



**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
for California Community Colleges  
LEADERSHIP • EMPOWERMENT • VOICE

## ASCCC Fall Plenary Session 2024 Resolutions

For Discussion – Friday, November 8, 2024

### Disclaimer:

The enclosed resolutions do not reflect the position of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, its Executive Committee, or standing committees. They are presented for the purpose of discussion by the field and are to be debated and voted on by academic senate delegates at the Academic Senate Fall Plenary Session held on November 9, 2024.

### **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

PLENARY RESOLUTIONS PROCESS .....	1
CONSENT CALENDAR .....	2
RESOLUTIONS CATEGORIES .....	4
101 CURRICULUM.....	5
101.01 F24 Adopt Using Outcomes for the Course Outline of Record in Title 5 .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
*+101.02 F24 Nutrition Science Integration in General Education Curriculum as a Cal-GETC Subject Area 5B Course .....	5
*#101.02.01 F24 Amend 101.02 F24 Nutrition Science Integration in General Education Curriculum as a Cal-GETC .....	5
*+101.03 F24 Cal-GETC External Examination Credit for Cambridge International Assessments .....	6
*+101.04 F24 Automatic California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) Approval of California Community Colleges (CCC) Ethnic Studies Courses .....	6
*#101.05 F24 UC Transferability of English for Speakers of Other Languages Oral Communications Courses .....	7
*#101.06 F24 No Implementation without Articulation: Safeguarding Student Success and Transfer Pathways in Future Common Course Numbering Phases .....	8
*#101.07 F24 Delay Public-Facing Implementation of Common Course Numbering Until Transfer Agreements Are Established .....	9
*#101.08 F24 Phase-Out Process for Courses that Lose Course-to-Course Articulation .....	10
*#101.09 F24 Use CCN Templates for CCC System Level Transferability and General Education (Cal-GETC) Review and Approval.....	10
*#101.10 F24 Develop Clear Guidelines for Transferability and Articulation Processes .....	11
104 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT.....	12
*#104.01 F24 Strengthening Systemic Support for the Early Childhood Education and Education Sector in Alignment with Vision 2030 .....	12
105 STUDENT PREPARATION AND SUCCESS .....	13
*105.01 F24 Investigate Academic Renewal Policies .....	13
*+105.02 F24 Encouraging Funding for Printing Lab Manuals to Achieve Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) Status.....	13
*+105.03 F24 Encouraging Transparency and Eliminating Automatic Billing Practices in Course Material Access.....	14
*+105.04 F24 Support the Establishment of Guidance for Course Syllabi .....	15
+105.05 F24 Acknowledge Extended Opportunity Programs and Services' 55 Years of Student Success.....	16
*#105.06 F24 Reevaluation of Data Analysis and Implementation Guidelines for AB 1705.....	16
*#105.07 F24 Negative Impacts on Equity and Inclusion in Relation to California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Guidance on AB 1705.....	17
108 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT .....	18
*#108.01 F24 Selecting and Evaluating Artificial Intelligence for Faculty Use.....	18
109 PROGRAM REVIEW .....	19
*+109.01 F24 Update the 2009 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Paper "Program Review: Setting a Standard" to reflect ACCJC 2023 Standards.....	19
111 ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES .....	20
111.01 F24 Update the ASCCC Paper, "The Role of Counseling Faculty and the Delivery of Counseling Services in the California Community Colleges" .....	20
111.02 F24 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Rules Revision.....	21
111.03 F24 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Bylaws Revision .....	22
*#111.04 F24 Open Educational Resources and Publication Date.....	22
*#111.05 F24 Senator Emeritus for Sharyn Eveland .....	23

*#111.06 F24 Clarify the Rules around Special Elections.....	23
113 LEGISLATION AND ADVOCACY.....	24
*+113.01 F24 Legislative Advocacy to Restore Student Choice on English and Math Courses .....	24
*#113.02 F24 Designating an Official Native American Holiday for the California Community College System .....	25
114 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLORS OFFICE .....	25
*+114.01 F24 Support for Faculty for Implementation of AB 1111 Guidance .....	25
*+114.02 F24 Work Experience Education Course Repeatability .....	26
*#114.03 F24 Encroachment of Academic and Professional Matters Due to California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Guidance on AB 1705 .....	27

## PLENARY RESOLUTIONS PROCESS

In order to ensure that deliberations are organized, effective, and meaningful, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges uses the following resolution procedure:

- Pre-plenary resolutions are developed by the Executive Committee (through its committees) and submitted to the pre-plenary area meetings for review.
- Amendments and new pre-plenary resolutions are generated in the area meetings.
- The Resolutions Committee meets to review all pre-plenary resolutions and combine, reword, append, or render moot these resolutions as necessary.
- Resolutions and amendments must be submitted to the Resolutions Committee before the posted deadlines each day by using the webform available on the Resolutions Process webpage.
- New resolutions submitted on the second day of the plenary session are held to the next session unless the resolution is declared urgent by the Executive Committee.
- Resolutions and amendments are debated and voted upon in the general sessions on the last day of the plenary session by the delegates.
- All resources are available on the ASCCC website.

Prior to plenary session, it is each attendee's responsibility to read the following documents:

- Senate Delegate Roles and Responsibilities (found in [Local Senates Handbook](#))
- Resolution Procedures (Part II in [Resolutions Handbook](#))
- Resolution Writing and General Advice (Part III in [Resolutions Handbook](#))

New delegates are strongly encouraged to watch the New Attendee Information pre-plenary webinar.

Explore California legal codes via <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/home.xhtml>

Explore California Code of Regulations, including title 5, via <https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?transitionType=Default&contextData=%28sc.Default%29>

The following legend has been used to identify consent calendar items, new resolutions, and new amendments:

- Consent Calendar resolutions and amendments are marked with \*
- Resolutions and amendments submitted at area meetings are marked with +
- Resolutions and amendments submitted through Thursday of the plenary session are marked with #
- Amendments and urgent resolutions submitted on Friday are marked with ^

## CONSENT CALENDAR

Resolutions may be placed on the Consent Calendar by the Resolutions Committee for any of the following criteria: 1) believed noncontroversial, 2) do not potentially reverse a previous position of the Academic Senate, 3) do not compete with another proposed plenary session resolution. Resolutions and any subsequent clarifying amendments that meet these criteria have been included on the Consent Calendar. If an amendment is submitted that proposes to substantially change a resolution on the Consent Calendar, that resolution will be removed from the Consent Calendar.

To remove a resolution from the Consent Calendar, please see the Consent Calendar section of the Resolutions Procedures for the plenary session. Reasons for removing a resolution from the Consent Calendar may include moving of a substantial amendment, a desire to debate the resolution, a desire to divide the motion, a desire to vote against the resolution, or even a desire to move for the adoption by the body by acclamation.

- \*+101.02 F24 Nutrition Science Integration in General Education Curriculum as a Cal-GETC Subject Area 5B Course
- \*#101.02.01 F24 Amend 101.02 F24 Nutrition Science Integration in General Education Curriculum as a Cal-GETC
- \*+101.03 F24 Cal-GETC External Examination Credit for Cambridge International Assessments
- \*+101.04 F24 Automatic California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) Approval of California Community Colleges (CCC) Ethnic Studies Courses
- \*#101.05 F24 UC Transferability of English for Speakers of Other Languages Oral Communications Courses
- \*#101.06 F24 No Implementation without Articulation: Safeguarding Student Success and Transfer Pathways in Future Common Course Numbering Phases
- \*#101.07 F24 Delay Public-Facing Implementation of Common Course Numbering Until Transfer Agreements Are Established
- \*#101.08 F24 Phase-Out Process for Courses that Lose Course-to-Course Articulation
- \*#101.09 F24 Use CCN Templates for CCC System Level Transferability and General Education (Cal-GETC) Review and Approval
- \*#101.10 F24 Develop Clear Guidelines for Transferability and Articulation Processes
- \*#104.01 F24 Strengthening Systemic Support for the Early Childhood Education and Education Sector in Alignment with Vision 2030
- \*105.01 F24 Investigate Academic Renewal Policies
- \*+105.02 F24 Encouraging Funding for Printing Lab Manuals to Achieve Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) Status
- \*+105.03 F24 Encouraging Transparency and Eliminating Automatic Billing Practices in Course Material Access
- \*+105.04 F24 Support the Establishment of Guidance for Course Syllabi
- \*#105.06 F24 Reevaluation of Data Analysis and Implementation Guidelines for AB 1705
- \*#105.07 F24 Negative Impacts on Equity and Inclusion in Relation to California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Guidance on AB 1705
- \*#108.01 F24 Selecting and Evaluating Artificial Intelligence for Faculty Use

- \*+109.01 F24 Update the 2009 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Paper “Program Review: Setting a Standard” to reflect ACCJC 2023 Standards
- \*#111.04 F24 Open Educational Resources and Publication Date
- \*#111.05 F24 Senator Emeritus for Sharyn Eveland
- \*#111.06 F24 Clarify the Rules around Special Elections
- \*+113.01 F24 Legislative Advocacy to Restore Student Choice on English and Math Courses
- \*#113.02 F24 Designating an Official Native American Holiday for the California Community College System
- \*+114.01 F24 Support for Faculty for Implementation of AB 1111 Guidance
- \*+114.02 F24 Work Experience Education Course Repeatability
- \*#114.03 F24 Encroachment of Academic and Professional Matters Due to California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Guidance on AB 1705

## 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 begin 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:

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

## 101 CURRICULUM

### **\*+101.02 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 their own Introduction to Human Nutrition (NUSCTX 10) meets UC Berkeley Biological Science, Letters and Science (L&S) Breadth, and CSU Long Beach recognizing their 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)<sup>1</sup> states Nutrition courses were determined to have a narrow or applied focus and therefore unacceptable for inclusion in Subject Area 5: Physical or Biological Sciences, and though Cal-GETC Standards Version 1.2 (May 2024)<sup>2</sup> no longer contains the exclusion language, Nutrition course proposals continue to be denied with the reason cited being that the proposal is too narrow in focus;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges urges and collaborates with our University of California and California State University partners to update their UC Transfer Eligibility Standards for Science and the Cal-GETC course review process to include Nutrition as a science eligible course for Cal-GETC Subject Area 5B.

Contact: Solange Bushra Wasef, Palomar College, Area D

### **\*#101.02.01 F24 Amend 101.02 F24 Nutrition Science Integration in General Education Curriculum as a Cal-GETC**

#### Subject Area 5B Course

#### Amend the Resolved:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges urges and collaborates with our University of California and California State University partners to update their UC Transfer Eligibility Standards for Science to allow Nutrition courses to be considered a science course for UC admission purposes, and the Cal-GETC course review process to include Nutrition as a science eligible course for Cal-GETC Subject Area 5B.

**Contact:** Mark Edward Osea, ASCCC Executive Committee

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://icas-ca.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Cal-GETC\\_Standards\\_1v0\\_2023.pdf](https://icas-ca.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Cal-GETC_Standards_1v0_2023.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> [https://icas-ca.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/Cal-GETC\\_Standards\\_1v2\\_2024.pdf](https://icas-ca.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/Cal-GETC_Standards_1v2_2024.pdf)



### **\*+101.03 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 US, the National Student Clearinghouse reports hundreds of Cambridge International students in the US enrolled in California postsecondary institutions, and thousands of international Cambridge students annually matriculate to California colleges and universities;

Whereas, AS <sup>3</sup>Levels Exams 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 deserving recognition and unit credit in academic contexts;

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

Whereas, While the University of California campuses recognize Singapore-Cambridge A levels, UCs still deny credit for Cambridge AS levels, exam grade thresholds vary, and without a current executive order for Cambridge credit from the California State University System, the CSU Office of the Chancellor as noted in the CSU Policy Guide<sup>7</sup> has recommended use of the ACE National Guide for awarding college credit based on prior learning assessment, 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;

Resolved, That the Academic Senates 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

### **\*+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;

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.cambridgeinternational.org/programmes-and-qualifications/cambridge-advanced/cambridge-international-as-and-a-levels/qualification/>

<sup>4</sup> Cal-GETC Standards p. 18 [https://icas-ca.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Cal-GETC\\_Standards\\_1v0\\_2023.pdf](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.

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

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

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

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

### **\*#101.05 F24 UC Transferability of English for Speakers of Other Languages Oral Communications Courses**

Whereas, The University of California special regulations <sup>8</sup>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”; <sup>9</sup>

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”<sup>i</sup>

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”<sup>10</sup> is transferable, and UC Berkeley offers credit for lower division listening and speaking courses for ESL students through the College Writing Program, including College Writing 3H “ESL Listening and Speaking” and College Writing 9R “Academic and Public Speaking for Multilingual Students”<sup>11</sup>; and

Whereas, In light of AB 705 (Irwin, 2017)<sup>12</sup>, 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

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.ucop.edu/transfer-articulation/transferable-course-agreements/tca-policy/regulations-by-subject-area.html#e>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.ucop.edu/transfer-articulation/transferable-course-agreements/tca-policy/regulations-by-subject-area.html#e>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.ucop.edu/transfer-articulation/transferable-course-agreements/tca-policy/regulations-by-subject-area.html#e>

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.ucop.edu/transfer-articulation/transferable-course-agreements/tca-policy/regulations-by-subject-area.html#e>

<sup>12</sup> [https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=20170180AB705](https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=20170180AB705)

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 of the California Community Colleges request that the University of California update the University of California special regulations<sup>13</sup> for courses in specific subject areas to remove language prohibiting articulation of ESOL/ESL advanced oral communication classes.

Contact Leslie Blackie, Laney College

### **\*#101.06 F24 No Implementation without Articulation: Safeguarding Student Success and Transfer Pathways in Future Common Course Numbering Phases**

Whereas, [Education Code Sections 66725-66725.5](#)<sup>14</sup>, established by Assembly Bill No. 1111 (Berman)<sup>15</sup>, requires 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 College, California State University, and University of California systems to provide accessible, streamlined education, and creating confusion for students regarding the transferability of CCN courses;

Whereas, The current approach to CCN implementation, which requires the submission of potentially more than 1,000 courses across 115 colleges for Phase 1 articulation<sup>16</sup>, with anticipated exponential increases in Phases 2 and 3<sup>17</sup>, 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 Common Course Numbering (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, directly antithetical to the mission of CCN;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges calls 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 of the California Community Colleges advocates to the Chancellor's Office that all future phases of Common Course 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, to prevent unintended harm to students;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges advocates for an articulation-first approach to CCN 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

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.ucop.edu/transfer-articulation/transferable-course-agreements/tca-policy/regulations-by-subject-area.html#e>

<sup>14</sup> [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&sectionNum=66725](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&sectionNum=66725).

<sup>15</sup> [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=202120220AB1111](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1111)

<sup>16</sup> 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.

<sup>17</sup> 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.

Resolved, The Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges commits 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

### **\*#101.07 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)<sup>18</sup>;

Whereas, The Chancellor's Office communication ESLEI 24-22 (April 15, 2024)<sup>19</sup> emphasized that the vision calls 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, CSU, and AICCU);

Whereas, The CCCC Memo ESLEI 24-53 (September 6, 2024)<sup>20</sup> 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 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, CCCs 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 Chancellor's Office would provide revised course outlines to the system offices for use by the UC and CSU to test concepts and potentially revise articulation processes; and

Whereas, The CCCC Memo ESLEI 24-60 (October 24, 2024)<sup>21</sup> informed about 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.

---

<sup>18</sup> 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.](#))

<sup>19</sup> CCCC, ESLEI 24-22, April 15, 2024, Common Course Numbering Update ( [eslei-24-22-common-course-numbering-update-a11y.pdf](#))

<sup>20</sup> 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-i-a11y.pdf](#))

<sup>21</sup> CCCC 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](#))

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

### **\*#101.08 F24 Phase-Out Process for Courses that Lose Course-to-Course Articulation**

Whereas, Two years is the “standard time” for California community college students to complete their requirements for transfer to the California State University or University of California;

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

### **\*#101.09 F24 Use CCN Templates for CCC System Level Transferability and General Education (Cal-GETC) Review and Approval**

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

Whereas, The Common Course Numbering Task Force 2023 Report<sup>22</sup> sets a new vision for California Community College 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, Task Force Report, 2023); 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 by California State University and University of California agreeing 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;

---

<sup>22</sup> <https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Agendas/ab1111-summary-report-oct2023-final-draft-all.pdf>

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, through the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), 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

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

### **\*#101.10 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, the Academic Senate for the California State University, the University of California Academic Senate, 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, 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



## 104 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

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

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Vision 2030 report<sup>23</sup> has prioritized the Early Childhood Education (ECE) and Education (EDU) sector, recognizing the vital role in improving socio-economic mobility for all Californians;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges unanimously passed the resolution "Prioritizing System Support for the ECE/EDU Education and Human Development Sector" in Spring 2021<sup>24</sup>, establishing a strong foundation for addressing workforce shortages and improving educational outcomes, yet challenges still exist, such as persistent workforce shortages<sup>25</sup> and resource gaps<sup>26</sup>, 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, There is a critical need <sup>27</sup>for additional Regional Supplemental Instruction (RSI) funds to support non-traditional Early Childhood Education/Education programs apprenticeships, which will expand access to training and resources for a wider range of participants, including those in underserved communities<sup>28</sup>;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for enhanced systemic support and resources, including opportunities for faculty professional learning inclusive of workshops, webinars, and collaborative training sessions, to further strengthen program impact, enhancing their 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 (TAPs) to provide essential guidance and expertise so that programs meet the evolving workforce demands and align with state economic and educational goals;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges collaborate with the California Community College Chancellor's Office to actively promotes equitable access to apprenticeship opportunities for historically underrepresented populations in ECE/EDU 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

---

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/report/Vision-2030-A-Roadmap-for-California-Community-Colleges.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> <https://asccc.org/resolutions/prioritizing-system-support-eceedu-education-and-human-development-sector>

<sup>25</sup> <https://coecc.net/bay-area/2023/10/sector-profile-education/>

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.ccdaily.com/2021/10/community-colleges-step-into-teacher-ed-breach/>

<sup>27</sup> <https://www.dir.ca.gov/DAS/e-News/2022/Five-Point-Action-Plan.pdf>

<sup>28</sup> <https://cscce.berkeley.edu/workforce-index-2024/state-policies-to-improve-early-childhood-educator-jobs/early-childhood-educator-workforce-policies/qualifications-educational-supports/>

## 105 STUDENT PREPARATION AND SUCCESS

### **\*105.01 F24 Investigate Academic Renewal Policies**

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

Whereas, Title 5 §55046<sup>(OBJ)</sup> 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 (CCCs), and therefore create differences in access to and the educational standards of the CCCs; and

Whereas, Academic renewal policies and procedures are an academic and professional matter, specifically Title 5 §53200(c)(3) grading policies<sup>(OBJ)</sup>;

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 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, and report on the results by Fall 2025; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourages 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

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

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

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Board of Governors and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges have consistently supported efforts to decrease the cost of instructional materials for students, emphasizing the importance of sustainable solutions<sup>(OBJ)</sup> to achieve Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) status<sup>29</sup>



while preserving faculty's right to select appropriate instructional materials (F23 17.01<sup>30</sup>, S22 03.03<sup>31</sup>); to achieve Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) status<sup>32</sup> while preserving faculty's right to select appropriate instructional materials (F23 17.01<sup>33</sup>, S22 03.03<sup>34</sup>);

Whereas, The ASCCC recognizes open educational resources as the preferred and most sustainable mechanism for eliminating course costs, but acknowledges that in some cases, tangible instructional materials like printed lab manuals are necessary to achieve ZTC status (F21 03.05<sup>35</sup>); and); and

Whereas, The implementation of ZTC courses can be hindered by the cost of printing lab manuals, 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

### **\*+105.03 F24 Encouraging Transparency and Eliminating Automatic Billing Practices in Course Material Access**

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

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges opposes the use of automatic billing strategies and other approaches that maintain reliance upon commercial publishers (F22 17.02<sup>36</sup>), and encourages faculty and colleges to carefully consider the impact of such programs and recognize that while they may address immediate student needs, they may not work in students’ long-term interest (F19 09.06<sup>35</sup>); and encourages faculty and colleges to carefully consider the impact of such programs and recognize that while they may address immediate student needs, they may not work in students’ long-term interest (F19 09.06<sup>36</sup>);

Whereas, California community colleges are required by law to mark their sections which have no textbook costs (California Education Code 66406.9<sup>37</sup>) 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) and all California community colleges have received Zero Textbook Cost Program funds to increase the availability of course

---

<sup>32</sup> [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&sectionNum=78052](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&sectionNum=78052)

<sup>33</sup> <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/sustainability-and-institutionalization-zero-textbook-cost-pathway-efforts>

<sup>34</sup> <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/oppose-reliance-textbook-publishers-achieve-zero-textbook-cost>

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/consider-implications-publisher-developed-lower-cost-%E2%80%9Cinclusive-access%E2%80%9D-strategies>

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, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourages faculty and colleges to use the term “automatic billing” in lieu of euphemisms such as “inclusive”, “equitable”, or “first day” access; and

Resolved, 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

### **\*+105.04 F24 Support the Establishment of Guidance for Course Syllabi**

Whereas, The freedom to create and teach courses is a professional right of each faculty member<sup>(OBJ)</sup>;

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)<sup>(OBJ)</sup>, sections 66000 - 101149.5 of the California Education Code<sup>37</sup>, sections 50000 – 59704 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 5<sup>38</sup>, the 2024 ACCJC Accreditation Standards<sup>39</sup>, or the Policies for Prerequisites, Corequisites and Advisories on Recommended Preparation adopted by the Board of Governors<sup>40</sup> to clarify what information should be included in each course syllabus or when students can expect to receive a syllabus from their instructor;; sections 66000 - 101149.5 of the California Education Code<sup>41</sup>, sections 50000 – 59704 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 5<sup>42</sup>, the 2024 ACCJC Accreditation Standards<sup>43</sup>, or the Policies for Prerequisites, Corequisites and Advisories on Recommended Preparation adopted by the Board of Governors<sup>44</sup> 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

---

<sup>41</sup> [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displayexpandedbranch.xhtml?tocCode=EDC&division=&title=3.&part=&chapter=&article=&nodetreepath=3](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayexpandedbranch.xhtml?tocCode=EDC&division=&title=3.&part=&chapter=&article=&nodetreepath=3)

<sup>42</sup> [https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?guid=I5EDC84B04C6911EC93A8000D3A7C4BC3&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations?guid=I5EDC84B04C6911EC93A8000D3A7C4BC3&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default))

<sup>43</sup> <https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/ACCJC-2024-Accreditation-Standards-with-Review-Criteria-Evidence.pdf>

<sup>44</sup> [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](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)

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; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges shall make the syllabus guidance available by Spring 2026.

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

### **+105.05 F24 Acknowledge Extended Opportunity Programs and Services' 55 Years of Student Success**

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

Whereas, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services 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 achieve their educational objectives and goals" (*California Education Code §69640*);

Whereas, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services is a categorical program whose funds are intended to support students who are underserved, are educationally and economically disadvantaged, and often are first-generation college students, and whose monies have been restricted to protect funding to serve these students (*California Code of Regulations Title 5 §56200-56298*); and

Whereas, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services has demonstrated its long-term success with a statewide retention rate of 88%, a statewide completion rate of 81% consistently the highest of any large-scale student support program, and Extended Opportunity Programs and Services is present at 116 California Community Colleges, with EOPS having served more than 86,843 statewide in the latest academic year in which complete data is available (*Data Mart – California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office*);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges hereby 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 according 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

### **\*#105.06 F24 Reevaluation of Data Analysis and Implementation Guidelines for AB 1705**

Whereas, The California Community College Chancellor's Office [definition](#)<sup>45</sup> of "highly unlikely to succeed" for mathematics courses has changed from the implementation of Assembly Bill 705 (AB 705) to Assembly Bill 1705 (AB 1705), specifically where the most recent AB 1705 [guidance memorandum](#)<sup>46</sup> 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;

---

<sup>45</sup> California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and ASCCC. FAQ on AB 705 (2018). [https://c-id.net/cms-uploads/cms/AB705\\_FAQ\\_030218.pdf](https://c-id.net/cms-uploads/cms/AB705_FAQ_030218.pdf)

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

Whereas, [Research from the National Center for Education Statistics](#)<sup>47</sup> indicates that approximately 30% of students often change their majors and academic pathways, which highlights the necessity of offering preparatory courses that support diverse student needs and pathways, particularly for those 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 their [report](#)<sup>48</sup> titled, "Preparatory Pathways and STEM Calculus Completion" is used to justify the most recent AB 1705 guidance, and the report concludes, "No group was deemed highly unlikely to succeed in STEM Calculus 1 when directly enrolled and given two years, regardless of high school GPA or math preparation."; and

Whereas, The California State University Math Council has echoed concerns in a [resolution](#)<sup>49</sup> 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 advocates 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 advocates for the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office' reconsideration of throughput as a metric of success as outlined in AB 1705 STEM pathway guidance;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocates for a comprehensive audit of the [data and evidence](#)<sup>50</sup> 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 advocates for a reevaluation of data using validation processes, which 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

### **\*#105.07 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 College system;

---

<sup>47</sup> 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>

<sup>48</sup> 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](https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/MultipleMeasures/AB705_Workshops/PreparatoryPathwaysSTEMCalcCompletion_February2024.pdf?ver=2024-02-23-070133-477)

<sup>49</sup> 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>

<sup>50</sup> 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](https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/MultipleMeasures/AB705_Workshops/PreparatoryPathwaysSTEMCalcCompletion_February2024.pdf?ver=2024-02-23-070133-477)

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office AB 1705 [guidance memorandum](#) ESLEI 24-15<sup>51</sup> 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 \(Irwin, 2022\)](#)<sup>52</sup> exceed both the requirements and intent of the legislation;

Whereas, A recent [CSU Math Council Resolution](#)<sup>53</sup> raises serious concerns about the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office AB 1705 implementation guidance, noting that requiring underprepared students 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 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 \(f\)\(1\)](#)<sup>54</sup> validated in alignment with Chancellor's Office Guidelines for [Title 5 Section 55003\(f\)](#)<sup>55</sup>.

Contact: Tina Akers-Porter, Modesto Junior College

## 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 College system have expressed a growing interest in AI and its potential applications in the classroom, as evidenced by increased participation in Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges webinars and discussions on the 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 in the classroom 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 determination regarding tool selection and policy decisions;

---

<sup>51</sup> 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>

<sup>52</sup> California Education Code 78213. <https://codes.findlaw.com/ca/education-code/edc-sect-78213/>

<sup>53</sup> 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>

<sup>54</sup> California Education Code 78213(f)(1). <https://codes.findlaw.com/ca/education-code/edc-sect-78213/>

<sup>55</sup> Chancellor's Office. Guidelines for Title 5 Section 55003 (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](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)

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 of the 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

topic as well as Chancellor's Office webinars and trainings; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has previously recognized the importance of addressing AI in education through Resolution [SP23 13.05](#)<sup>56</sup>, which called for "prioritizing the development of

## 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 is established as an academic and professional matter in Title 5 §53200<sup>(OBJ)</sup> indicating the role and involvement of faculty self-study and improvement process; indicating the role and involvement of faculty self-study and improvement process;

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) adopted updated standards in June 2023<sup>(OBJ)</sup> resulting in Program Review being referenced as a source of evidence to support Standard 1, Standard 2, and Standard 3 rather than explicitly outlined as a requirement as it was in the ACCJC 2014 standards<sup>57</sup>; resulting in Program Review being referenced as a source of evidence to support Standard 1, Standard 2, and Standard 3 rather than explicitly outlined as a requirement as it was in the ACCJC 2014 standards<sup>58</sup>;

Whereas, Local academic senates and faculty members may require support to maintain the need for faculty involvement in the processes for Program Review due to the less explicit language in the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges 2023 standards; and

Whereas, The last paper on Program Review by the ASCCC, titled *Program Review: Setting a Standard*<sup>(OBJ)</sup>, was adopted in 2009 and is based on the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) 2014 standards and does not reflect the more recently adopted ACCJC standards in 2023; , was adopted in 2009 and is based on the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) 2014 standards and does not reflect the more recently adopted ACCJC standards in 2023;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update its *Program Review: Setting a Standard* (2009) paper to reflect language of the updated Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges 2023 standard to reinforce the role of faculty in program review processes; and

---

<sup>56</sup> ASCCC. Resolution SP23 13.05. <https://asccc.org/resolutions/considering-merits-and-faults-artificial-intelligence-community-college-classroom>

<sup>58</sup> [ACCJC 2014 standards](#)



Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide updated resources reflecting updated Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges 2023 standards to support local academic senates and faculty to assert their role and effectively engage in the program review process, by Spring 2026.

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

## 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 both serve students in-person and remotely and increased the need to address mental health issues among college-aged students through trauma-informed care<sup>[00]</sup>;

Whereas, The California Legislature has enacted AB 705 (2017, Irwin)<sup>[00]</sup> and AB 1705 (2021, Irwin)<sup>59</sup> which has impacted counseling roles and practices regarding advisement of students in placement for math, English, and English as a Second Language; and AB 1705 (2021, Irwin)<sup>60</sup> which has impacted counseling roles and practices regarding advisement of students in placement for math, English, and English as a Second Language;

Whereas, The California Community Colleges have adopted the guided pathways framework<sup>[00]</sup> and the California Community College Chancellor’s Office has developed and adopted Vision 2030<sup>61</sup> 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 (e.g., African American/Black, Latinx/e, undocumented, justice impacted); and the California Community College Chancellor’s Office has developed and adopted Vision 2030<sup>62</sup> 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 (e.g., African American/Black, Latinx/e, undocumented, justice impacted); 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*<sup>[00]</sup> has not been updated since 2012; 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 on course placement, educational planning, appropriate roles for paraprofessionals and faculty advisors, the use of online counseling and technological tools for delivering some counseling services, the adoption of guided pathways, increased focus on career counseling, trauma-informed practices in providing crisis counseling, and the practice of case management to support student’s basic needs, to be completed by Spring 2026.

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

---

<sup>60</sup> <https://legiscan.com/CA/text/AB1705/id/2609099>

<sup>62</sup> <https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Vision-2030>

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

Whereas, The proposed revisions to the ASCCC Rules were approved by the ASCCC Board of Directors 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 adopt the revised ASCCC Rules<sup>63</sup> and that the revised ASCCC Rules take effect immediately following their approval. and that the revised ASCCC Rules take effect immediately following their approval.

Contact: Christopher Howerton, ASCCC Executive Committee

---

<sup>63</sup> <https://nam04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fasccc.org%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2F2024-10%2FASCCC%2520Rules%2520Carryover%2520Edits%2520and%2520New%2520Comments%2520Final.docx&data=05%7C02%7Cstewarril%40lasc.edu%7C52609c8c968b413bf4a208dce7e0b0b4%7C0b71261a495f4ea99911da844b9402ef%7C0%7C0%7C638640199930847197%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoijMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklIhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=3gAhUf0Y0AvcODiqcbI6cKltlkywwwW6Te%2F2pAylsVQ%3D&reserved=0>



### **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 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 academic senates from the ASCCC, clarified the 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 specify the threshold necessary for the ASCCC Rules to be changed by resolution at an ASCCC Plenary Session; and

Whereas, The proposed revisions to the ASCCC Bylaws were approved by the Board of Directors 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 adopt the revised ASCCC Bylaws<sup>64</sup> and that the revised ASCCC Bylaws take effect immediately following their approval. and that the revised ASCCC Bylaws take effect immediately following their approval.

Contact: Christopher Howerton, ASCCC Executive Committee

### **\*#111.04 F24 Open Educational Resources and Publication Date**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges supports removing the requirement of an international standard book number (ISBN) and a copyright date from all curriculum and articulation processes when open educational resources are specified<sup>65</sup>;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges was directed by Resolution [22F 09.01](#)<sup>66</sup> 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 when submitting courses for articulation and the University of California Transfer Course Agreement guidelines state that “textbooks must be dated within seven years of the course submission date or clearly identified as a ‘Classic text’ in the course outline of record”, yet editable open educational resources can be modified at any time; and

Whereas, Both the [APA](#)<sup>67</sup> and [MLA](#)<sup>68</sup> style guides require the date an electronic resource was accessed or retrieved be used when no publication date is available.

---

<sup>64</sup> <https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/2024-11/ASCCC%20Bylaws%20Carryover%20Edits%20and%20New%20Comments%20final%20REVISED%20110724.docx>

<sup>65</sup> ASCCC. Resolution 22F 09.01. <https://asccc.org/resolutions/removing-barriers-adoption-open-educational-resources>

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

<sup>67</sup> American Psychological Association. Webpage on Website References. <https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/references/examples/webpage-website-references>

<sup>68</sup> 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

#### **\*#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, Standards and Practices Committee, and Accreditation Committee, 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 ACCJC peer review teams;

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

Whereas, Sharyn was an amazing Psychology professor, Academic Senate President, 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 her Area A colleagues and past students, recognizes that she is one of the lucky ones enjoying retirement and wishes her the best in her future with "good" 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: Carrie Roberson, Butte College

#### **\*#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 support ASCCC's Strategic Plan Direction of "Embracing Organizational Change"<sup>69</sup>;

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

Contact: RJ Dolbin, Irvine Valley College, Area D

---

<sup>69</sup>

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

## 113 LEGISLATION AND ADVOCACY

### **\*+113.01 F24 Legislative Advocacy to Restore Student Choice on English and Math Courses**

Whereas, California Education Code Section 78213,<sup>[06]</sup> as revised in 2022 by AB 1705 (Irwin), prohibits community college districts from (a) enrolling students in pretransfer-level English and mathematics courses and (b) enrolling STEM majors in mathematics courses below Calculus 1 unless said courses can demonstrate better aggregate results in one-year throughput despite whether individual students may want the option to take said courses, effectively banning academic subjects, such as Algebra, from community college students; as revised in 2022 by AB 1705 (Irwin), prohibits community college districts from (a) enrolling students in pretransfer-level English and mathematics courses and (b) enrolling STEM majors in mathematics courses below Calculus 1 unless said courses can demonstrate better aggregate results in one-year throughput despite whether individual students may want the option to take said courses, effectively banning academic subjects, such as Algebra, from community college students;

Whereas, California Education Code Section 78213, as revised in 2022 by AB 1705 (Irwin), prevents community colleges from offering prohibited courses to students who are not succeeding in the one-year throughput metric despite whether (a) such students would like the option of taking said courses, (b) community colleges had other success data metrics to support the value of said courses, or (c) CSU and UC faculty from the affected disciplines expect the additional preparation students receive from said courses;

Whereas, California Education Code Section 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, Calculus 1 courses, that they are opting to drop before census or to not enroll altogether, which contradicts the shared goals of all public educational institutions in California “to provide educational opportunity and success to the broadest possible range of our citizens” specified in California Education Code Section 66010.2;<sup>[06]</sup> and and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has long expressed concerns that the ability of community colleges to serve all students were threatened by the implementation of AB 705 and AB 1705<sup>70</sup>;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for revisions to California Education Code 78213 to allow community college districts to offer pretransfer-level English and mathematics courses and, for STEM majors, mathematics courses below Calculus so students will have the choice of taking said courses when (1) requested by students, (2) local college data supports the value of said courses irrespective of one-year throughput, or (3) CSU and UC faculty from the affected disciplines recommend the additional preparation students receive from said courses.

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

---

<sup>70</sup> See the following ASCCC resolutions:

[F23 07.04 AB 1705 Meaningful Metrics for Equitable Outcomes](#)

[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 \(Irwin, 2022\)](#)

[FI9 09.09 Ensuring Access and Opportunity for Success for All Students Through AB 705 \(Irwin, 2017\) Implementation](#)

## **\*#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 our colleges stand;

Whereas, A Native American holiday would serve to honor the histories, cultures, and contributions of the original inhabitants of what is now the 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 ASCCC's 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 College system stakeholders, and the California State Legislature to advocate for designation of an official Native American holiday for the California Community College system.

Contact: Nicholas Petti, Mendocino College, Area B

## **114 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLORS OFFICE**

### **\*+114.01 F24 Support for Faculty for Implementation of AB 1111 Guidance**

Whereas, The California legislature passed AB 1111 (Berman) in 2021<sup>[OBJ]</sup> directing California community colleges (CCC) 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 which the AB 1111 steering committee recognized as introducing challenges with 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; directing California community colleges (CCC) 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 which the AB 1111 steering committee recognized as introducing challenges with 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 began in Spring of 2024 with course templates being made available in September 2024 with a due date for submission identified as December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024, and an effective date of Fall 2025, demonstrating a lack of consideration for 1) established curriculum timelines and processes at California Community Colleges and 2) the ramifications these updates may have on ASSIST and Cal-GETC updates in addition to the additional stress this puts on a system already burdened by required updates from AB 928 (Berman), AB 705 (Irwin), AB 1705 (Irwin), and introducing Ethnic Studies requirements;

Whereas, Practical considerations 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 vs. semester system course topic distribution, multi-college districts that may require layers of vetting, and numerous questions about academic freedom have arisen, vastly complicating an already complex implementation plan; and

Whereas, Funding<sup>[OBJ]</sup> has been provided to assist with AB 1111 updates with guidance that clearly identifies the work involved in “aligning existing course curricula to the CCN system” as one of the items fund may be allocated for; has been provided to assist with AB 1111 updates with guidance that clearly identifies the work involved in “aligning existing course curricula to the CCN system” as one of the items 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 course numbering to ensure that systemwide articulation with CSU and UC will be able to be implemented within the anticipated/expected timeframe of AB 1111;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with local academic senates to advocate for spending funds provided for AB 1111 directly on faculty efforts to make required curriculum changes and make associated updates to other courses and programs; 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.~~

Contact: Mary Pape, De Anza College, Area B

#### **\*+114.02 F24 Work Experience Education Course Repeatability**

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

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office stated in Memorandum ESS 23-49<sup>[OBJ]</sup> that Title 5 “section 58161, ...authorizes districts to claim apportionment “without limitation” for students “enrolled in work-experience education.” (Title 5 California Code of Regulations § 58161<sup>72</sup>, subdivision (f)(4)) ...[and] work experience education is repeatable as dictated by local district policy” yet Title 5 section 58161 only addresses apportionment and does not address repeatability; that Title 5 “section 58161, ...authorizes districts to claim apportionment “without limitation” for students “enrolled in work-experience education.” (Title 5 California Code of Regulations § 58161<sup>72</sup>, subdivision (f)(4)) ...[and] work experience education is repeatable as dictated by local district policy” yet Title 5 section 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 (4) to Section 55041(a) of the California Code of Regulations, which would read: “(4) Work Experience Education courses, as defined in section 55252.”<sup>[OBJ]</sup>

Contact: Ashley Young, Las Positas College, Area B

---

<sup>72</sup> <https://casetext.com/regulation/california-code-of-regulations/title-5-education/division-6-california-community-colleges/chapter-9-fiscal-support/subchapter-2-limitations-on-state-aid/article-5-other-limitations/section-58161-apportionment-for-credit-course-enrollment>

## **\*#114.03 F24 Encroachment of Academic and Professional Matters Due to California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Guidance on AB 1705**

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office [February 2024 guidance on Assembly Bill 1705](#)<sup>73</sup> was issued without consultation with the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges, as outlined in Title 5 53200 [LINK], which establishes the academic and professional matters for which academic senates shall be collegially consulted;

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office’s [February 2024 guidance](#) set limits on the maximum number of units allowed for preparatory courses, resulting in rules that conflict with (a) established C-ID standards and (b) previous guidance that did not restrict units ([December 2022 Guidance Memo](#)<sup>74</sup> and [March 2023 Implementation Guide](#)<sup>75</sup>);

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

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office’s [February 2024 memo](#)<sup>76</sup> 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 reaffirms primacy in curricular matters as defined in the “10+1” areas, and encourages the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to (continue to) consult with the ASCCC in updating guidance for AB1705 implementation;

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges expresses 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

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges commits to collaborating with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to revise the guidance to affirm local colleges' authority to develop curriculum for preparatory courses for STEM Calculus 1 in accordance with [California Education Code § 78213 \(f\)](#)<sup>77</sup>, and to examine the appropriate unit value for these courses.

Contact: Tina Akers-Porter, Modesto Junior College

---

<sup>73</sup> 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>

<sup>74</sup> Chancellor’s Office. ESS Memo 22-400-009. December 2022. <https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/ab705/ess22400009ab1705implementation12322a11y.pdf>

<sup>75</sup> 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>

<sup>76</sup> 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>

<sup>77</sup> <https://codes.findlaw.com/ca/education-code/edc-sect-78213/>

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

One Capitol Mall, Suite 230 Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 445-4753 [info@asccc.org](mailto:info@asccc.org) [www.asccc.org](http://www.asccc.org)

---