



## Consent Calendar

The resolutions that have been placed on the Consent Calendar 1) were believed to be noncontroversial, 2) do not potentially reverse a previous position and 3) do not compete with another proposed resolution. Resolutions that meet these criteria and any subsequent clarifying amendments have been included on the Consent Calendar. To remove a resolution from the Consent Calendar, please see the Consent Calendar section of the *Resolution Procedures for the Plenary Session*.

- \*2.01 F13 ASCCC Statement on Accreditation
- \*2.03 F13 Sufficient Advance Notice for Changes to Required ACCJC Annual Reports
  - \*2.03.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.03 F13
- \*7.01 F13 Academic Senate Participation in the Online Course Exchange
- \*7.02 F13 Request of CCCCCO to Provide Faculty Obligation Number Data
- \*8.01 F13 Counselors as Discipline Experts
- \*9.01 F13 Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) Development and Implementation Guidelines Resolution
- \*12.01 F13 Community College Faculty Exchanges
- \*18.01 F13 Use of Multiple Measures in Common Statewide Assessment Exams

The resolutions on the Consent Calendar are marked within the following packet by an \*

# Table of Contents

<b>2.0 ACCREDITATION STANDARDS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
*2.01 F13 ASCCC Statement on Accreditation .....	1
2.02 F13 Request of ACCJC to Model Effective Self-Evaluation Practices .....	1
2.02.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.02 F13.....	2
*2.03 F13 Sufficient Advance Notice for Changes to Required ACCJC Annual Reports.....	2
*2.03.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.03 F13 .....	3
2.04 F13 Employ “Resolve a Deficiency” Rather Than “Recommendation for Improvement” for Evaluation Findings That Must Be Addressed by the Two-Year Rule.....	3
2.04.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.04 F13 .....	4

## **RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013**

### **2.0 ACCREDITATION STANDARDS**

#### **\*2.01 F13 ASCCC Statement on Accreditation**

Whereas, The “faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self study and annual reports” is one of the “10+1” academic and professional matters designated to academic senates in Title 5 section 53200;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Communi

## **RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013**

Chancellor's Office, and the Board of Governors, and letters sent by the Academic Senate to the U.S. Department of Education (USDE)<sup>1</sup>; and

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges formally request that the ACCJC provide member institutions opportunities for meaningful input to the ACCJC about any proposed changes to the required annual reports, and that any adopted changes by ACCJC to annual reports be published at least six months in advance of the effective date of implementation of the required annual reports.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Past Chair, Accreditation Committee

### **\*2.03.01 F13 Amend Resolution 2.03 F13**

Amend the resolved to read:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges formally request that the ACCJC provide member institutions opportunities for meaningful input to the ACCJC about any proposed changes to the required annual reports, and that any adopted changes by ACCJC to the annual reports be published at least six months in advance of the effective date of implementation of the required annual reports, or within four weeks of the ACCJC being notified of a federal mandate if a notice of six months is not possible.

Contact: Matthew Clark, Woodland College, Area A

### **2.04 F13 Employ “Resolve a Deficiency” Rather Than “Recommendation for Improvement” for Evaluation Findings That Must Be Addressed by the Two-Year Rule**

Whereas, Section 602.20(a) of the Secretary’s Criteria for Recognition mandates that recognized accrediting agencies for institutions such as the California community colleges must either take immediate adverse action against the institution, or give the institution two years to bring itself into compliance (the so-called “Two-Year Rule”);

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) currently uses the term “recommendation” in two senses when communicating the Commission’s actions, namely, “to meet the standard” or “to improve institutional effectiveness,” and thus it is unclear which of the “recommendations” issued to member institutcTwo-Year

**RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013**





## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

Whereas, The Exchange promises to allow students to enroll in high quality online courses from colleges across the state through the centralized California Virtual Campus, with potential for great benefit and opportunities for our students by providing additional access to courses needed for transfer and degree completion;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is the collective faculty voice on academic and professional matters statewide and has long provided leadership for faculty on distance education matters through its position papers, resolutions, *Rostrum* articles and presentations; and

Whereas, The Chancellor's Office request for application process proposes the establishment of governance and advisory bodies for the Exchange that may make recommendations regarding the work of the Exchange related to academic and professional matters, including but not limited to:

- The development of specifications for a statewide course management system (CMS) for the Exchange
- Minimum quality standards for courses selected for the Exchange
- Minimum educational and training qualifications for faculty who will teach online courses on the Exchange
- Minimum level of preparation required of students who will take online courses on the Exchange;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges remind the Chancellor's Office that faculty primacy in academic and professional matters applies to the development of the Online Course Exchange; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Chancellor's Office to include the Academic Senate as the central and vital participant in all governance, advisory and steering bodies that would guide the establishment and continuing work of the Online Course Exchange.

Contact: John Freitas, Los Angeles City College, Area C

### **\*7.02 F13 Request of CCCCCO to Provide Faculty Obligation Number Data**

Whereas, Hiring criteria, policies, and procedures for new faculty members are within the purview of the academic senate, as denoted in California Education Code 87360;

Whereas, The application of locally agreed to policies and procedures requires accurate and verifiable data;

Whereas, Faculty Obligation Number (FON) calculation worksheets for each district detailing compliance with Title 5 §51025 were posted on the Chancellor's Office website from 2006 - 2011, but were not posted in 2012; and

Whereas, Calculated advance FON for 2013 have been provided to administrators via email, but neither the advance FON nor the data used to cal7465(t)-2.53536(a)-6.86129417(a)3.15789(t)-2.5331( )-0.479431(b)-0.956417789



**RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013**



**RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013**

Whereas, The California State University (CSU), by Executive Order 1065 (2011), states:

*Each CSU campus shall define its GE student learning outcomes, to fit within the framework of the four “Essential Learning Outcomes” drawn from the*

## RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION ON NOVEMBER 7, 2013

### 18.0 MATRICULATION

#### \*18.01 F13 Use of Multiple Measures in Common Statewide Assessment Exams

Whereas, Title 5 §55502 requires use of multiple measures in the assessment of course placement for individual students;

Whereas, Recent research conducted by the Community College Research Center (February, 2012) suggests that:

- Using placement exam scores as the sole determinant of college access simply for the sake of consistency and efficiency may not be justified;
- Using placement exam scores as the only means for placing students in English and math courses results in significant misplacement of students at rates of 24-33% in these courses;
- Using multiple measures instead of only placement exam scores may reduce English and math misplacement rates by up to 15%;
- Using multiple measures may reduce the need for remediation by 8-12% and may also improve student success in college-level courses;

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office is soliciting proposals for developing a common assessment that will enable increased portability of assessment scores in accordance with the Student Success Act; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (Resolution 13.03 F11) supports the establishment of a centralized standard assessment as an option provided that the right to determine cut scores for placement locally is maintained and affirms the importance of faculty primacy with respect to the use of assessment for placement scores and the application of multiple measures;