



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

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
RECORDING RESOLUTIONS VOTING.....	4
RESOLUTIONS CATEGORIES.....	4
ADOPTED RESOLUTIONS	5
101 CURRICULUM	5
101.01 F24 Nutrition Science Integration in General Education Curriculum as a Cal-GETC Subject Area 5B Course.....	5
101.02 F24 Cal-GETC External Examination Credit for Cambridge International Assessments	6
101.03 F24 UC Transferability of English for Speakers of Other Languages Oral Communications Courses.....	7
101.04 F24 No Implementation without Articulation: Safeguarding Student Success and Transfer Pathways in Future Common Course Numbering Phases	8
101.05 F24 Delay Public-Facing Implementation of Common Course Numbering Until Transfer Agreements Are Established.....	9
101.06 F24 Phase-Out Process for Courses that Lose Course-to-Course Articulation	10
101.07 F24 Use CCN Templates for CCC System Level Transferability and General Education (Cal-GETC) Review and Approval.....	11
101.08 F24 Develop Clear Guidelines for Transferability and Articulation Processes.....	12
104 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	13
104.01 F24 Strengthening Systemic Support for the Early Childhood Education and Education Sector in Alignment with Vision 2030	13
105 STUDENT PREPARATION AND SUCCESS	14
105.01 F24 Investigate Academic Renewal Policies	14
105.02 F24 Encouraging Funding for Printing Lab Manuals to Achieve Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) Status	15
105.03 F24 Encouraging Transparency and Eliminating Automatic Billing Practices in Course Material Access	16
105.04 F24 Acknowledge Extended Opportunity Programs and Services’ 55 Years of Student Success	17
105.05 F24 Reevaluation of Data Analysis and Implementation Guidelines for AB 1705.....	18
105.06 F24 Negative Impacts on Equity and Inclusion in Relation to California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Guidance on AB 1705.....	19
108 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	20
108.01 F24 Selecting and Evaluating Artificial Intelligence for Faculty Use	20
109 PROGRAM REVIEW	21

109.01 F24 Update the 2009 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Paper “Program Review: Setting a Standard” to reflect ACCJC 2023 Standards.....	21
111 ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES.....	22
111.01 F24 Update the ASCCC Paper, “The Role of Counseling Faculty and the Delivery of Counseling Services in the California Community Colleges”	22
111.02 F24 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Rules Revision.....	23
111.03 F24 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Bylaws Revision	23
111.04 F24 Open Educational Resources and Publication Date	24
111.05 F24 Senator Emeritus for Sharyn Eveland	25
111.06 F24 Clarify the Rules Around Special Elections.....	25
113 LEGISLATION AND ADVOCACY	26
113.01 F24 Legislative Advocacy to Restore Student Choice on English and Math Courses.....	26
113.02 F24 Designating an Official Native American Holiday for the California Community College System.....	27
114 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLORS OFFICE.....	28
114.01 F24 Support for Faculty for Implementation of AB 1111 Guidance	28
114.02 F24 Work Experience Education Course Repeatability.....	29
114.03 F24 Encroachment on Academic and Professional Matters Due to California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Guidance on AB 1705	29
FAILED RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS	32
101.01 F24 Adopt Using Outcomes for the Course Outline of Record in Title 5	32
101.01.01 F24 Amend Adopt Using Outcomes for the Course Outline of Record in Title 5	32
101.04 F24 Automatic California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) Approval of California Community Colleges (CCC) Ethnic Studies Courses.....	33
105.04 F24 Support the Establishment of Guidance for Course Syllabi	34
DELEGATES	35

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 exams³ 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 Curriculum⁴ (Cal-GETC) has not yet included Cambridge International AS and A Level exams⁵ to fulfill transfer general education areas, and credit for prior learning is rigorously reviewed by external evaluators, with the American Council on Education National Guide⁶ 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 Guide⁷, 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 regulations⁸ 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 articulation¹⁵ with anticipated exponential increases in Phases 2 and 3¹⁶, 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§ionNum=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, CCCC 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 CCCC, ESLEI 24-22, April 15, 2024, Common Course Numbering Update ([eslei-24-22-common-course-numbering-update-a11y.pdf](#))

¹⁹ CCCC 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 CCCCCO 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, CCCCCO 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 CCCCCO 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 Report²¹ 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 report²² 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 2021²³, establishing a strong foundation for addressing workforce shortages and improving educational outcomes, yet challenges still exist, such as persistent workforce shortages²⁴ and resource gaps²⁵, 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 need²⁶ 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 communities²⁷;

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-ecedu-education-and-human-development-sector>

²⁴ <https://coecc.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 purposes²⁸, 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 §55046²⁹ 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 policies³⁰;

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&originContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=\(sc.Default\)&bhcp=1](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I628AE6B34C6911EC93A8000D3A7C4BC3?viewType=FullText&originContext=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 §59404³¹ 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 solutions³² to achieve Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) status³³ while preserving faculty's right to select appropriate instructional materials (F23 17.01³⁴, S22 03.03³⁵);

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 03.05³⁶); 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 17.02³⁷) 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 09.06³⁸);

Whereas, California community colleges are required by law to mark their sections that have no textbook costs (California Education Code 66406.9³⁹), 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 students⁴¹; 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 available⁴²;

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>

105.05 F24 Reevaluation of Data Analysis and Implementation Guidelines for AB 1705

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office definition⁴³ 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 memorandum⁴⁴ 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 Statistics⁴⁵ 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 report⁴⁶ 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 resolution⁴⁷ 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 evidence⁴⁸ 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 24-15⁴⁹ 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 Resolution⁵¹ 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 13.05⁵⁴, 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 §53200⁵⁵, 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 standards⁵⁶ 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 standards⁵⁷;

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&originContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I604256434C6911EC93A8000D3A7C4BC3?viewType=FullText&originContext=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 care⁵⁹;

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 framework⁶² and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office has developed and adopted Vision 2030⁶³ 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 Rules⁶⁵ 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 Bylaws⁶⁶ 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 specified⁶⁷;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges was directed by Resolution 22F 09.01⁶⁸ 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 APA⁶⁹ and MLA⁷⁰ 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 §78213⁷², 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 §66010.2⁷³; 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 1705⁷⁴;

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

⁷² https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC§ionNum=78213

⁷³ https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC§ionNum=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 2021⁷⁵, 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, Funding⁷⁶ 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 23-49⁷⁷ 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 §53200⁷⁹ and §53206⁸⁰ 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§ionNum=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 guidance⁸¹ 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 Memo⁸² and March 2023 Implementation Guide⁸³;

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 memo⁸⁴ 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-Program.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-Program.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 standards⁸⁷ 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 standards⁸⁸ 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;~~

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

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 member⁸⁹;

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 Code⁹¹, sections 50000 – 59704 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 5⁹², the 2024 ACCJC Accreditation Standards⁹³, 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=\(sc.Default\)](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 Governors⁹⁴ 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 Code⁹⁵, sections 50000 – 59704 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 5⁹⁶, the 2024 ACCJC Accreditation Standards⁹⁷, or the Policies for Prerequisites, Corequisites and Advisories on Recommended Preparation adopted by the Board of Governors⁹⁸ 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?gui=d=I5EDC84B04C6911EC93A8000D3A7C4BC3&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextD ata=\(sc.Default\)](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?gui=d=I5EDC84B04C6911EC93A8000D3A7C4BC3&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextD ata=(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
Siskiyou, 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