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# 3.0 EQUITY AND DIVERSITY

## \*3.01 S17 Revise the Paper *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures*

Whereas, The most recent ASCCC paper on faculty hiring, *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures[[1]](#footnote-1)*, was adopted in Fall 2000, and it is good practice to regularly review and reevaluate professional standards regarding the hiring processes and procedures for all faculty;

Whereas, Awareness of the importance of developing faculty hiring processes to increase the diversity of candidates applying and being interviewed for full-time faculty positions has become more significant throughout the system, including the drafting and recent release by the Chancellor’s Office of the *Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Diversity Best Practices Handbook[[2]](#footnote-2)* which provides an explanation of the recently-adopted, multiple methods allocation model for EEO funding and model practices for addressing the nine multiple methods described in the allocation model; and

Whereas, The report from the Board of Governors’ Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy included recommendations to expand the pool of potential career and technical education (CTE) faculty with industry experience, and subsequent efforts by the ASCCC and the Chancellor’s Office CTE Minimum Qualifications Task Force have been made to assist colleges to be more flexible when hiring CTE faculty while maintaining high academic and professional standards;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update the paper *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures* and bring it to the Spring 2018 Plenary Session for discussion and possible adoption.

Contact: Randy Beach, Equity and Diversity Action, and John Freitas, Standards and Practices

## \*3.02 S17 Support for Marginalized Students

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) embraces equity principles for all in its Values Statement[[3]](#footnote-3) which states that the ASCCC “works to empower faculty from diverse backgrounds and experiences in order to promote inclusiveness and equity in all of their forms” and supports this same principle as applied to all students and staff;

Whereas, Recent actions and rhetoric by federal government officials and the president of the United States have resulted in escalating concerns and fears on the part of students who identify with traditionally marginalized identities including, but not limited to, LGBTQ students, students who may belong to targeted religious groups, undocumented immigrant students, or students with Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) status; and

Whereas, College and local senate leaders who wish to address the concerns of students but are uncertain as to the impact of passing local resolutions declaring their campuses to be “sanctuary” campuses including consideration of the liabilities and restrictions that self-designation may cause;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the guiding principles set forth by Chancellor Eloy Ortiz Oakley in the December 6, 2016, press release “California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Provides Guidance Related to Undocumented Students”[[4]](#footnote-4) which states that “California Community Colleges are open to all students who meet the minimum requirements for admission, regardless of immigration status”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s office to provide legal guidance to colleges considering passing resolutions expressing support for marginalized student populations including, but not limited to, LGBTQ students, students belonging to targeted religious groups, undocumented immigrant students, and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) students; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates to use that guidance to engage in dialog with other constituent groups in order to best show support for all students and to promote the ASCCC goals of inclusiveness and equity by supporting equal opportunities and equal human dignity for all.

Contact: Randy Beach, Equity and Diversity Action

## \*3.03 S17 Support for Students with Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Status

Whereas, Faculty throughout the country are concerned about the reported potential ending of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which has allowed undocumented immigrants who were brought to the United States before their 16th birthday prior to June 2007 to remain in the United States under specific conditions and to apply for renewal of this program every two years;

Whereas, To be eligible for the DACA program, applicants must have demonstrated lawful conduct, and must be either currently enrolled in school, be a high school graduate, or be honorably discharged from the military[[5]](#footnote-5);

Whereas, Significant numbers of DACA students have attended and continue to attend California community colleges; and

Whereas, DACA students are representative of the students on whom the future of the state of California depends, and their removal from California and the United States would be a devastating loss;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges affirm its support for students with Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) status in the California community college system, the other segments of education in California, and across the nation; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges convey this affirmation to Chancellor Eloy Ortiz Oakley, the Board of Governors, and other interested stakeholders both in the state of California and nationally.

Contact: Executive Committee

# 5.0 BUDGET AND FINANCE

## \*5.01 S17 Sustainable Funding for Inmate Education Programs

Whereas, SB1391 (2014, Hancock)[[6]](#footnote-6) waives the open course requirement for community college courses offered in state correctional facilities and allows attendance hours generated by credit courses to be funded at the credit rate, instead of the noncredit funding rate;

Whereas, As of Academic Year 2016-17, 16 pilot colleges began delivering face-to-face courses inside 32 of the state’s 35 correctional facilities;

Whereas, Pilot colleges that are delivering instruction in support of academic programs in state correctional facilities express concern that the courses they are offering might be vulnerable during budgetary cuts or when the colleges are at or exceeding growth caps; and

Whereas, The current practice of categorically funded programs mitigates the impact of budget cuts and local budgetary decisions on the most vulnerable special populations of students;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to recognize that serving incarcerated students within the college’s service area is a part of the college’s mission should be valued and prioritized as other student populations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges acknowledge that incarcerated students are among the most disenfranchised of the community college student population; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to establish a plan for sustaining the provision of in-person community college courses inside the state’s correctional facilities in an economic downturn, including the possibility of seeking categorical funding for inmate education programs offered throughout the California Community College System.

Contact: Cleavon Smith, Equity and Diversity Action, Executive Committee

# 6.0 STATE AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

## \*6.01 S17 Support for AB204[[7]](#footnote-7) (Medina, January 23, 2017)

Whereas, The implementation of the Seymour-Campbell Student Success Act in 2012, enshrined in California Education Code §76300, called for a process that revokes a student’s Board of Governors fee waiver in certain instances where the student fails to meet adequate markers of progress toward completion;

Whereas, The Seymour-Campbell Student Success Act of 2012 requires colleges to afford students an appeals process when the fee waiver is revoked but the due process procedures of colleges varies widely across the state;

Whereas, Students in urban centers of the state may elect to enroll at a different community college district and re-apply for a fee waiver to start anew and that opportunity is not readily available to students in rural areas of the state; and

Whereas, AB204 (Medina, January 23, 2017) seeks to amend California Education Code §76300 that defines the due process considerations when a Board of Governors fee waiver is revoked as:

*(C) To ensure that students are not unfairly impacted by the requirements of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1):*

*(i) At least once every three years, the board of governors shall review and approve any due process standards adopted to appeal the loss of a fee waiver under this section.*

*(ii) At least once every three years, each community college district shall examine the impact of the requirements of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and determine whether they have had a disproportionate impact on a specific class of students. If a disproportionate effect is found, the community college district shall include steps to address that impact in a student equity plan.*

*(iii) If the board of governors adopt any due process standards to appeal the loss of a fee waiver under this section, those standards shall also require a community college district to allow for an appeal due to hardship based on geographic distance from an alternative community college at which the student would be eligible for a fee waiver,*

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support AB204 (Medina, January 23, 2017) and communicate that support to the legislature and other constituents as appropriate.

Contact: Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, ASCCC Legislative and Advocacy Committee

# 7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE

## \*7.01 S17 Improve the Basic Skills Funding Formula

Whereas, Assembly Budget Bill 1602 (2016, Committee on Budget)[[8]](#footnote-8) established the Student Success for Basic Skills Program, which establishes new basic skills funding formulas, replacing those in place for the Basic Skills Initiative;

Whereas, The basic skills funding formula legislated by AB 1602 (2016, Committee on Budget) includes the following weighted factors:

1. “The percentage of students receiving a Board of Governors fee waiver who first enrolled in a course below transfer level in English, mathematics, or English as a second language, or any combination of these, and subsequently completed a college-level course in the same subject within one year and within two years. This factor shall comprise 50 percent of the allocation formula.
2. The percentage of students receiving a Board of Governors fee waiver. This factor shall comprise 25 percent of the formula.
3. The percentage of basic skills full-time equivalent students in courses offered by that community college district using evidence-based practices and principles [as specified]. This factor shall comprise 25 percent of the formula”;

Whereas, The legislated funding formula excludes the ability of a college to count noncredit students because noncredit students, generating 38% of system FTES in basic skills[[9]](#footnote-9) between 2013-2016, do not apply for financial aid, therefore not determining eligibility for receipt of Board of Governors fee waivers;

Whereas, The formula also excludes many noncredit and credit basic skills students who may be seeking literacy skills rather than pre-collegiate skills, therefore not completing a college-level course in the same subject within one year and within two years, and the formula necessitates a measurement of courses utilizing evidence-based practices, something that likely varies between sections of the same course, and that is not currently measured; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to propose an alternate funding formula that includes college efforts to improve basic skills in students through noncredit courses and for student goals different than college degree attainment and transfer.

Contact: Cheryl Aschenbach, Basic Skills Committee

## \*7.02 S17 Kognito Module for Formerly Incarcerated Students

Whereas, The Student Mental Health Program, a partnership between the California Community Colleges’ Chancellor's Office and the Foundation for California Community Colleges, offers online training courses, delivered by Kognito, for any community college employee or student that simulate encounters with students in real life situations in order to improve the mental health outcomes for individuals, families and communities;

Whereas, The online training courses currently available to community college employees and students consist of modules that simulate encounters with veterans, LGBTQ students, and students broadly identified as “At Risk”, but do not provide simulations specifically designed to work with formerly incarcerated students; and

Whereas, Formerly incarcerated students face serious mental health challenges when re-entering society and attempting to navigate through the California’s community colleges;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office and the Foundation for California Community Colleges to work with Kognito, mental health providers, and relevant service providers working specifically with formerly incarcerated populations to develop modules within Kognito that will help the college community’s ability to be responsive to and supportive of the mental health of formerly incarcerated students and improve their success outcomes.

Contact: Cleavon Smith, Executive Committee

# 9.0 CURRICULUM

## \*9.01 S17 Update to the Existing SLO Terminology Glossary and Creation of a Paper on Student Learning Outcomes

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges(ASCCC) approved at its Spring 2016 plenary session resolution 9.06, which states that the ASCCC should “urge local senates to ensure that institutional decisions regarding student learning outcomes assessment are understood to be a curricular matter and therefore institutions should consult collegially with local senates;”

Whereas, The development of student learning outcomes (SLOs) is a potentially useful tool for faculty to develop educational programs and course outlines of record, as well as an important part of accreditation requirements, including the recently added requirement that colleges review disaggregated SLO data; and

Whereas, The creation and assessment of SLOs have curricular implications that are not always understood by faculty, lead to confusion and reservations toward collecting and using SLO data, and go beyond the goal of compliance with accreditation standards;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update its white paper *SLO Terminology Glossary: A Resource for Local Senates* (2009)[[10]](#footnote-10); and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create a paper on effective practices for student learning outcomes assessment and present that information to the field at the Spring 2018 plenary session.

Contact: Dolores Davison, ASCCC Curriculum Committee Chair

## \*9.02 S17 Adopt the Revised Paper *The Course Outline of Record: A Curriculum Reference Guide*

Whereas, Resolution 9.06 S14 directed the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges to “update The Course Outline of Record: A Curriculum Reference Guide to more accurately reflect the current curriculum processes, guidelines, and requirements and present it for adoption at the Spring 2016 Plenary Session.”;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopt the paper The Course Outline of Record: A Curriculum Reference Guide and disseminate the paper to local senates and curriculum committees upon its adoption.

Contact: Dolores Davison, Chair, Curriculum Committee

Appendix XXX

# 10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST

## \*10.01 S17 Disciplines List – Public Safety

Whereas, Oral and written testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of minimum qualifications for faculty in the California community colleges, known as the “Disciplines List,” supported the following addition of the Public Safety discipline:

*Any bachelor’s degree and two years of professional experience, or an associate’s degree and six years of professional experience;* and

Whereas, The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has reviewed the proposal and deemed that the process outlined in the “Disciplines List Revision Handbook” was followed;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the California Community Colleges Board of Governors adopt the proposed addition to the “Disciplines List” for Public Safety.

Contact: John Freitas, Executive Committee, Standards and Practices Committee

See Appendix XXX for the Disciplines Summary Report.

## \*10.02 S17 Faculty Internship Minimum Qualifications in Disciplines Not Requiring a Master’s Degree

Whereas, Faculty internship programs provide valuable opportunities for prospective community college faculty to gain experience teaching or providing service to students while simultaneously completing the requirements for meeting the minimum qualifications for faculty;

Whereas, The Board of Governors Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation and a Strong Economy recognized through its recommendations the importance of faculty internships as a means to expand opportunities for industry professionals to teach in Career and Technical Education programs, specifically recommendation 14(e), which states:

*Develop and promote guidelines to implement Title 5 §53502, Faculty Internship Minimum Qualifications, for those disciplines for which a master’s degree is not expected or required*; and

Whereas, The current minimum qualifications for faculty interns in disciplines not requiring a master’s degree stated in Title 5 §53502(b) are not fully aligned with the minimum qualifications for credit faculty in disciplines not requiring master’s degrees stated in Title 5 §53410, such as the use of the term “industry experience” instead of “professional experience” and the lack of a provision for interns who are completing or who have completed baccalaureate degrees, and this lack of alignment may present difficulties in developing the guidelines on faculty internship minimum qualifications recommended by the Strong Workforce Task Force;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to review, clarify, and develop as needed possible revisions to the minimum qualifications for faculty interns as stated in Title 5 §53502(b) for disciplines not requiring a master’s degree in order to promote the expansion faculty internship opportunities for industry professionals and report its findings by Fall 2017.

Contact: Stacey Searl-Chapin, Mt. San Jacinto College, Standards and Practices Committee

See Appendix YYY for a comparison of the language in Title 5 §53410 and §53502(b).

## \*10.03 S17 Review Experience Definitions for Disciplines Not Requiring a Master’s Degree

Whereas, Title 5 §53404 (last amended in 1994) defines experience, as required for faculty minimum qualifications, solely in terms of years of full-time experience[[11]](#footnote-11); and

Whereas, The current requirement of basing the required experience in disciplines not requiring a master’s degree on years of full-time experience emphasizes quantity of experience over quality of experience and excludes applicants who may be well-rounded in their fields but who have not worked full-time for the number of years required to meet the minimum qualifications stated in Title 5 §53410, thus reducing the pool of otherwise qualified applicants for faculty positions in those disciplines;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with discipline faculty to explore alternatives to the current definitions of professional and occupational experience stated in Title 5 §53404 and report its findings by Fall 2017.

Contact: Eric Narveson, Evergreen Valley College, Standards and Practices Committee

## \*10.04 S17 Review Experience Requirements for Disciplines Not Requiring a Master’s Degree

Whereas, The professional experience components of the minimum qualifications for faculty in disciplines not requiring a master’s degree stated in Title 5 §53410 are identical, regardless of whether or not a bachelor’s or associate’s degree is expected or available[[12]](#footnote-12); and

Whereas, The lack of any credit from earning an associate’s or bachelor’s degree in the discipline directly related to the faculty member’s teaching assignment towards the professional experience requirement disregards the expertise gained by completing a degree in that discipline;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with discipline faculty to explore the potential of revising the minimum qualifications for disciplines not requiring a master’s degree in order to allow for appropriate credit for years of professional experience when an associate’s or bachelor’s degree is completed in the specific discipline and report its findings by fall 2017.

Contact: Stacey Searl-Chapin, Mt. San Jacinto College, Standards and Practices Committee

## \*10.05 S17 Recognition of Degrees Earned from Accredited Institutions for Meeting Minimum Qualifications

Whereas, Title 5 §53406 requires that degrees earned by faculty in the California community colleges be from “a postsecondary institution accredited by an accreditation agency recognized by either the U.S. Department of Education or the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation;[[13]](#footnote-13)”

Whereas, The requirement for accreditation by a recognized accreditation agency is not restricted to regional accreditation agencies, and therefore all degrees, including associate’s degrees, earned by students from institutions accredited by any agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (formerly the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation) may be accepted as valid degrees for meeting faculty minimum qualifications; and

Whereas, Being more restrictive than what is allowed by Title 5 §53406 may unnecessarily restrict the pool of qualified applicants for faculty positions, particularly in the Career and Technical Education disciplines;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges remind local senates that Title 5 §53406 allows the recognition of all degrees earned from institutions accredited by any accreditation agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (formerly the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation) as valid degrees for the purpose of meeting faculty minimum qualifications.

Contact: Eric Narveson, Evergreen Valley College, Standards and Practices Committee

## \*10.06 S17 Equivalency Resources for Local Senates

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has long asserted that all faculty must model what it means to be an educated person through the attainment of depth and breadth of knowledge and experience at least equal to the discipline-specific and general education requirements of a college degree;

Whereas, Applicants for faculty positions in the California community colleges who do not meet the minimum qualifications may demonstrate that their qualifications are equivalent to the minimum qualifications through a variety of means, depending on local policies, including through demonstrated completion of academic coursework in the discipline and in general education, through work experience, and through eminence; and

Whereas, Local senates often struggle with determining whether or not the qualifications of applicants with significant years of professional experience but with little or no formal academic preparation are equivalent to the minimum qualifications, particularly in the CTE disciplines, and would benefit from the availability of expanded resources for determining equivalencies to the minimum qualifications;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with instructional faculty in the CTE and non-CTE disciplines and other entities as appropriate to develop and disseminate resources that empower local senates to evaluate and assess more effectively and with greater flexibility the qualifications of applicants for faculty positions who have significant professional experience in the field but who have not completed formal academic work in the discipline and/or in general education and report the outcomes by spring 2018.

Contact: John Freitas, Executive Committee, Standards and Practices Committee

# 11.0 TECHNOLOGY

## \*11.01 S17 Using Savings from Adopting Canvas

Whereas, Resolution 12.04 F14 “Using Anticipated Savings from Adopting the Common Course Management System to Support Online Faculty Professional Development Needs”[[14]](#footnote-14) urged “local senates and barging units to work with their administrations to ensure monetary savings from a district or college transitioning to a Common Course Management System (CCMS) be used primarily to support the professional development needs of distance education faculty making the transition to the new CCMS;”

Whereas, The Online Education Initiative (OEI) has adopted the Common Course Management System (CMS) Canvas for all distance education course offered though the OEI course exchange, OEI Exchange colleges are able to adopt Canvas at no cost for their Exchange and non-Exchange online course offerings, and Colleges that are not participating in the OEI Exchange are able to adopt Canvas at a significant cost savings with 75% of the cost of Canvas paid for by the OEI ;

Whereas, The governor’s January 2017 budget proposal included $8 million annually and ongoing to fund Canvas as the CMS for the entire California Community College System; and

Whereas, Even though the State of California may pay for Canvas in its entirety for the foreseeable future, the ongoing funding for professional development as well as the maintenance, improvement, and expansion of the technology infrastructure needed to support Canvas remains as required ongoing funding;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly urge local senates to advocate to their administration to ensure monetary savings resulted directly from the adoption of Canvas, be utilized to fund faculty professional development~~,~~ as well as the ongoing maintenance, improvement, and necessary technology infrastructure for high quality distance education programs.

Contact: LaTonya Parker, Moreno Valley College, Online Education Committee

## \*11.02 S17 Expansion of the Online Course Exchange

Whereas, The 2013-2014 Budget Act enacted the governor’s Online Education Initiative to expand access to online education in the California Community College System and allocated $16.9 million for that purpose, and furthermore the Chancellor’s Office established the California Community College Online Education Initiative to realize this legislation through the creation of the Online Course Exchange (“Exchange”);

Whereas, The Exchange promises to allow students to enroll in high quality online courses from colleges across the state through a centralized exchange, with potential for great benefit and opportunities for our students by providing additional access to courses needed for transfer and degree completion, and the 2016-2017 Budget Act (AB 1602)[[15]](#footnote-15) appropriated an additional $20,000,000 to “expedite and enhance the adaptation and development of courses that are available through the online course exchange of the Online Education Initiative”;

Whereas, It is important that efforts to expand the courses offered and colleges participating in the Exchange not compromise course quality or instructional integrity and that practices and policies focus on increasing student access and success across the system; and

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

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges remind the Online Education Initiative (OEI) that faculty primacy in academic and professional matters applies to curriculum and academic standards, which includes the academic standards for development and offering of courses for the Exchange, and that any decisions directly impacting courses need to be made in consultation with the OEI Steering Committee and with input from the Consortium;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges insist that high standards, including review of courses by trained faculty reviewers and determination of alignment with the OEI Course Design Rubric by those same faculty reviewers, remain in place to ensure that courses offered on the Exchange are of superior quality, of appropriate rigor, and offered and supported locally prior to being offered on the Exchange; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Online Education Initiative to develop enrollment management criteria for managing the number of courses individual colleges have on the Exchange and managing the selection of courses offered on the Exchange.

Contact: Cheryl Aschenbach, Executive Committee

# 15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES

## \*15.01 S17 California Community College Faculty Primacy in the C-ID Process

Whereas, The passage of SB1440 (Padilla, 2010) resulted in the following language added to the California Education Code, § 66745, Article 3[[16]](#footnote-16):

*The bill would condition a community college district’s receipt of state apportionment funds on its development and granting of associate degrees for transfer, unless each of the state’s community college districts waives reimbursement for specified state-mandated costs of implementing the bill in accordance with a prescribed procedure. This bill would prohibit a community college district from imposing any requirements, in addition to these requirements, for a student to be eligible for the associate degree for transfer, and would prohibit remedial noncollegiate level coursework from being counted towards the units required for the associate degree for transfer.*

*This bill would require the California State University to guarantee admission with junior status to any community college student who meets the requirements for the associate degree for transfer.*

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has led the effort, through the Course Identification Numbering (C-ID) System and the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) process to establish an appropriate and collegial review process to facilitate the transfer of students between segments of higher education in California including California State University and University of California partners in both processes; and

Whereas, Occasionally there have been serious disagreements between systems regarding appropriate TMCs or course descriptors;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that the final authority over curricular matters of course descriptors and transfer model curriculum design rests with the faculty of the community colleges per California Education Code, § 66745, Article 3.

Contact: John Stanskas, ASCCC Vice President

# 17.0 LOCAL SENATES

## \*17.01 S17 Resolution of Local President Sign-off on Grants and Initiative Plans

Whereas, The Governor of California and state legislature have been instrumental in producing legislation that has transformed and continues to transform educational standards in the California Community College System, such as the Institutional Effective Partnership Initiative (IEPI), Strong Workforce Program (SB 66, 2016/Leyva)[[17]](#footnote-17), Adult Education/Non-Credit Initiative (AB86, Education Omnibus Trailer Bill, 2013-2014)[[18]](#footnote-18) and Student Success and Support Programs (SSSP) Initiative (SB1456, 2012/Lowenthal)[[19]](#footnote-19), and other special grants such as Zero Cost Textbook Degree (AB798, 2012/Bonilla)[[20]](#footnote-20), California Pathways Application;

Whereas, These state initiatives, programs, and grant proposals involve many academic and professional matters under faculty purview including student success, processes for program review, curriculum development, institutional planning, budget development and more;

Whereas, Districts and colleges have well-established processes for ensuring that decision-making is a participatory process and that faculty have primacy in making recommendations related to academic and professional matters; and

Whereas, The timeline for participation in these initiatives, programs, and grants are frequently hurried and do not allow for the collegial consultation process to occur;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to remain vigilant in their contributions to and review of grants, programs, and initiatives that fall under the purview of academic and professional matters; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community College Chancellor’s office to include mechanisms, including a local academic senate signoff, that ensure local senate involvement in and approval of all grants, programs, and initiatives that fall under the purview of academic and professional matters.

Contact: Rebecca Eikey, College of the Canyons, and the Legislative Action Committee

[This resolution is consistent with but distinctly different from:

FA12 17.03, FA14 17.01, FA12 17.01, FA12 17.02, and FA14 12.03]

## \*17.02 S17 Adequate Support and a Designated Point Person for Formerly Incarcerated Students

Whereas, SB1391 (2014, Hancock)[[21]](#footnote-21) increased the California community college course offerings inside state prisons so that California community colleges are now teaching in-person in 32 of the state’s 35 correctional facilities:

Whereas, Proposition 57 (2016)[[22]](#footnote-22) will increase the number of individuals being released from state correctional facilities, and will prioritize those individuals who are pursuing college courses while incarcerated;

Whereas, Individuals being released are encouraged to continue their pursuit of higher education when they return to their communities; and

Whereas, Formerly incarcerated students, like other special populations of students, face dramatic obstacles to accessing college service and academic programs without intentional direct support and outreach;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that local senates work with their college administrators to designate and publicize a point person at the college who is responsible for supporting formerly incarcerated students and helping those students connect with appropriate support services at the college; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges’ Chancellor’s Office to assist colleges in their efforts to support formerly incarcerated students access college programs and achieve their academic goals at the college.

Contact: Cleavon Smith, Executive Committee
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