas-ca.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/Cal-GETC_Standards_1v2_2024.pdf

Contact: Solange Bushra Wasef, Palomar College, Area D

MSU

101.02 F24 Cal-GETC External Examination Credit for Cambridge International Assessments

Whereas, Cambridge International, known as a global educational program taught in English in 160 countries, is rapidly expanding across the United States, the National Student Clearinghouse reports hundreds of Cambridge International students in the U.S. enrolled in California postsecondary institutions, and thousands of international Cambridge students annually matriculate to California colleges and universities;

Whereas, AS Levels exams[3] are administered at the end of a one-year course of study comparable to an Advanced Placement exam, A Level exams correspond to two years of in-depth study in a subject, and Cambridge International AS and A Level exams allow students to validate college level learning outcomes comparable to formal educational settings, aligned with subject exams corresponding to general education transfer pathways, therefore making them deserving of recognition and unit credit in academic contexts;

Whereas, The California General Education Transfer Curriculum[4] (Cal-GETC) has not yet included Cambridge International AS and A Level exams[5] to fulfill transfer general education areas, and credit for prior learning is rigorously reviewed by external evaluators, with the American Council on Education National Guide[6] recommending credit for passing Cambridge International A and AS Level exams; and

Whereas, While University of California campuses recognize Singapore-Cambridge A levels, UCs still deny credit for Cambridge AS levels, exam grade thresholds vary, and without a current executive order for Cambridge credit from the California State University System, the CSU Office of the Chancellor, as noted in the CSU Policy Guide[7],,has recommended use of the ACE National Guide for awarding college credit based on prior learning assessment, and thereby students encounter inequitable credit opportunities and international students are increasingly aware that they can maximize the California community colleges' recognized pathways to successfully transfer to universities;

---

[3] https://www.cambridgeinternational.org/programmes-and-qualifications/cambridge-advanced/cambridge-international-as-and-a-levels/qualification/

[4] Cal-GETC Standards p. 18 https://icas-ca.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Cal-GETC_Standards_1v0_2023.pdf. Although the Cal-GETC Standards mentions Credit by Exam, it does not address other options for Cambridge International AS and A level exams.

[5] Cambridge AS and A level exams, https://www.cambridgeinternational.org/programmes-and-qualifications/cambridge-advanced/cambridge-international-as-and-a-levels/

[6] American Council on Education National Guide, https://www.acenet.edu/National-Guide/Pages/Organization.aspx?oid=51af64b0-6f0d-ea11-a811-000d3a3786fc

[7] See Article 4 of the California State University's Credit for Prior Learning Policy: https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/13630631/latest

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the faculty representatives of the University of California and the California State University through the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates to include the use of passing Cambridge International AS and A Level exam grades to meet requirements for the California General Education Transfer Curriculum.

Contact: Dave DeGroot, Allan Hancock College, Area C

MSC

101.03 F24 UC Transferability of English for Speakers of Other Languages Oral Communications Courses

Whereas, The University of California special regulations[8] for courses in specific subject areas allow for English as a Second Language (ESL) courses to be transferable to the UC as long as they are the "highest levels of ESL, which prepare students for transferable English composition";[9]

Whereas, The UC special regulations for courses in specific subject areas also summarily deny UC transferability for "courses that focus exclusively on listening, reading comprehension, or speaking (conversational) skills";

Whereas, The UC Transfer Articulation Regulations also state that "a course that is comparable to a lower-division course offered at one or more UC campuses"[10] is transferable, and UC Berkeley offers credit for lower division listening and speaking courses for ESL students through the College Writing Program, including ESL Listening and Speaking (College Writing 3H) and Academic and Public Speaking for Multilingual Students (College Writing 9R)[11]; and

Whereas, In light of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017)[12], there has been a push to increase completion and transfer rates for students in the ESL sequence, and research by the Public Policy Institute of California has shown that one of the highest impact reforms that colleges can make is to offer transferable ESL classes, increasing the likelihood that ESL students will complete transfer-level requirements by 16 to 20 percentage points;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request that the University of California update the University of California special regulations for courses in specific subject areas to remove language prohibiting articulation of ESOL/ESL advanced oral communication classes.

---

[8] https://www.ucop.edu/transfer-articulation/transferable-course-agreements/tca-policy/regulations-by-subject-area.html#e
[9] https://www.ucop.edu/transfer-articulation/transferable-course-agreements/tca-policy/regulations-by-subject-area.html#e
[10] https://www.ucop.edu/transfer-articulation/transferable-course-agreements/tca-policy/regulations-by-subject-area.html#e
[11] https://www.ucop.edu/transfer-articulation/transferable-course-agreements/tca-policy/regulations-by-subject-area.html#e
[12] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB705

Contact Leslie Blackie, Laney College

MSC

101.04 F24 No Implementation without Articulation: Safeguarding Student Success and Transfer Pathways in Future Common Course Numbering Phases

Whereas, Education Code §§ 66725-66725.5[13], established by Assembly Bill No. 1111 (Berman, 2021)[14], require the implementation of a student-facing Common Course Numbering (CCN) system across the California community colleges by July 1, 2027 to streamline transfer pathways, reduce excess credit accumulation, and strengthen equitable transfer and student success;

Whereas, The recent decision to require all six Phase 1 CCN courses to be submitted for Cal-GETC review—rather than only the CCN public speaking course (COMM C1000) as initially expected—introduces significant risks to established IGETC and Cal-GETC approvals, potentially disrupting transfer pathways for over one million community college students, undermining the core mission of the California Community Colleges, California State University, and University of California systems to provide accessible, streamlined education and creating confusion for students regarding the transferability of CCN courses;

Whereas, The current approach to CCN implementation, which requires the submission of potentially more than 1,000 courses across 115 colleges for Phase 1 articulation[15] with anticipated exponential increases in Phases 2 and 3[16], is administratively burdensome and may not align with the intended goals of AB 1111 to simplify the transfer process, particularly in the absence of guaranteed articulation agreements; and

Whereas, achieving true alignment between CCN and articulation requires careful coordination and engagement with the intersegmental articulation community, as failure to secure such alignment risks unintended consequences that could disrupt transfer pathways, create confusion, and ultimately harm students' educational progress and success, which would be directly antithetical to the mission of CCN;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges call for continued statewide collaboration on the development of Phase 2 and Phase 3 CCN course templates in an effort to meet mandated deadlines to implement CCN;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office that all future phases of Common Course

---

[13] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&sectionNum=66725.
[14] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1111
[15] If all 115 colleges submitted updates COR templates for each of the 6 identified courses and the honors course companions then 1,380 courses must be evaluated for articulation.
[16] Phase 2 has 23 courses identified with expected honors course companions, potentially 5,290 courses requiring articulation evaluation. Phase 3 is projected to include at least 50 courses which could lead to more than 10,000 courses requiring articulation approval.

Numbering (CCN)—including Phases 2, 3, and any subsequent phases—develop CCN course templates that secure intersegmental articulation agreements with system partners prior to local implementation in order to prevent unintended harm to students;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for an articulation-first approach to Common Course Numbering implementation, ensuring that any local modifications to curriculum and course numbering do not add unnecessary complexity to the transfer process or compromise existing articulation agreements; and

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges commit to ongoing collaboration with intersegmental partners, including CSU and UC stakeholders, to ensure that the implementation of Common Course Numbering serves the best interests of students and aligns with the core mission of California's public higher education systems.

Contact: Kelly Rivera, Mt. San Antonio College

MSC

101.05 F24 Delay Public-Facing Implementation of Common Course Numbering Until Transfer Agreements Are Established

Whereas, Assembly Bill 1111 (Berman 2021), enacted as Education Code §66725.5, mandates the adoption of a student-facing common course numbering system for all general education and transfer pathway courses by the California community colleges to streamline transfer processes and reduce excess credit accumulation by July 1, 2024, extended to July 1, 2027 by AB 3290 (Berman, 2024)[17];

Whereas, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) communication ESLEI 24-22 (April 15, 2024)[18] emphasized the goal of implementing "CCN in concert with a new vision for dramatically improved transfer and articulation across the state of California, supported by a resourced infrastructure for intersegmental faculty collaboration (including the California community colleges, UC [University of California], CSU [California State University], and AICCU [Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities])";

Whereas, CCCCO memo ESLEI 24-53 (September 6, 2024)[19] provided further guidance on the implementation process, emphasizing the importance of maximizing credit mobility for students, equitable transfer, and student success, detailing the need for a coordinated engagement of stakeholders including faculty, administrators, staff, and system officials to build

---

[17] AB 3290, Committee on Higher Education. Public postsecondary education. (September 2024). An act to amend Sections 66725.5 and 68075 of the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education. (Bill Text - AB-3290 Public postsecondary education.)
[18] CCCCO, ESLEI 24-22, April 15, 2024, Common Course Numbering Update (eslei-24-22-common-course-numbering-update-a11y.pdf)
[19] CCCCO ESLEI 24-53 Circular Guidance and Information for Common Course Numbering (CCN) System Implementation (Phase I) (eslei-24-53-curricular-guidance-and-information-for-ccn-system-implementation-phase-1-a11y.pdf)

cohesive academic plans and ensure that required courses transfer and apply to degree completion, and specifically noting that during the 2024–2025 Cal-GETC submission period, California community colleges would not submit revisions of the six Phase I courses to CSU or UC via ASSIST for review –except for the course now known as COMM C1000—but, instead, the CCCCO would provide revised course outlines to the UC and CSU system offices for use by the UC and CSU to test concepts and potentially revise articulation processes; and

Whereas, CCCCO Memo ESLEI 24-60 (October 24, 2024)[20] indicated a change in the guidance and clarified that CCN templates alone do not automatically confer specific articulation approval or general education approval with the CSU or UC as envisioned by the Common Course Numbering Task Force, and therefore submission and review of CORs for Cal-GETC in ASSIST would proceed as usual, with revisions to CCN Phase I courses needing to be submitted by December 2, 2024, for review for Fall 2025, which is likely to negatively impact student transfer when transferability and articulation varies between colleges and students encounter cases of courses not being recognized by UC and CSUs in the ways intended;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to explore the feasibility of delaying the public-facing implementation of all CCN courses, including those aligned with Phase I CCN course templates, until after articulation of the templates by CSU, UC, and independent colleges and universities is established or no later than July 1, 2027 as established by AB 3290.

Contact: Margarita Pillado, Los Angeles Pierce College, Area C

MSU

101.06 F24 Phase-Out Process for Courses that Lose Course-to-Course Articulation
Whereas, Two years is the assumed standard time for California community college students to complete their requirements for transfer to the California State University or University of California;

Whereas, A two-year phase-out period exists for courses that lose their University of California Transferable Course Agreement (UCTCA) or Cal-GETC articulations upon re-evaluation of existing articulations, but no similar phase-out process exists for courses required for course-to-course discipline or major preparation articulation that lose those articulations, which can delay students' transfer timelines and may necessitate completing major preparation courses after transfer, thereby affecting enrollment in preparatory courses at the University of California or California State University: and

Whereas, A two-year phase-out timeline allows California community college faculty the opportunity to continue to prepare students for transfer while revising a course outline of

---

[20] CCCCO ESLEI 24-60 COCI Submission Steps, Technological Updates and Taxonomy Parameters, Transition from TOP to CIP (eslei-24-60-coci-submission-steps-and-tech-updates-a11y.pdf)

record (COR) for re-review by a University of California or California State University campus that revokes course-to-course or major articulation and also simultaneously for other forms of articulation such as UC TCA, C-ID and Cal-GETC if re-review is also necessary after COR revision;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates to define system-wide two-year phase-out timelines for courses that lose course-to-course or major articulation at a California State University or University of California campus.

Contact: Eric Wada, ASCCC Executive Committee

MSC

101.07 F24 Use CCN Templates for CCC System Level Transferability and General Education (Cal-GETC) Review and Approval

Whereas, Current University of California transferability (UCTCA) and IGETC—soon to be Cal-GETC—review processes are dependent on submissions of individual course outlines of record from California community colleges, resulting in variances in approvals across the 115 credit-granting community colleges, which creates an array of UC transferability and general education approvals that at best is confusing to students and at worst causes students to take courses that do not satisfy the expected transfer or GE requirements because of the college at which a course was taken;

Whereas, The Common Course Numbering Task Force 2023 Report[21] sets a new vision for California Community Colleges system-level articulation to include "a framework for which course elements must be identical or equivalent for a course to be numbered the same with consistent transferability and applicability" (p. 4); and

Whereas, The vision for consistent transferability and applicability can only be achieved with a shift from individual college course outlines of record as the documents being reviewed to the Common Course Numbering course templates as the system-level document being reviewed, a change that can only be accomplished if the California State University and University of California agree to update their transferability and articulation policies and processes and by independent college and universities agreeing to do the same for their policies and processes;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, through the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, request California State University and University of California academic senate leaders work with their system leadership to update transferability and articulation policies and processes to rely upon Common Course Numbering course templates, when available, for system-level review and approval of coursework from California community colleges; and

---

[21] https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Agendas/ab1111-summary-report-oct2023-final-draft-a11y.pdf

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge faculty and administrators at independent colleges and universities to work with their institutional leadership to update articulation policies and processes to rely upon Common Course Numbering course templates, when available, for system-level review and approval of coursework from California Community Colleges.

Contact: Cheryl Aschenbach, ASCCC Executive Committee

MSC

101.08 F24 Develop Clear Guidelines for Transferability and Articulation Processes

Whereas, The processes and criteria for system-level transferability and general education submission, review, and approval are unclear, as demonstrated by the inconsistent articulation results for ethnic studies courses, where many were denied approval for California State University Area F, highlighting inconsistencies in applying expected standards;

Whereas, Processes for transferability and articulation of California community college courses to the individual institutions of the California State University, University of California, and independent colleges and universities are inconsistent, with wide variance of required elements within the course outline of record expected across universities and departments; and

Whereas, A consistent and clear process for transferability and articulation with system partners could help streamline the articulation process and benefit students by providing more course options that satisfy general education and major preparation requirements;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates and other system partners to develop clear guidelines for transferability and articulation processes to provide more consistency for general education, course to course, and major preparation articulation;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates and the Cal-GETC Standards Subcommittee to develop a technical guide that overviews the Cal-GETC review cycle, reviewer training process, review process, and reviewer criteria for denying a course; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge that the California State University Chancellor's Office and University of California Office of the President use the Cal-GETC technical guide developed by the Cal-GETC Standards Subcommittee during the annual Cal-GETC submission and review cycle.

Contact: Erik D. Reese, ASCCC Executive Committee

MSU

104 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

104.01 F24 Strengthening Systemic Support for the Early Childhood Education and Education Sector in Alignment with Vision 2030

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Vision 2030 report[22] has prioritized the Early Childhood Education (ECE) and Education (EDU) sector, recognizing its vital role in improving socio-economic mobility for all Californians;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges unanimously passed the resolution "Prioritizing System Support for the ECE/EDU Education and Human Development Sector" in Spring 2021[23], establishing a strong foundation for addressing workforce shortages and improving educational outcomes, yet challenges still exist, such as persistent workforce shortages[24] and resource gaps[25], highlighting the need for additional systemic support;

Whereas, Vision 2030 emphasizes the need for flexible workforce training, apprenticeship development, and industry partnerships, which are essential to creating pathways to high-skill, high-wage job opportunities for diverse communities, underscoring the necessity for robust technical assistance and training to effectively implement these initiatives; and

Whereas, A critical need[26] exists for additional Regional Supplemental Instruction (RSI) funds to support the creation of non-traditional early childhood education/education programs apprenticeships, which will expand access to training and resources for a wider range of participants, including those in underserved communities[27];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for enhanced systemic support and resources, including opportunities for faculty professional learning such as workshops, webinars, and collaborative training sessions, to further strengthen program impact, enhancing the ability to support students and adapt to evolving industry needs;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for increased systemic funding for the development and implementation of effective early childhood education/education programs, as well as the establishment of Technical Assistance Providers to provide essential guidance and expertise so that programs meet evolving workforce demands and align with state economic and educational goals; and

---

[22] https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/report/Vision-2030-A-Roadmap-for-California-Community-Colleges.pdf

[23] https://asccc.org/resolutions/prioritizing-system-support-eceedu-education-and-human-development-sector

[24] https://coeccc.net/bay-area/2023/10/sector-profile-education/

[25] https://www.ccdaily.com/2021/10/community-colleges-step-into-teacher-ed-breach/

[26] https://www.dir.ca.gov/DAS/e-News/2022/Five-Point-Action-Plan.pdf

[27] https://cscce.berkeley.edu/workforce-index-2024/state-policies-to-improve-early-childhood-educator-jobs/early-childhood-educator-workforce-policies/qualifications-educational-supports/

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges collaborate with the California Community College Chancellor's Office to actively promote equitable access to apprenticeship opportunities for historically underrepresented populations in early childhood education/education programs by advocating for focused outreach initiatives, providing resources for equitable program design, and supporting innovative teaching methods, including generative AI, to enhance learning experiences and improve educational outcomes.

Contact: Matthew Freeman, Berkeley City College

MSU

105 STUDENT PREPARATION AND SUCCESS

105.01 F24 Investigate Academic Renewal Policies

Whereas, Academic renewal policies and procedures can alleviate some substandard grades for clear educational purposes[28], such as when a student's past academic performance does not reflect the student's recent academic performance, and academic renewal policies and procedures exist to, for example, help students re-attain good standing for academic progress or financial aid eligibility or to gain readmission to a community college;

Whereas, Title 5 §55046[29] requires each community college district to develop academic renewal policies and procedures but leaves flexibility for local variation in the maximum amount of coursework that may be alleviated, the amount of coursework completed with a 2.00 GPA to be completed subsequent to the alleviated coursework, and the length of time elapsed since the coursework to be alleviated was recorded;

Whereas, District policies and procedures on academic renewal vary among California community colleges and therefore create differences in access to and the educational standards of the colleges; and

Whereas, Academic renewal policies and procedures are an academic and professional matter under Title 5 §53200(c)(3) grading policies[30];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges survey district academic renewal policies with a focus on the maximum number of units that can be alleviated, the amount of coursework with a 2.00 GPA to be completed subsequent to the alleviated coursework, and the length of time elapsed since the coursework to be alleviated was recorded and report on the results by Fall 2025; and

---

[28]https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I628AE6B34C6911EC93A8000D3A7C4BC3?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=(sc.Default)&bhcp=1
[29] https://www.law.cornell.edu/regulations/california/5-CCR-55046
[30] https://casetext.com/regulation/california-code-of-regulations.title-5-education.division-6-california-community-colleges.chapter-4-employees.subchapter-3-certificated-positions.article-2-academic-senates.section-53200-definitions

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local and district academic senates to evaluate their academic renewal policies and procedures' criteria for renewal and determine whether they are grounded in educational purposes as defined locally.

Contact: Jacqueline Stahlke, ASCCC Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Committee

MSU

105.02 F24 Encouraging Funding for Printing Lab Manuals to Achieve Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) Status

Whereas, Title 5 §59404[31] of the California Code of Regulations mandates that districts take reasonable steps to minimize the cost and ensure the necessity of instructional materials, and the Burden-Free Instructional Materials Task Force has recommended structural changes to reduce instructional materials costs for students in the long term;

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Board of Governors and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges have consistently supported efforts to decrease the cost of instructional materials for students, emphasizing the importance of sustainable solutions[32] to achieve Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) status[33] while preserving faculty's right to select appropriate instructional materials (F23 17.01[34], S22 03.03[35]);

Whereas, The Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges recognizes open educational resources as the preferred and most sustainable mechanism for eliminating course costs but acknowledges that, in some cases, tangible instructional materials like printed lab manuals are necessary to achieve ZTC status (F21 03.05[36]); and

Whereas, The implementation of ZTC courses can be hindered by the cost of printing lab manuals that may be necessary for safety and practical reasons, which may be the only barrier to achieving ZTC status for certain courses;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to work with their administrative colleagues to allocate funds to cover the printing costs of lab manuals when such costs are the only barrier to a course achieving Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) status, thereby supporting students' access to affordable instructional materials and facilitating the broader adoption of ZTC courses.

Contact: Michelle Pilati, Rio Hondo College, Area C

---

[31] https://www.law.cornell.edu/regulations/california/5-CCR-59404
[32] https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/ensure-sustainability-zero-textbook-cost-degree-program
[33] https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/textbook-automatic-billing-concerns
[34] https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/sustainability-and-institutionalization-zero-textbook-cost-pathway-efforts
[35] https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/oppose-reliance-textbook-publishers-achieve-zero-textbook-cost
[36] https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/zero-means-zero-textbook-cost

MSU

105.03 F24 Encouraging Transparency and Eliminating Automatic Billing Practices in Course Material Access

Whereas, Publishers and bookstore vendors have introduced programs that require students to pay a per unit fee for course resources and refer to these automatic billing programs with deceptive names such as "inclusive," "equitable," or "first day" access although the costs of the program may exceed the actual costs of the required resources, misleading students to believe they are saving money or putting the burden on the students to opt out of the arrangement if it is not financially beneficial;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges opposes the use of automatic billing strategies and other approaches that maintain reliance upon commercial publishers (F22 17.02[37]) and encourages faculty and colleges to carefully consider the impact of such programs and recognize that while they may address immediate student needs, they may not work in students' long-term interest (F19 09.06[38]);

Whereas, California community colleges are required by law to mark their sections that have no textbooks costs (California Education Code 66406.9[39]), and all California community colleges have received Zero Textbook Cost Program funds to increase the availability of course sections with no textbook costs, yet no course section is truly zero cost when students are automatically billed for their course resources; and

Whereas, College-wide automatic billing programs that require students to opt-out establish a system that requires students to act in order for a course section to be no-cost.

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage faculty and colleges to use the term "automatic billing" in lieu of euphemisms such as "inclusive," "equitable," or "first day" access; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request that the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office require that course sections that have no textbook cost be excluded from automatic billing programs.

Contact: Michelle Pilati, Rio Hondo College, Area C

---

[37] https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/textbook-automatic-billing-concerns
[38] https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/consider-implications-publisher-developed-lower-cost-%E2%80%9Cinclusive-access%E2%80%9D-strategies
[39] https://casetext.com/statute/california-codes/california-education-code/title-3-postsecondary-education/division-5-general-provisions/part-40-donahoe-higher-education-act/chapter-6-academic-materials/section-664069-operative-712024-highlighting-course-materials-available-free-of-charge#:~:text=2024%20Legislative%20Session.-,Section%2066406.9%20%2D%20%5BOperative%207%2F1%2F2024%5D%20Highlighting,Clearly%20highlight%2C%20by%20means%20that

MSC

105.04 F24 Acknowledge Extended Opportunity Programs and Services' 55 Years of Student Success

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

Whereas, EOPS 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 to achieve their educational objectives and goals"[40];

Whereas, EOPS is a categorical program whose funds are intended to support students who are underserved, are educationally and economically disadvantaged, and often are first-generation college students and whose monies have been restricted to protect funding to serve these students[41]; and

Whereas, EOPS has demonstrated its long-term success with a statewide retention rate of 88%, a statewide completion rate of 81%, which is consistently the highest of any large-scale student support program, and EOPS is present at 116 California Community Colleges, with EOPS having served more than 86,843 students statewide in the latest academic year in which complete data is available[42];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges congratulate Extended Opportunity Programs and Services on its 55 years of serving students;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the integrity of Extended Opportunity Programs and Services by affirming that their categorical funds should be used exclusively to serve EOPS students in accordance with to Title 5; and

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

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

ACCLAMATION

---

[40] https://casetext.com/statute/california-codes/california-education-code/title-3-postsecondary-education/division-5-general-provisions/part-42-student-financial-aid-program/chapter-2-student-financial-aid-programs/article-8-community-college-extended-opportunity-programs-and-services/section-69640-legislative-intent
[41] https://casetext.com/regulation/california-code-of-regulations/title-5-education/division-6-california-community-colleges/chapter-7-special-programs/subchapter-25-extended-opportunity-programs-and-services
[42] https://datamart.cccco.edu/datamart.aspx

Whereas**,** The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office definition[43] of "highly unlikely to succeed" for mathematics courses has changed between the implementation of Assembly Bill 705 (Irwin, 2017) and Assembly Bill 1705 (Irwin, 2022), specifically in that the most recent AB 1705 guidance memorandum[44] establishes a low 15% throughput rate for Calculus 1, while also setting a significantly higher benchmark for any local alternative requiring transfer level preparatory courses;

Whereas, Research from the National Center for Education Statistics[45] indicates that approximately 30% of students change their majors and academic pathways, which highlights the necessity of offering preparatory courses that support diverse student needs and pathways, particularly for students transitioning into STEM fields, and illustrates that using throughput as a measure of success for STEM pathway students can lead to a misinterpretation of the data;

Whereas**,** The RP Group's analysis in the report[46] titled *Preparatory Pathways and STEM Calculus Completion* is used to justify the most recent AB 1705 guidance, and the report concludes, "No group was deemed highly unlikely to succeed in STEM Calculus 1 when directly enrolled and given two years, regardless of high school GPA or math preparation"; and

Whereas, The California State University Math Council has echoed concerns in a resolution[47] advocating for the University of California and the California State University to jointly commission a comprehensive peer review of RP Group data analysis used by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office;

Resolved**,** That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to revise the definition and threshold of "highly unlikely to succeed";

Resolved**,** That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office reconsideration of throughput as a metric of success as outlined in AB 1705 STEM pathway guidance;

---

[43] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and ASCCC. FAQ on AB 705 (2018). https://c-id.net/cms-uploads/cms/AB705_FAQ_030218.pdf
[44] Ibid.
[45] National Center for Education Statistics. Beginning College Students Who Change Their Majors Within 3 Years of Enrollment. (December 2017). https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2018/2018434/index.asp
[46] California Community Colleges, in Partnership with RP Group. (Updated June 2024). Updated Preparatory Pathways and STEM Calculus Completion. https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/MultipleMeasures/AB705_Workshops/PreparatoryPathwaysSTEMCalcCompletion_February2024.pdf?ver=2024-02-23-070133-477
[47] CSU Math Council Resolution Regarding the Implementation of Assembly Bill 1705 as it Pertains to STEM Major Academic Preparation. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1eixVznsGx-ya7vPiRdOufiVS8DaERXQF/view

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request a comprehensive audit of the data and evidence[48] used to establish AB 1705 guidance, including access to the RP Group's Multiple Measures Assessment Project raw data including the context of the local placement method applied; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request reevaluation of data using validation processes that re-define students in the low-STEM preparatory category as those who have never taken trigonometry, precalculus, or calculus courses, regardless of GPA.

Contact: Tina Akers-Porter, Modesto Junior College

MSU

105.06 F24 Negative Impacts on Equity and Inclusion in Relation to California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Guidance on AB 1705

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is committed to upholding the principles of academic freedom, shared governance, equity, and inclusion as well as transparency within the California Community Colleges system;

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office AB 1705 guidance memorandum ESLEI 24-15[49] establishes a validation standard on preparatory courses for STEM Calculus 1 and states that none of the 115 California community colleges were able to attain validation, and the guidance for implementing AB 1705 (Irwin, 2022)[50] exceeds both the requirements and intent of the legislation;

Whereas, A recent California State University Math Council Resolution[51] raises serious concerns about the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office AB 1705 implementation guidance, noting that requiring students who have not completed STEM preparatory coursework to enroll directly in Calculus 1 could harm STEM enrollment and jeopardize students' academic and career pathways; and

Whereas, The impact of the validation criteria for preparatory STEM Calculus 1 courses will diminish California community college students' equitable access to math preparatory courses

---

[48] California Community Colleges, in Partnership with RP Group. (Updated June 2024). Updated Preparatory Pathways and STEM Calculus Completion. https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/MultipleMeasures/AB705_Workshops/PreparatoryPathwaysSTEMCalcCompletion_February2024.pdf?ver=2024-02-23-070133-477

[49] Chancellor's Office. ESLEI Memo 24-15. https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/memo/ESLEI-2415-AB-1705-Validation-of-Equitable-Placement-Support-and-Completion-Practices-for-STEM-Progr.pdf?la=en&hash=60D9524BAD2695B8D34252BFFDA8CF8F4805F197&hash=60D9524BAD2695B8D34252BFFDA8CF8F4805F197

[50] California Education Code 78213. https://codes.findlaw.com/ca/education-code/edc-sect-78213/

[51] CSU Math Council Resolution

for STEM Calculus 1, while California State University and University of California students have opportunities to enroll in these courses;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to ensure that transfer-level math preparatory courses for STEM Calculus 1 be permitted at the California community colleges as written in California Education Code 78213 (f)(1)[52], validated in alignment with Chancellor's Office Guidelines for Title 5 Section 55003(f)[53].

Contact: Tina Akers-Porter, Modesto Junior College

MSU

108 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

108.01 F24 Selecting and Evaluating Artificial Intelligence for Faculty Use

Whereas, The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in education is rapidly expanding, influencing various aspects of teaching and learning and creating a need for clear guidelines to ensure ethical and effective use for faculty and in the guidelines they establish for students;

Whereas, Faculty across the California Community Colleges system have expressed a growing interest in AI and its potential applications in the classroom, as evidenced by increased participation in Academic Senate for California Community Colleges webinars and discussions on the topic as well as California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office webinars and trainings; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has previously recognized the importance of addressing AI in education through Resolution SP23 13.05[54], which called for "prioritizing the development of resources addressing artificial intelligence and its implications on education and academic integrity, [and to] develop a framework for local colleges to use in developing academic and professional policies";

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) assert that methods, guidelines, standards, and tools for determining the use of AI are academic and professional matters and that the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office must rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the ASCCC when making determinations regarding tool selection and policy decisions;

---

[52] California Education Code 78213(f)(1). https://codes.findlaw.com/ca/education-code/edc-sect-78213/
[53] Chancellor's Office. Guidelines for Title 5 Section 550003 (2012). https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/About-Us/Divisions/Educational-Services-and-Support/Academic-Affairs/What-we-do/Curriculum-and-Instruction-Unit/Files/Prerequisites_Guidelines_55003-Final_pdf.pdf
[54] ASCCC. Resolution SP23 13.05. https://asccc.org/resolutions/considering-merits-and-faults-artificial-intelligence-community-college-classroom

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop criteria for evaluating AI tools for potential use in pilot projects by faculty, considering aspects such as ethical use, impact on teaching and learning, and alignment with academic integrity standards; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges disseminate these criteria to local academic senates, provide guidance on the implementation of pilot projects involving AI, and facilitate professional development opportunities to support faculty in understanding and utilizing AI effectively by fall 2025.

Contact: Julie Bruno, Sierra College

MSU

109 PROGRAM REVIEW

109.01 F24 Update the 2009 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Paper "Program Review: Setting a Standard" to reflect ACCJC 2023 Standards

Whereas, Processes for program review are established as an academic and professional matter in Title 5 §53200[55], indicating the role and involvement of faculty in the self-study and improvement process;

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) adopted updated 2024 standards[56] resulting in program review being referenced as a source of evidence to support Standard 1, Standard 2, and Standard 3 rather than explicitly outlined as a requirement as it was in the ACCJC 2014 standards[57];

Whereas, Local academic senates and faculty members may require support to maintain faculty involvement in the processes for program review due to the less explicit language in the ACCJC'S 2024 standards; and

Whereas, The most recent paper on Program Review by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, titled *Program Review: Setting a Standard*[58], was adopted in 2009 and is based on the ACCJC's 2014 standards and thus does not reflect the more recently adopted ACCJC standards of 2024;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update its 2009 *Program Review: Setting a Standard* paper to reflect language of the updated Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges 2024 standard in order to reinforce the role of faculty in program review processes; and

---

[55] https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I604256434C6911EC93A8000D3A7C4BC3?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=(sc.Default)

[56] https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/ACCJC-2024-Accreditation-Standards.pdf

[57] https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Accreditation-Standards_-Adopted-June-2014.pdf

[58] https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Program-review-spring09_0.pdf

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide resources reflecting the updated Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges 2024 standards to support local academic senates and faculty in asserting their role and effectively engaging in the program review process by spring 2026.

Contact: Davena Burns-Peters, San Bernardino Valley College, Area D

MSU

111 ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

111.01 F24 Update the ASCCC Paper, "The Role of Counseling Faculty and the Delivery of Counseling Services in the California Community Colleges"

Whereas, The COVID-19 pandemic fundamentally shaped how counseling and student services faculty provide support for students through the increased use of technology to serve students both in-person and remotely and increased the need to address mental health issues among college-aged students through trauma-informed care[59];

Whereas, The California Legislature has enacted AB 705 (2017, Irwin)[60] and AB 1705 (2021, Irwin)[61], which have impacted counseling roles and practices regarding advisement of students regarding placement for math, English, and English as a Second Language;

Whereas, California community colleges have adopted the guided pathways framework[62] and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office has developed and adopted Vision 2030[63] to close equity gaps and meet California's workforce needs, increasing the need for counselors to use varied strategies to support disproportionately impacted student groups such as African American/Black, Latinx/e, undocumented, system impacted, Foster Youth, LGBTQIA, and Native American; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community College's paper *The Role of Counseling Faculty and the Delivery of Counseling Services in the California Community Colleges*[64] has not been updated since 2012;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update the paper *The Role of Counseling Faculty and the Delivery of Counseling Services in California Community Colleges* to include equitable practices in counseling regarding course placement, educational planning, appropriate roles for paraprofessionals and faculty advisors, the use of online counseling and technological tools for delivering counseling services, the adoption of guided pathways, increased focus on career counseling, trauma-informed practices in providing crisis

---

[59] https://www.cccstudentmentalhealth.org/
[60] https://codes.findlaw.com/ca/education-code/edc-sect-78213/
[61] https://legiscan.com/CA/text/AB1705/id/2609099
[62] https://www.cccco.edu/College-Professionals/Guided-Pathways
[63] https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Vision-2030
[64] https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/CounselingS12_0.pdf

counseling, and the practice of case management to support student's basic needs by spring 2026.

Contact: Jacqueline Stahlke, ASCCC Transfer, Articulation, and Student Services Committee

MSU

111.02 F24 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Rules Revision

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Rules outline election procedures for the Executive Committee, procedures for filling vacancies on the Executive Committee, term limits for the Executive Committee, responsibilities of Executive Committee officers, the relationship between the Academic Senate Foundation and the Executive Committee, and the process for forming, amending, and deleting ASCCC standing committees, task forces, workgroups, and ad hoc groups;

Whereas, The ASCCC Standards and Practices Committee reviewed and revised the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Rules to ensure that they were consistent with all applicable laws, ASCCC policies and procedures, and prior adopted ASCCC resolutions; and

Whereas, The proposed revisions to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Rules were approved by the ASCCC Executive Committee at the June 2024 Executive Committee meeting, were distributed to member academic senates in advance of the Fall 2024 pre-plenary session area meetings, and were discussed during a breakout at the Fall 2024 Plenary Session;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) adopt the revised ASCCC Rules[65] and that the revised ASCCC Rules take effect immediately following their approval.

Contact: Christopher Howerton, ASCCC Executive Committee

MSU

111.03 F24 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Bylaws Revision

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) is a 501(c)(6) nonprofit organization that is required to follow nonprofit laws and California Corporations Code, and the ASCCC Bylaws serve as a foundational legal document that outlines the structure of the organization and provides an operational framework to comply with those laws;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Standards and Practices Committee was tasked to review the ASCCC Bylaws in 2022, in consultation with legal counsel, to ensure that they were consistent with previously adopted resolutions, incorporated practices enacted since the COVID pandemic, clarified language throughout to distinguish local

---

[65] [Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Rules Revision](#)

academic senates from the ASCCC, clarified language pertaining to the relationship of the ASCCC Executive Director to the ASCCC Board of Directors, moved duties and responsibilities of board officers to the ASCCC Rules document, and specified the threshold necessary for the ASCCC Rules to be changed by resolution at an ASCCC Plenary Session; and

Whereas, The proposed revisions to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Bylaws were approved by the Executive Committee at the June 2024 Executive Committee meeting, were distributed to member academic senates in advance of the Fall 2024 pre-plenary session area meetings, and were discussed during a breakout at the ASCCC Fall 2024 Plenary Session;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) adopt the revised ASCCC Bylaws[66] and that the revised ASCCC Bylaws take effect immediately following their approval.

Contact: Christopher Howerton, ASCCC Executive Committee

MSU

111.04 F24 Open Educational Resources and Publication Date

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges supports removing the requirement of an international standard book number (ISBN) and a copyright date from all curriculum and articulation processes when open educational resources are specified[67];

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges was directed by Resolution 22F 09.01[68] to work with all appropriate statewide entities that establish textbook-related policies and requirements that impact the California community colleges to remove any requirements that act as barriers to the use of open educational resources; and

Whereas, ASSIST requires that a year be provided on textbooks when courses are submitted for articulation, and the University of California Transfer Course Agreement guidelines state that "textbooks must be dated within seven years of the course submission date or clearly identified as a 'Classic text' in the course outline of record," yet editable open educational resources can be modified at any time; and

Whereas, Both the APA[69] and MLA[70] style guides recommend the date an electronic resource was accessed or retrieved be used when no publication date is available;

---

[66] [Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Bylaws Revision](#)
[67] ASCCC. Resolution 22F 09.01. https://asccc.org/resolutions/removing-barriers-adoption-open-educational-resources
[68] Ibid.
[69] American Psychological Association. Webpage on Website References. https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/references/examples/webpage-website-references
[70] Columbia College. LibGuides: MLA Citation Guide. https://columbiacollege-ca.libguides.com/MLA9/websites

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage colleges to establish policies or practices that recognize the date of last access as the date of publication for an editable open educational resource that does not provide a publication or last updated date.

Contact: Michelle Pilati, Rio Hondo College

MSU

111.05 F24 Senator Emeritus for Sharyn Eveland

Whereas, Sharyn Eveland served in various capacities for the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, such as Educational Policies Committee member, Standards and Practices Committee member, and Accreditation Committee member, authored *Rostrum* articles on practices supporting students, and served on multiple Chancellor Office committees;

Whereas, Sharyn recognized and elevated quality programs at many colleges while serving on multiple peer review teams for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges;

Whereas, Sharyn was never shy about speaking at Area A meetings, always welcomed newcomers to the dynamic, and could always be counted on to thoughtfully and thoroughly offer resolutions and amendments to resolutions to support students throughout the system; and

Whereas, Sharyn was an outstanding psychology professor, academic senate resident, and collaborator with her ever-transitioning Taft College administrators and could always be found in her leather bomber jacket and stylin' hats, or, of course, fishing in her happy place;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, together with Sharyn Eveland's Area A colleagues and past students, recognize that she is one of the lucky ones enjoying retirement and wish her the best in her future with wife Sharon and daughter Olivia; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges confer upon Sharyn Eveland its highest honor of senator emeritus and thank her for her contributions to the faculty and students of the California community colleges.

Contact: Victoria Jacobi, Taft College

ACCLAMATION

111.06 F24 Clarify the Rules Around Special Elections

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Rules on special elections are sparse and vague; and

Whereas, Clear rules and procedures are necessary for a fair and equitable election process and to support the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Strategic Plan Direction of "Embracing Organizational Change"[71];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update its Rules to clarify the special elections rules and procedures.

Contact: RJ Dolbin, Irvine Valley College

MSU

113 LEGISLATION AND ADVOCACY

113.01 F24 Legislative Advocacy to Restore Student Choice on English and Math Courses

Whereas, California Education Code §78213[72], as revised in 2022 by AB 1705 (Irwin), prohibits community college districts from enrolling students in pretransfer-level English and mathematics courses and enrolling STEM majors in mathematics courses below Calculus 1 unless the college can demonstrate better aggregate results in one-year throughput for those courses without consideration of whether individual students may want the option to take the courses, effectively banning access to academic subjects such as algebra for community college students;

Whereas, California Education Code §78213, as revised in 2022 by AB 1705 (Irwin), prevents community colleges from offering the prohibited courses to students who are not succeeding in the one-year throughput metric without consideration of whether such students would like the option of taking such courses, whether community colleges had other success data metrics to support the value of the courses, or whether CSU and UC faculty from the affected disciplines expect the additional preparation students receive from the courses;

Whereas, California Education Code §78213, as revised in 2022 by AB 1705 (Irwin), does not account for students who may feel so excluded by being forced to take transfer-level English or mathematics or, for STEM majors, transfer-level Calculus that they are opting to drop before census or to not enroll altogether, which contradicts the shared goal of all public educational institutions in California "to provide educational opportunity and success to the broadest possible range of our citizens" as specified in California Education Code §66010.2[73]; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has long expressed concerns that the ability of community colleges to serve all students has been threatened by the implementation of AB 705 and AB 1705[74];

---

[71]https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I61F3AFC34C6911EC93A8000D3A7C4BC3?viewType=FullText&origination Context=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=(sc.Default)

[72] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&sectionNum=78213

[73] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&sectionNum=66010.2

[74] See the following ASCCC resolutions:
F23 07.04 AB 1705 Meaningful Metrics for Equitable Outcomes

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for revisions to California Education Code §78213 to allow community college districts to offer pre-transfer level English and mathematics courses and, for STEM majors, mathematics courses below Calculus so that students will have the choice of taking those courses when the course are requested by students, local college data supports the value of the courses irrespective of one-year throughput, or CSU and UC faculty from the affected disciplines recommend the additional preparation students receive from such courses.

Contact: Jeffrey Hernandez, Los Angeles Community College District, Area C

MSU

113.02 F24 Designating an Official Native American Holiday for the California Community College System

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognizes the importance of acknowledging and honoring the original inhabitants of the land upon which California's community colleges stand;

Whereas, A Native American holiday would serve to honor the histories, cultures, and contributions of the original inhabitants of what is now California, providing an opportunity to reflect on the historical and ongoing struggles of indigenous peoples and to celebrate their resilience and strength;

Whereas, The establishment of a Native American holiday aligns with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges commitment to inclusion, diversity, equity, anti-racism, and accessibility and would demonstrate a commitment to honoring indigenous peoples and promoting understanding of their cultures; and

Whereas, Modesto Junior College, Santa Rosa Junior College, and Palomar College already close in observance of Native American Day alongside strong student support for broader recognition of this important holiday;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request that the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office work with Indigenous communities, the California Community Colleges system stakeholders, and the California Legislature to advocate

---

F22 07.11 Determining When Pre-transfer English and Mathematics Meets the Needs of a Defined Student Population
S22 06.03 Upholding the California Community College Mission – Oppose AB 1705 (Irwin, 2022) as of April 9, 2022 Unless Amended
S22 06.04 Students' Right to Choose to Take a Pre-Transfer Level English or Mathematics Course
S22 06.05 Regarding Chancellor's Office Student Enrollment Data in AB 1705 (Irwin, 2022)
F19 09.09 Ensuring Access and Opportunity for Success for All Students Through AB 705 (Irwin, 2017) Implementation

for designation of an official Native American holiday for the California Community Colleges system.

Contact: Nicholas Petti, Mendocino College

ACCLAMATION

114 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLORS OFFICE

114.01 F24 Support for Faculty for Implementation of AB 1111 Guidance

Whereas, The California Legislature passed AB 1111 (Berman) in 2021[75], directing California community colleges to adopt a student-facing, common course numbering (CCN) system in order to "streamline transfer from two- to four-year postsecondary educational institutions and reduce excess credit (unit) accumulation," a mandate that the AB 1111 steering committee recognized as introducing challenges for a system that mandated common course numbering but not common articulation, leading the committee to recommend that a number of additional curricular elements be aligned along with course prefixes and numbers, sometimes in opposition to faculty requests and recommendations;

Whereas, Phase I of implementation of the CCN system began in spring 2024, with course templates being made available in September 2024 and with a due date for submission identified as December 1, 2024 and an effective date of fall 2025, demonstrating a lack of consideration for established curriculum timelines and processes at California community colleges and for the ramifications these updates may have on ASSIST and Cal-GETC updates in addition to the additional stress on a system already burdened by required updates from AB 928 (Berman), AB 705 (Irwin), AB 1705 (Irwin), and new ethnic studies requirements;

Whereas, Practical considerations regarding the CCN system have arisen, including technological challenges with curriculum, catalog, and scheduling systems, questions with respect to maintaining articulation agreements, and other local concerns at individual colleges, including but not limited to local numbering practices, quarter versus semester system course topic distribution, multi-college districts that may require layers of vetting, and numerous questions about academic freedom, vastly complicating an already complex implementation plan; and

Whereas, Funding[76] has been provided to assist with AB 1111 updates along with guidance that clearly identifies the work involved in "aligning existing course curricula to the CCN system" as one of the items the fund may be allocated for;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, system partners, and the legislature as necessary to provide for additional time to review, reflect on, and implement course templates for common

---

[75] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1111
[76] https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/memo/eslei-24-55-ccn-implementation-allocation-a11y.pdf?la=en&hash=B22CCD432C315F1B2BA70FF0B89DB1E92A395DE8

course numbering to ensure that systemwide articulation with CSU and UC will be able to be implemented within the anticipated and expected timeframe of AB 1111; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and system partners to advocate for additional funding for implementation and continued efforts to make required updates for the Common Course Numbering system.

Contact: Mary Pape, De Anza College, Area B

MSU

114.02 F24 Work Experience Education Course Repeatability

Whereas, The California Internship and Work Experience Association worked with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office regarding changes to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations regarding work experience education; and

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office stated in Memorandum ESS 23-49[77] that Title 5 "section 58161 … authorizes districts to claim apportionment 'without limitation' for students 'enrolled in work-experience education' … [and] work experience education is repeatable as dictated by local district policy," yet Title 5 §58161 only addresses apportionment and does not address repeatability;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to align the language regarding the repeatability of work experience education courses and other repeatable courses by adding an additional point to §55041(a) of the California Code of Regulations that would read, "(4) Work Experience Education courses, as defined in section 55252."[78]

Contact: Ashley Young, Las Positas College, Area B

MSU

114.03 F24 Encroachment on Academic and Professional Matters Due to California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Guidance on AB 1705

Whereas, Title 5 §53200[79] and §53206[80] authorize the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges to provide California community college faculty with a formal and effective

---

[77] https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/curriculum/ESS-23-49-Work-Experience-Education-Regulations-Clarification-Regarding-Repeatability.pdf

[78] https://casetext.com/regulation/california-code-of-regulations/title-5-education/division-6-california-community-colleges/chapter-6-curriculum-and-instruction/subchapter-1-programs-courses-and-classes/article-4-course-repetition-and-academic-renewal/section-55041-repeatable-courses

[79] https://casetext.com/regulation/california-code-of-regulations.title-5-education.division-6-california-community-colleges.chapter-4-employees.subchapter-3-certificated-positions.article-2-academic-senates.section-53200-definitions

[80] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&sectionNum=53206

mechanism for participating in the development of state policies on academic and professional matters and to serve as the representative of the faculty within the system;

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office's February 2024 guidance[81] set limits on the maximum number of units allowed for preparatory courses without reaching consensus with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, resulting in directions that conflict with established C-ID standards and previous guidance that did not restrict units as indicted in the December 2022 Guidance Memo [82]and March 2023 Implementation Guide[83];

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office's timeline for the removal of transfer level preparatory courses for STEM Calculus 1 does not provide sufficient time to collect relevant data, implement thoughtful curricular design, or achieve articulation with four-year institutions; and

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office's February 2024 memo[84] stated the following: "At no college were the Lowest STEM Placement students highly unlikely to succeed with direct enrollment into STEM Calculus 1 (using a throughput of 15% as the definition of 'highly unlikely')," invalidating all current transfer level preparatory courses for STEM Calculus 1:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) reaffirm primacy in curricular matters as defined in Title 5 §53200 and §53206 and encourage the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to continue to consult with the ASCCC in updating future guidance for AB1705 implementation;

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges express its strong opposition to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office guidance on AB1705 with respect to preparatory courses for STEM Calculus 1 including restrictions on course development, validating prerequisites, and establishing maximum units; and

[81] https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/memo/ESLEI-2415-AB-1705-Validation-of-Equitable-Placement-Support-and-Completion-Practices-for-STEM-Progr.pdf?la=en&hash=60D9524BAD2695B8D34252BFFDA8CF8F4805F197&hash=60D9524BAD2695B8D34252BFFDA8CF8F4805F197

[82] Chancellor's Office. ESS Memo 22-400-009. December 2022. https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/ab705/ess22400009ab1705implementation122322a11y.pdf

[83] Chancellor's Office. AB 1705 Implementation Guide. https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/ab705/ab-1705-implementation-guide-11-30-23-a11y.pdf?la=en&hash=0B8CD769C64A1553279A9C12FE2BB65ED86B07C0

[84] Chancellor's Office. ESLEI Memo 24-15 (February 2024). https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/memo/ESLEI-2415-AB-1705-Validation-of-Equitable-Placement-Support-and-Completion-Practices-for-STEM-Progr.pdf?la=en&hash=60D9524BAD2695B8D34252BFFDA8CF8F4805F197&hash=60D9524BAD2695B8D34252BFFDA8CF8F4805F197

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges commit to collaborating with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to revise the guidance on AB 1705 to affirm local colleges' authority to develop curriculum for preparatory courses for STEM Calculus 1 in accordance with California Education Code §78213 (f)[85] and to examine the appropriate unit value for those courses.

Contact: Tina Akers-Porter, Modesto Junior College

MSC

---

[85] https://codes.findlaw.com/ca/education-code/edc-sect-78213/

FAILED RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS

101.01 F24 Adopt Using Outcomes for the Course Outline of Record in Title 5

Whereas, Student learning objectives are building block skills required to demonstrate proficiency of the higher-level, broader student learning outcomes;

Whereas, California Code of Regulations Title 5 §55002(a)(3)[86] requires course objectives as part of the requirements for the course outline of record, while the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges standards[87] refer to student learning outcomes;

Whereas, The WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) serves as the accreditation agency for the California State University and the University of California systems as well as many other universities in California and more globally, and WSCUC standards[88] also refer to outcomes; and

Whereas, The course content of the course outline of record (COR) provides the context for the outcomes, often aligning with the current use of objectives, perhaps adding unnecessary redundancy to the COR;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellors Office and other system partners to adopt using student learning outcomes as requirements in Title 5 instead of course objectives in the course outline of record (COR) to reduce redundancy in the COR and align with accreditation requirements for the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California systems.

Contact: Erik D. Reese, ASCCC Executive Committee

MSF

101.01.01 F24 Amend Adopt Using Outcomes for the Course Outline of Record in Title 5

Replace the 4th Whereas:

~~Whereas, The course content of the course outline of record (COR) provides the context for the outcomes, often aligning with the current use of objectives, perhaps adding unnecessary redundancy to the COR;~~

<u>Whereas, The implementation by California community colleges of the processes for student learning outcomes (SLO) development and assessment in response to ACCJC accreditation standards was often difficult, time-consuming and fraught with accreditation ramifications, and therefore any transition to replacing course objectives with SLOs in the course outline of record will not be trivial and will likely require colleges to reimagine SLO assessment processes as well</u>

---

[86] [California Code of Regulations Title 5 Section 55002(a)(3)](#)
[87] https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/ACCJC-2024-Accreditation-Standards.pdf
[88] WSCUS Standards of Accreditation: https://www.wscuc.org/handbook2023/#standards-of-accreditation

as curriculum development process, all of which will be difficult, time-consuming, and require extensive input from faculty as well as professional development resources for faculty;

Amend the 1st Resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellors Office and other system partners ~~adopt using~~ to explore the potential beneficial and adverse consequences of using student learning outcomes ~~as requirements in Title 5~~ instead of course objectives in the course outline of record (COR) to reduce redundancy in the COR ~~and~~ while being in alignment ~~align~~ with the accreditation standards of ACCJC and WSCUC ~~requirements for the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California systems.~~; and

Add a 2nd Resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide professional development to and seek input from the faculty of the California community colleges regarding the potential replacement of course objectives with student learning outcomes through surveys, Academic Senate event breakout sessions, Academic Senate regional meetings, and other appropriate means, and report its findings prior to taking any positions of support of amending title 5 regulations to replace course objectives with student learning outcomes by the Fall 2025 Plenary Session.

Contact: John Freitas, Los Angeles Community College District

MSF

101.04 F24 Automatic California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) Approval of California Community Colleges (CCC) Ethnic Studies Courses

Whereas, Since fall 2021, students have been required to complete an ethnic studies course as part of an intersegmental general education transfer pattern with California State University General Education Breadth (CSU GE/B) Area F Ethnic Studies established effective fall 2021, and Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) Area 7 Ethnic Studies effective fall 2023, with both replaced by California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) Area 6 Ethnic Studies effective fall 2025;

Whereas, It appears that California Community College (CCC) Ethnic Studies courses are being held to a higher standard for review and approval for transfer general education Ethnic Studies requirement than "comparable" California State University (CSU) Ethnic Studies courses that are approved for CSU campus-specific general education ethnic studies requirements;

Whereas, It has been reported that CCC course-to-course articulation requests for Ethnic Studies courses with CSU Area F approved courses have been denied by some CSU campuses if the CCC "comparable" course is not already approved for California State University General

Education Breadth (CSU GE/B) Area F Ethnic Studies (which is aligned with Cal-GETC Area 6 Ethnic Studies effective fall 2025); and

Whereas, Requiring courses to have a prior intersegmental general education approval as a condition for a course to receive course-to-course articulation contradicts best practice of granting course-to-course articulation based primarily upon course content, course objectives and other course outline of record elements in a manner "comparable" to the CSU or UC course, not whether the course is approved for a transfer general education area;

Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates to strongly encourage California State University and University of California faculty to base course-to-course articulation agreements on course comparability, not transfer general education approval; and

Resolved, That Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates to develop and implement a policy, effective Fall 2025, that for any California Community College (CCC) Ethnic Studies course that is articulated to any California State University (CSU) course approved for any CSU campus ethnic studies general education requirement (Area F or Area 6), and any California Community College (CCC) ethnic studies course that is articulated to any University of California (UC) course approved for any UC campus ethnic studies general education and/or graduation requirements, be "automatically" approved for Cal-GETC Area 6.

Contact: David Degroot, Allan Hancock College, Area C

MSF

105.04 F24 Support the Establishment of Guidance for Course Syllabi

Whereas, The freedom to create and teach courses is a professional right of each faculty member[89];

Whereas, Course syllabi are integral to student success by providing important information about academic expectations, grading standards, and course requirements; and

Whereas, No language exists in Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)[90], sections 66000 - 101149.5 of the California Education Code[91], sections 50000 – 59704 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 5[92], the 2024 ACCJC Accreditation Standards[93], or the Policies

---

[89] https://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure#3
[90] https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-34
[91] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayexpandedbranch.xhtml?tocCode=EDC&%20division=&title=3.&part=&chapter=&article=&nodetreepath=3
[92] https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?gui%20d=I5EDC84B04C6911EC93A8000D3A7C4BC3&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default)
[93] https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/ACCJC-2024-Accreditation-Standards-with-Review-Criteria-Evidence.pdf

for Prerequisites, Corequisites and Advisories on Recommended Preparation adopted by the Board of Governors[94] to clarify what information should be included in each course syllabus or when students can expect to receive a syllabus from their instructor, sections 66000 - 101149.5 of the California Education Code[95], sections 50000 – 59704 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 5[96], the 2024 ACCJC Accreditation Standards[97], or the Policies for Prerequisites, Corequisites and Advisories on Recommended Preparation adopted by the Board of Governors[98] to clarify what information should be included in each course syllabus or when students can expect to receive a syllabus from their instructor;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate For California Community Colleges develop guidance, grounded in Cultural Humility, to ensure that students are provided with a syllabus during the first week of class and that each syllabus contains information regarding instructor contact information, office hours and location (if applicable), required textbook and course materials, course modality, student learning outcomes, grading criteria and the grade scale used for the course, course attendance policy, accommodation services available on campus, and any other locally adopted policies, requirements, or guidelines by Spring 2026;

Contact: Preston Pipal, San José City College, Area B

MSF

DELEGATES

College	First	Last
Alameda, College of	Jacinda	Marshall
Allan Hancock College	Alberto	Restrepo
American River College	Brian	Knirk
Antelope Valley College	Hal	Huntsman
Bakersfield College	Lisa	Harding

[94] https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/About-Us/Divisions/Educational-Services-and-Support/Academic-Affairs/What-we-do/Curriculum-and-Instruction-Unit/Files/Prerequisites_Guidelines_55003-Final_pdf.pdf
[95] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayexpandedbranch.xhtml?tocCode=EDC&division=&title=3.&part=&chapter=&article=&nodetreepath=3
[96] https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?guid=I5EDC84B04C6911EC93A8000D3A7C4BC3&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default)
[97] https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/ACCJC-2024-Accreditation-Standards-with-Review-Criteria-Evidence.pdf
[98] https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/About-Us/Divisions/Educational-Services-and-Support/Academic-Affairs/What-we-do/Curriculum-and-Instruction-Unit/Files/Prerequisites_Guidelines_55003-Final_pdf.pdf

Barstow College	Melissa	Matteson
Berkeley City College	Matthew	Freeman
Butte College	Jess	Vickery
Cabrillo College	Victoria	Banales
Calbright College	Michael	Stewart
Canada College	Gampi	Shankar
Canyons, College of	Lisa	Hooper
Cerro Coso College	Yvonne	Mills
Chabot College	Mona	Abdoun
Chaffey College	Nicole	DeRose
Citrus College	Lisa	Villa
Clovis College	Max	Hembd
Coalinga College	Matt	Magnuson
Coastline College	Ann	Holliday
College of Marin	Maria	Coulson
Columbia College	Marcus	Whisenant
Compton College	Michael	VanOverbeck
Contra Costa CCD	Louie	Giambattista
Contra Costa College	Gabriela	Segade
Copper Mountain College	Jennifer	Anderson
Cosumnes River College	Jacob	Velasquez
Crafton Hills College	Meridyth	McLaren
Cuesta College	Alexandra	Kahane
Cuyamaca College	Karen	Marrujo
Cypress College	Kathleen	McAlister
De Anza College	So Kam	Lee
Diablo Valley College	Susan	Parkinson
East Los Angeles College	Leticia	Barajas

Evergreen Valley College	Henry	Estrada
Feather River College	Nikki	Grose
Folsom Lake College	Wayne	Jensen
Foothill College	Ben	Kaupp
Foothill DeAnza CCD	Mary	Pape
Fresno City College	Michael	Takeda
Fullerton College	Bridget	Kominek
Gavilan College	Cherise	Mantia
Glendale College	Cameron	Hastings
Golden West College	Damien	Jordan
Grossmont College	Sharon	Sampson
Hartnell College	Jennifer	Moorhouse
Imperial Valley College	Ric	Epps
Irvine Valley College	RJ	Dolbin
Laney College	Leslie	Blackie
Las Positas College	Ashley	Young
Lassen College	Adam	Runyan
Lemoore College	Amy	Babb
Long Beach City College	Jerome	Hunt
Los Angeles CCD	Angela	Echeverri
Los Angeles City College	Anna	Le
Los Angeles Mission College	Maryanne	Galindo
Los Angeles Pierce College	Margarita	Pillado
Los Angeles Southwest College	Erum	Syed
Los Angeles Trade Tech College	Marvin	Da Costa
Los Angeles Valley College	Edgar	Perez
Los Medanos College	Adrianna	Simone
Los Rios CCD	Paula	Cardwell

Madera College	Erin	Heasley
Mendocino College	Nicholas	Petti
Merced College	Wanda	Schindler
Merritt College	Tom	Renbarger
MiraCosta College	Curry	Mitchell
Mission College	Joanna	Sobala
Modesto Junior College	Gisele	Flores
Moorpark College	Nicole	Block
Moreno Valley College	Esteban	Navas
Mt. San Antonio College	Kelly	Rivera
Mt. San Jacinto College	Nick	Zappia
Napa Valley College	Matthew	Kronzer
Norco College	Kimberly	Bell
North Orange Continuing Education	Michelle	Patrick-Norng
Ohlone College	Katherine	Michel
Orange Coast College	Rendell	Drew
Oxnard College	Dolores	Ortiz
Palo Verde College	Sarah	Frid
Palomar College	Wendy	Nelson
Pasadena City College	Lindsey	Ruiz
Peralta CCD	Matthew	Goldstein
Porterville College	Rebecca	Baird
Rancho Santiago CCD	Sara	Gonzalez
Redwoods, College of the	Bernadette	Johnson
Reedley College	Ruby	Duran
Rio Hondo College	Angela	Rhodes
Riverside City College	Don	Wilcoxson

Sacramento City College	Lori	Petite
Saddleback College	Frank	Gonzalez
San Bernardino Valley College	Andrea	Hecht
San Diego City College	Mona	Alsoraimi-Espiritu
San Diego Continuing Ed	Richard	Weinroth
San Diego Mesa College	Andrew	Hoffman
San Diego Miramar College	Pablo	Martin
San Francisco, City College of	Alexis	Litzky
San Joaquin Delta College	Becky	Plaza
San Jose City College	Heidi	Kozlowski
San Jose-Evergreen CCD	Eric	Narveson
San Mateo CCD	David	Eck
San Mateo, College of	Tod	Windisch
Santa Ana College	Merari	Weber
Santa Barbara City College	Kathleen	O'Connor
Santa Monica College	Jamar	London
Santa Rosa Junior College	John	Stover
Santiago Canyon College	Tara	Kubicka-Miller
Sequoias, College of the	Ramyar Alavi	Moghaddam
Shasta College	Chase	Brown
Sierra College	Andre	Mendoza
Siskiyous, College of the	Andrea	Craddock
Skyline College	Kate	Browne
Solano College	Joshua	Scott
Southwestern College	Andrew	Rempt
Taft College	Michelle	Beasley
Victor Valley College	Jane	Montgomery
West Los Angeles College	Jason	Librande

West Valley College	Meg	Farrell
Woodland College	Aree	Metz
Yuba College	Melissa	Ha

Executive Committee Member	First Name	Last Name
President	Cheryl	Aschenbach
Vice President	LaTonya	Parker
Secretary	Stephanie	Curry
Treasurer	Robert L.	Stewart Jr.
At-Large Representative	Karen	Chow
At-Large Representative	Christopher	Howerton
North Representative	Eric	Wada
North Representative	Mitra	Sapienza
South Representative	Luke	Lara
South Representative	Carlos	Guerrero
Area A Representative	Juan	Arzola
Area B Representative	Mark Edward	Osea
Area C Representative	Erik	Reese
Area D Representative	Maria-Jose	Zeledon-Perez

Course Caps Taskforce
Workgroup Information

This document was developed by a workgroup comprising the following faculty and administrators:

Bemiller, Quinton – Norco College
Chavez, Michael – RCC
Douglass, Kelly – RCC
Dunphy, Laura – Moreno Valley
Farrar, Carol – Norco College
Galicia, Felipe – Moreno Valley
Johnson, Brian – Norco College
Lee, Virgil – Norco College
McGowan, Joumana – Moreno Valley
Murrell, Deanna – Moreno Valley
Pfeifle, Ann – Moreno Valley
Reade, Dan – Norco College
Rhyne, Jeff – Moreno Valley
Sanchez, Abel – Moreno Valley
Scott-Coe, Jo – RCC
Sell, Kathleen – RCC
Taube, Rhonda – RCC
Webb, Joel – Moreno Valley
Worsham, Patty – Norco College
Wright, Lynn – RCC
Yates, Shari – RCC
Bajaj, Raj – District Office
Susan Mills/Bishop, Eric – District Office
Brown, Aaron – District Office

RCCD Establishment and Modification of Course Caps

References: Title 5 §§53200-53206; Title 5 §53002; Education Code Section 70902

Definitions of Four Principles of Defining Course Caps

Integrity of Teaching and Learning Practice

Considerations for determining Course Caps include but are not limited to:

- Discipline-based professional publications and/or organization guidance and best teaching practices for course type;
- Health, safety, accreditation, and legal requirements;
- Course type;
- Classroom instruction methods articulated by the discipline in course outline of record methods of instruction;
- Writing and other student assessments as required by C-ID descriptor, articulation requirement, course outcomes, and/or described in course outline of record methods of evaluation; and
- The general principles outlined in Section III on principles for discipline faculty in ASCCC's Spring 2012 paper "Setting Course Enrollment Maximums: Process, Roles, and Principles" pages 5-9.

Exceptions to Course Caps include courses in the Honors Program which follow the HTCC Course Cap guidelines and courses in learning communities. The Course Caps for all courses in a learning community should have the same cap, the lowest cap of courses in the community. Course Caps should be the same across delivery methods unless a discipline determines that modality changes the integrity of teaching and learning, in which case rationale must be provided.

Principles for Optimal Course Efficiency

Course Caps need to be optimized to maintain high efficiency/productivity. The district is on a compressed calendar.

- A typical 3-unit F2F class would need an enrollment at census of 35 to reach a target of 595.
- A typical 3-unit online and hybrid class would need an enrollment at census of 40 to reach a target of 595.
- A typical 4-unit F2F class would need an enrollment at census of 35 to reach a target of 595.
- A typical 4-unit online and hybrid class would need an enrollment at census of 40 to reach a target of 595.
- Limitation due to special programs may have an impact on setting caps.
- Course Caps are independent of Room Caps or Section Caps or equipment availability.

Workload Equity

Principles:

- Standard Course Caps, including online sections, must be consistent across the district by course although Section Caps may vary because of space/room limitations.
- Course Caps for new courses in a discipline should be consistent with existing Course Caps in the discipline unless a reasonable rationale is provided.
- New disciplines should have Course Caps consistent with their most closely related disciplines.
- Standard Course Caps must consider the nature of in-class instruction/learning.
- Comparisons across closely related courses within a discipline should adhere to principles of teaching and learning. Comparisons of courses across disciplines should not serve as the basis for each discipline's self-determination of Course Caps.
- Every discipline must be afforded right to "negotiate" caps on their courses.

Nature of work considerations:

These considerations apply at the course level and align with the Integrity of Teaching and Learning Practice.

- Time and nature of lecture/lab preparation.
- Time and nature of grading.
- Nature of in-class instruction/learning (i.e., courses that require hands-on work as central to learning or close observation by instructor for safety, optimal student learning, etc.)

Financial Sustainability

Financial Sustainability requires a *balance* of Course Caps in terms of:

- **Districtwide Efficiency of 595 Achievement**
- **Student Demand** – Optimize scheduling by offering high-demand courses to accommodate as many students as possible while scheduling low-demand courses in nuanced consideration of course rotation, student pathways, capstone courses, and program needs.
- **Space Needs** – Align the size and layout of classrooms or instructional facilities with course requirements to provide a safe and effective learning environment.
- **Space Utilization** – Scheduling classes throughout the day and across all days of the week to meet student need.
- **Class Cancellation** – Establish and adhere to class cancellation criteria due to low enrollment.
- **Resources** – Optimize instructional equipment and materials, technology,

instructors, teaching assistants, and support services.
- **College/Program Accreditation Standards/Compliance** – Adhere to accreditation standards and regulations which often dictate Course Caps and student-faculty ratios.
- **Education Quality** – Preserve a high standard of instruction conducive to effective teaching and learning.
- **Diverse Modalities** – Sustain a blend of face-to-face, hybrid, and online instructional formats in a way that is financially sustainable and takes into account the current environment.

**No course caps will be changed administratively without first following due process as outlined in the following procedures, including consultation and agreement with appropriate discipline faculty as outlined in Article X.J.6. of the Agreement Between the Riverside Community College District and the RCCD FA CCA/CTA/NEA, 2021-24.

Procedure for Proposing Modifications to Course Caps (Faculty)

1. Disciplines may propose course caps for new courses and course cap modifications for existing courses in their disciplines to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs (for college-specific disciplines) and to the Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Strategic Planning (for districtwide disciplines).

2. Discipline faculty at the college(s) where the course is offered shall develop a proposal for modifying existing course caps or establishing course caps for new courses, including a rationale grounded in the "Four Principles of Defining Course Caps" as defined in this document. Discipline faculty shall submit evidence that proposal was considered and approved by the discipline faculty at their college. For courses that exist at more than one college, disciplines shall agree to a common proposal, either by consensus or, in the case of courses offered at all three colleges, by consensus or majority vote of the colleges.

3. After finalizing its proposal to modify a Course Cap, the discipline shall submit the proposal to the VPAA(s) at each college where the course is offered and to the Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Strategic Planning. Proposals should be sent by November 1 of any fall semester to be considered for implementation the following fall or by March 1 to be considered for the following spring semester.

4. The VPAA(s), and VC, in consultation with the College President(s) shall acknowledge receipt of the proposal within ten (10) business days. They shall respond to the content of the proposal within one month.

5. If VPAA(s), President(s), and VC have questions or concerns about the proposal, they shall meet with the discipline faculty representatives to work collaboratively toward a mutually agreeable resolution to set Course Caps aligned with the "Four

Principles of Defining Caps." Invitation to find a mutually agreeable time to meet with discipline representatives should be sent to the faculty in the discipline within one month of receipt of the proposal.

6. If VPAA(s), President(s), and VC do not agree to any modification of course caps, they shall provide a detailed rationale rooted in the "Four Principles of Defining Caps." Course caps shall not be changed if an agreement to modify cannot be reached.

7. The VC of Educational Services will communicate to the affected discipline, VPAAs, and college academic senate presidents whether agreement has been reached to change current practice. The current course cap information will be updated and maintained by the office of VC of Educational Services.

8. Changes shall be implemented in the earliest possible semester that is reasonable so as not to impact students nor require significant changes to an already built schedule.

Procedure for Proposing Modifications to Course Caps (District or College Administrator)

1. A Vice President of Academic Affairs (for college specific disciplines) and the Vice Chancellor, Educational Services and Strategic Planning (for districtwide disciplines) may propose course caps for new courses and course cap modifications for existing courses to the affected discipline faculty.

2. Administrators shall develop a proposal for modifying existing course caps or establishing course caps for new courses, including a rationale grounded in the "Four Principles of Defining Course Caps" as defined in this document. For courses that exist at more than one college, administrators shall agree to a common proposal.

3. After finalizing their proposal to modify a Course Cap, VPAA(s) and VC shall submit their proposal to the Chairs of the affected discipline where the course is offered. Proposals should be sent by November 1 of any fall semester to be considered for implementation the following fall or by March 1 to be considered for the following spring semester.

4. The Chairs shall share the proposal with discipline faculty. The Chairs or designees shall acknowledge receipt of the proposal within ten (10) business days during regular semesters. Faculty in the affected discipline shall convene as quickly as possible to discuss the proposal. If faculty reach consensus (or vote, depending upon their bylaws or operational guidelines) to agree to the proposal, they shall respond within one month of receiving the proposal. Upon agreement from the affected discipline faculty, the VPAA(s) and VC shall send the proposal

to college President(s) to finalize the agreement.

5. If the discipline faculty have questions or concerns about the proposal, they shall meet with the VPAAs and VC of Ed Services to work collaboratively toward a mutually agreeable resolution to set Course Caps aligned with the "Four Principles of Defining Caps." Invitation to find a mutually agreeable time to meet with discipline representatives should be sent to the VPAAs and VC within one month of receipt of the proposal.

6. Time should be afforded to disciplines to communicate results of the discussion with administration to entire discipline faculty. For courses that exist at more than one college, disciplines shall agree to a common proposal, either by consensus or, in the case of courses offered at all three colleges, by consensus or majority vote of the colleges.

7. If the discipline faculty agree to the proposal after such consultation, chairs of the affected discipline faculty shall communicate to the VPAAs and VC Ed Services. The VPAA(s) and VC shall forward the proposal and rationale to college President(s) with a mutually agreed rationale supporting the proposal to finalize the agreement. VC Ed Services will communicate the approved proposal to all affected parties including academic senate presidents.

8. If the representative discipline faculty do not agree with the proposal from VPAA(s) and VC, the discipline faculty shall provide a detailed rationale rooted in the "Four Principles of Defining Caps." Course caps shall not be changed if an agreement to modify cannot be reached.

9. Changes shall be implemented in the earliest possible semester that is reasonable so as not to impact students nor require significant changes to an already built schedule.