



**Academic Senate**  
for California Community Colleges

LEADERSHIP. EMPOWERMENT. VOICE.

## **48<sup>th</sup> FALL SESSION RESOLUTIONS**

### ***FOR DISCUSSION AT AREA MEETINGS***

*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 to be debated and voted on by academic senate delegates at the Academic Senate Fall Plenary Session held November 3 – 5, 2016.*

#### Resolutions Committee 2016-2017

John Randy Beach, Executive Committee, Chair  
Julie Adams, ASCCC, Executive Director  
Virginia May, ASCCC, North Representative, Area A  
Eric Thompson, Santa Rosa Junior College, Area B  
Rebecca Eikey, College of the Canyons, Area C  
Donna Greene, College of the Desert, Area D

## RESOLUTIONS PROCESS OVERVIEW

In order to assure that deliberations are organized, effective, and meaningful, the Academic Senate uses the following resolution procedure:

- Pre-session resolutions are developed by the Executive Committee (through its committees) and submitted to the Pre-Session Area Meetings for review.
- Amendments and new pre-session resolutions are generated in the Area Meetings.
- The Resolutions Committee meets to review all pre-session resolutions and combine, re-word, append, or render moot these resolutions as necessary.
- Members of the Senate meet during the session in topic breakouts and give thoughtful consideration to the need for new resolutions and/or amendments.
- After all Session presentations are finished each day, members meet during the resolution breakouts to discuss the need for new resolutions and/or amendments. Each resolution or amendment must be submitted to the Resolutions Chair before the posted deadlines each day. There are also Area meetings at the Session for discussing, writing, or amending resolutions.
- New resolutions submitted on the second day of session are held to the next session unless the resolution is declared urgent by the Executive Committee.
- The Resolutions Committee meets again to review all resolutions and amendments and to combine, re-word, append, or render moot the resolutions as necessary.
- The resolutions are debated and voted upon in the general sessions on the last day of the Plenary Session.

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

- Senate Delegate Roles and Responsibilities
- Plenary Session Resolution Procedures
- Resolution Writing and General Advice

New delegates are strongly encouraged to attend the New Delegate Orientation on Thursday morning prior to the first breakout session.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

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

Consent calendar resolutions in the packet are marked with a \*

- \*2.01 F16 Local Recruitment and Nomination Processes for Accreditation Teams
- \*2.02 F16 Evaluation of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
- \*9.01 F16 Single Process for Local Curriculum Approval
- \*9.02 F16 Faculty Involvement in the Creation of Dual Enrollment Programs
- \*10.01 F16 Annual Consideration of the Disciplines List Proposals
- \*10.02 F16 Collaborate with System Partners to Remove Faculty Minimum Qualifications from Title 5
- \*10.03 F16 Explore Establishing a More Flexible Discipline for Emerging Career and Technical Education Fields
- \*12.01 F16 Use of Professional Learning Network (PLN) Resources to Satisfy FLEX Requirements
- \*15.01 F16 California State University Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report
- \*17.01 F16 Posting of Local Equivalency Processes on Websites
- \*18.01 F16 Local Senate Approval for Participation in Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP)
- \*18.02 F16 Validation of Statewide Multiple Measures
- \*21.01 F16 Faculty Participation in Career Technical Education Regional Consortia Governance
- \*21.02 F16 Develop a Paper on Effective Practices for Career Technical Education Advisory Committees

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

2.0	ACCREDITATION .....	1
*2.01	F16 Local Recruitment and Nomination Processes for Accreditation Teams .....	1
*2.02	F16 Evaluation of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges .....	1
7.0	CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE .....	2
*7.01	F16 Apprenticeship Programs.....	2
9.0	CURRICULUM.....	3
*9.01	F16 Single Process for Local Curriculum Approval.....	3
*9.02	F16 Faculty Involvement in the Creation of Dual Enrollment Programs .....	4
10.0	DISCIPLINES LIST .....	5
*10.01	F16 Annual Consideration of the Disciplines List Proposals .....	5
*10.02	F16 Collaborate with System Partners to Remove Faculty Minimum Qualifications from Title 5.....	5
*10.03	F16 Explore Establishing a More Flexible Discipline for Emerging Career and Technical Education Fields .....	6
12.0	FACULTY DEVELOPMENT.....	7
*12.01	F16 Use of Professional Learning Network (PLN) Resources to Satisfy Flex Requirements .....	7
15.0	INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES .....	8
*15.01	F16 California State University Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report.....	8
17.0	LOCAL SENATES.....	8
*17.01	F16 Posting of Local Equivalency Processes on Websites.....	8
18.0	MATRICULATION .....	9
*18.01	F16 Local Senate Approval for Participation in Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAAP) .....	9
*18.02	F16 Validation of Statewide Multiple Measures .....	9
21.0	CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION.....	10
*21.01	F16 Faculty Participation in Career Technical Education Regional Consortia Governance.....	10
*21.02	F16 Identify and Disseminate Effective Practices for Career Technical Education Advisory Committees .....	11

2016 FALL PLENARY RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION  
AT AREA MEETINGS

**2.0 ACCREDITATION**

**\*2.01 F16 Local Recruitment and Nomination Processes for  
Accreditation Teams**

Whereas, The Chief Executive Officers' Workgroup I on Accreditation document *A Preliminary Report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges*<sup>1</sup> recommended that the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges revise specific processes for visiting team member nomination and selection;

Whereas, Conversations about accreditation processes have on many occasions noted the need for more faculty participation on accreditation visiting teams;

Whereas, One frequently noted issue regarding the nomination of faculty members is that the only avenue for nomination is through recommendation of the college's chief executive officer (CEO), so faculty service on visiting teams is often solely dependent on the individual's relationship with his or her CEO; and

Whereas, Accreditation is most effective when it is a collaborative endeavor, and thus institutions could benefit from establishing local procedures for recruiting, screening, and nominating faculty members and others through a collegial process that includes the leadership of faculty, administration, and other constituencies;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Community College League of California and other appropriate constituencies to encourage colleges to establish collaborative local processes for recruiting, screening, and nominating faculty and other college employees to serve on accreditation visiting teams; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Community College League of California and other appropriate constituencies to identify effective practices and provide guidance for colleges to help them establish collaborative local processes for recruiting, screening, and nominating faculty and other college employees to serve on accreditation visiting teams.

Contact: Executive Committee

**\*2.02 F16 Evaluation of the Accrediting Commission for Community and  
Junior Colleges**

Whereas, In its January 2014 findings, The National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, (NACIQI) and the United States Department of Education concluded under 34 C.F.R. §602.13(a) that the Accrediting Commission for Colleges and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) does not have wide acceptance by educators for whom it serves as the regional accrediting body because *some of its supporting documents constituted 'letters of gratitude not letters of support' and*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Preliminary Report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges*, [http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/CA\\_CC\\_CEOs\\_Work\\_Group\\_1\\_Preliminary\\_Report\\_June\\_2016.pdf](http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/CA_CC_CEOs_Work_Group_1_Preliminary_Report_June_2016.pdf)

2016 FALL PLENARY RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION  
AT AREA MEETINGS

*almost none of the letters of support were from 'educators' and those conclusions were reaffirmed by the United States Department of Education in January 2016<sup>1</sup>;*

Whereas, Since January 2014 the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has passed resolutions critical of ACCJC, such as Resolution 2.02 S15 which supports the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Task Force recommendations which state, *The structure of accreditation in this region no longer meets the current and anticipated needs of the California Community Colleges and The California Community College system and its member institutions have lost confidence in the ACCJC.*;

Whereas, Efforts to interact collegially with ACCJC regarding the parameters of the California Community College baccalaureate degree program, as detailed in an April 13, 2016 letter to the Commission signed by many of the pilot colleges involved in the Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program, have been disregarded by the Commission, which has resulted in a policy that is significantly more stringent and proscriptive than those of regional accreditors; and

Whereas, ACCJC, after repeated requests from the task force assembled to provide guidance to colleges involved in the Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program, has not provided evidence to support its claim that its policy on baccalaureate degree programs is a result of direction from the Department of Education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, a body recognized by the California Legislature as representing the 56,000 faculty of the California Community Colleges in all academic and professional matters including accreditation processes, have failed to see tangible signs of progress by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) in addressing the issues previously identified in the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Task Force; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges communicates its position to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI) and the Department of Education prior to their consideration of the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior College's (ACCJC) progress toward compliance with its §602.13(a) and its responsibilities as a regional accreditor.

Contact: Executive Committee

<sup>1</sup> U.S.D.E Decision of the Secretary Letter, January 4, 2016

## **7.0 CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE**

### **\*7.01 F16 Apprenticeship Programs**

Whereas, Apprenticeship programs have been referenced in the Strong Workforce Program and Adult Education Program since they provide a unique opportunities for students to gain both paid, on-the-job experiences as well as college level curriculum pertaining to their chosen career;

2016 FALL PLENARY RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION  
AT AREA MEETINGS

Whereas, Common components of registered apprenticeship programs include at least 2,000 hours of paid, structured, and supervised on-the-job training and 144 hours of related instruction and training provided for college credit; and

Whereas, College credit is awarded for courses placed in a discipline in a program of study leading to a certificate or degree award and may include apprenticeship hours, work experience, or other credit or noncredit requirements related to the program of study;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local curriculum committees to ensure that degrees and certificates are not comprised solely of apprenticeship units, but are grounded in one or more disciplines related to the program of study;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community College Chancellor's Office and system partners to review the regulations and clarify the procedures and policies for implementing apprenticeships in programs of study including those that lead to certificate and degree awards; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with system partners and external agencies to collect and disseminate effective practices for the inclusion of apprenticeship in programs of study in the California community colleges.

Contact: Executive Committee

## **9.0 CURRICULUM**

### **\*9.01 F16 Single Process for Local Curriculum Approval**

Whereas, Curriculum is an area under the purview of local academic senates, as codified in AB 1725 (1988);

Whereas, Per Title 5 §55002, the development of curriculum, including courses and programs, should be directed primarily by faculty and, prior to being approved by the Board of Trustees and certified by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, must be approved by local curriculum committees under the purview of the academic senate or comprised primarily of faculty;

Whereas, The Board of Governor's Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy<sup>2</sup> recommended that system partners, including faculty, evaluate the curriculum approval process to ensure timely, responsive, and streamlined curriculum approval for career technical education (CTE) programs; and

Whereas, Any efforts based on that evaluation that lead to the creation of a separate approval process to address CTE curriculum, or any type of curriculum, could lead to confusion and inequities, perceived or real, between curriculum in

---

<sup>2</sup> Board Of Governors Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy Report and Recommendations  
[http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/portals/6/docs/sw/BOG\\_TaskForce\\_Report\\_v12\\_web.pdf](http://doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu/portals/6/docs/sw/BOG_TaskForce_Report_v12_web.pdf)

2016 FALL PLENARY RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION  
AT AREA MEETINGS

key areas identified by Title 5 §55002 Standards and Criteria for Courses, such as grading policies, unit calculations, prerequisites, and other standards of scholarship;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge faculty, administrators, and other stakeholders to recognize that curriculum and educational program development are areas of faculty primacy; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to ensure that approval of all curriculum should follow a single process, regardless of the modality or discipline of the curriculum being approved.

Contact: Michelle Sampat, Mt. San Antonio College, ASCCC Curriculum Committee

**\*9.02 F16 Faculty Involvement in the Creation of Dual Enrollment Programs**

Whereas, AB 288 (Holden, 2015)<sup>3</sup> created new regulations for the creation and implementation of dual enrollment programs designed to reach students previously excluded from dual enrollment agreements, including students who struggle academically or who are at risk of dropping out;

Whereas, Dual enrollment programs have the potential to provide underperforming students a pathway to engage in college-level work prior to graduation from high school;

Whereas, Some administrators may view dual enrollment programs as a means by which to increase Full Time Equivalent Student without considering the implications of these programs for both faculty and students involved; and

Whereas, Any dual enrollment program that is developed without significant involvement of the faculty who meet the minimum qualifications in the disciplines that are included in the program may not take into account academic and professional matters, such as curriculum development and grading standards, that are critical to student success in the program;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to engage in discussions with their administrations to ensure that the development and implementation of dual enrollment programs occurs with endorsement through collegial consultation with the academic senate;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to consult with local college administration to assure dual enrollment course offerings are within the capacity of the college to maintain without adversely affecting local programs; and

---

<sup>3</sup> The text of the bill is found at [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201520160AB288](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB288)

2016 FALL PLENARY RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION  
AT AREA MEETINGS

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Career Ladders Project, the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges, and other interested stakeholders to ensure that dual enrollment programs are created for the benefit of students and not solely for the benefit of a college's fiscal growth.

Contact: Michael Wyly, Solano College, ASCCC Curriculum Committee

**10.0 DISCIPLINES LIST**

**\*10.01 F16 Annual Consideration of the Disciplines List Proposals**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Disciplines List Process has been established in accordance with the requirements of Education Code §87357, which states that the Board of Governors will establish a process for reviewing faculty minimum qualifications at least every three years and that they rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the ASCCC to establish that process;

Whereas, Resolution 10.01 F05 recognized the need for shortening the time between Disciplines List revisions from three years, with the time subsequently shortened to two years;

Whereas, The Disciplines List Process was revised in Spring 2014 to allow for the year-round submission of proposals to revise the Disciplines List while maintaining the requirement that proposals be considered for action by the ASCCC every two years; and

Whereas, The establishment of the Strong Workforce Program in 2016 has resulted in calls for a more nimble and responsive Disciplines List Process;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges revise the Disciplines List Process to allow proposals to revise the Disciplines List to be considered for action at least annually and to amend the Disciplines List Handbook accordingly; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to publish annually the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in the California Community Colleges*.

Contact: Executive Committee

**\*10.02 F16 Collaborate with System Partners to Remove Faculty Minimum Qualifications from Title 5**

Whereas, Faculty minimum qualifications for health services professionals, noncredit instructors, Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S), Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), and learning assistance/learning skills/tutoring services are established in Title 5 and not the Disciplines List, and therefore revisions to those minimum qualifications require regulatory changes;

2016 FALL PLENARY RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION  
AT AREA MEETINGS

Whereas, Resolution 10.03 S10 called for removing faculty minimum qualifications from Title 5 and placing them in the Disciplines List so that all revisions to faculty minimum qualifications would occur through the same process; and

Whereas, Consultation and collaboration with the organizations that represent these disciplines of health services professionals, noncredit instructors, Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S), Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) and learning assistance/learning skills/tutoring services will ensure an effective approach to resolve any challenges in removing minimum qualifications from Title 5 and raise awareness of the Academic Senate for California Community College Disciplines List process with faculty in these disciplines as is necessary for the success of such efforts;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges collaborate with the Chancellor's Office and the organizations representing health services professionals; noncredit instruction; Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S); Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS); and learning assistance, learning skills, and tutoring services to determine the most effective means to place these specific faculty minimum qualifications in the Disciplines List; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges collaborate with the organizations representing health services professionals; noncredit instruction; Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S); Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS); and learning assistance, learning skills, and tutoring services to raise awareness of the Disciplines List process and ensure that faculty in these specific faculty minimum qualification areas are able to engage effectively in the Disciplines List process.

Contact: John Freitas, Los Angeles City College, Standards and Practices Committee

**\*10.03 F16 Explore Establishing a More Flexible Discipline for Emerging Career and Technical Education Fields**

Whereas, In order to be assigned duties as faculty, individuals must meet the minimum qualifications for disciplines stated in the Disciplines List, and those defined in other sections of Title 5;

Whereas, The rapidly evolving needs of industry and the workforce often put pressure on colleges to develop new career and technical education curriculum to respond to such needs;

Whereas, The creation of new curriculum in emerging career and technical fields may be hindered by difficulties in determining which disciplines on the Disciplines List to assign new courses because existing, specific disciplines may not align well with the emerging fields; and

Whereas, The existence of a discipline on the list of disciplines for which a master's degree is not expected or generally available, and which requires any bachelor's degree or associate's degree and requisite professional experience that is analogous to the Interdisciplinary Studies discipline on the list of disciplines requiring a master's degree, may provide colleges the ability to respond more readily to industry and

2016 FALL PLENARY RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION  
AT AREA MEETINGS

workforce needs in the development and delivery of new curriculum in emerging career and technical fields;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges explore establishing a discipline on the list of disciplines for which a master's degree is not expected or generally available, which requires a bachelor's degree or associate's degree and requisite professional experience, and which is analogous to the Interdisciplinary Studies discipline on the list of disciplines requiring a master's degree, to provide colleges flexibility in creating curriculum in emerging career and technical education fields, and report its findings and any recommendations by Spring 2017.

Contact: John Freitas, Los Angeles City College, Standards and Practices Committee

**12.0 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

**\*12.01 F16 Use of Professional Learning Network (PLN) Resources to Satisfy Flex Requirements**

Whereas, Many faculty are required to complete a minimum number of professional development or Flex hours each semester;

Whereas, The Professional Learning Network (PLN) is an online professional development repository that provides access to professional development activities provided by vendors like Lynda.com, as well as resources that have been developed and reviewed by community college faculty, administrators, and classified staff that cover many of the same topics that are presented during on campus Flex sessions; and

Whereas, Allowing the use of professional development resources available through the PLN to meet Flex obligations will allow full- and part-time faculty to choose from a wide array of materials that can be covered whenever it is convenient, instead of only having professional development options during designated professional development or Flex days;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office for California Community Colleges to evaluate the permissible activities in the *Guidelines for the Implementation of the Flexible Calendar Program* to potentially include activities on the Professional Learning Network (PLN); and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to work through their local process to consider allowing faculty use professional development activities available through the Professional Learning Network (PLN) to satisfy their required Flex obligation.

Contact: Craig Rutan, Santiago Canyon College, IEPI Professional Development Workgroup

2016 FALL PLENARY RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION  
AT AREA MEETINGS

**15.0 INTERSEGMENTAL ISSUES**

**\*15.01 F16 California State University Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report**

Whereas, The Academic Senate of the California State University appointed a Quantitative Reasoning Task Force with broad representation from the California State University, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC), the California Acceleration Project (CAP), and the University of California Office of the President to address fundamental questions regarding the prerequisite content of the California State University General Education B4 (CSU GE B4) and potential pre-requisite or co-requisite content for quantitative reasoning and mathematical competency (CSU GE B4);

Whereas, The Academic Senate of California State University Quantitative Reasoning Task Force convened in February 2016 and finalized their report<sup>1</sup> in August 2016;

Whereas, *The Academic Senate of California State University Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report* contains four recommendations regarding student proficiency in quantitative reasoning; and

Whereas, ASCCC has provided numerous breakout presentations and a *Rostrum* article to inform the body of the ASCCC about current issues surrounding quantitative reasoning requirements in California;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates and curriculum committees to disseminate the *Academic Senate of California State University Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report*; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges consult with local senates, discipline faculty, and other appropriate constituencies to determine an appropriate response to the *Academic Senate of California State University Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report*.

Contact: Ginni May, Sacramento City College, Executive Committee

Attachment A: *Academic Senate of California State University Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report*

**17.0 LOCAL SENATES**

**\*17.01 F16 Posting of Local Equivalency Processes on Websites**

Whereas, Reviewing other local equivalency processes can be helpful to local senates when they are undergoing review and revision of their local equivalency processes; and

Whereas, Local senates across the state have adopted a wide range of differing procedures for establishing equivalency and having access to these procedures would help colleges establishing procedures of their own to compare effective practices;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend to local senates that local faculty equivalency processes are posted on college and district websites in ways that are easily accessible to all interested parties.

2016 FALL PLENARY RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION  
AT AREA MEETINGS

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

**18.0 MATRICULATION**

**\*18.01 F16 Local Senate Approval for Participation in Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAAP)**

Whereas, The Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAAP) has developed course placement models using high school transcript data including highest course taken, course grades, and overall grade point average (GPA), and these models have been shown to be at least as effective at predicting student success as approved assessment tests;

Whereas, Assessment and placement of students is an academic and professional matter that is the purview of local academic senates based on the review and input of discipline faculty; and

Whereas, The academic senate is best equipped to facilitate discussions on student placement decisions which result in wide-ranging impacts that go beyond impacting English, mathematics, reading, and English as a Second Language disciplines in such a significant way that any modification to local placement models should include all effected disciplines;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates to facilitate discussions among faculty about the use of multiple measures including high school transcript data used by the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAAP) and determine which measures will best serve the needs of students without creating barriers to courses outside of English, reading, English as a Second Language and mathematics; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with representatives from the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAAP) to require that participation as an MMAAP college must have local academic senate approval by including the signature of the academic senate president on any forms indicating a college's intent to participate.

Contact: Ginni May, Sacramento City College, Executive Committee

**\*18.02 F16 Validation of Statewide Multiple Measures**

Whereas, The use of multiple measures when placing students into courses in English, English as a Second Language, reading, and mathematics is required by §55522 of the California Code of Regulations;

Whereas, Many multiple measures that are currently used at community colleges have been developed locally and the data collection and validation of those measures is the responsibility of the college;

Whereas, Any assessment test that is used to place students is required to go through a rigorous review and approval process that includes pilot testing, field testing,

2016 FALL PLENARY RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION  
AT AREA MEETINGS

demonstrating contentment validity, and showing that the test items and the test are free of bias; and

Whereas, The Common Assessment System will include multiple measures like the models created by the Multiple Measures Assessment Project using high school data such as courses taken, overall grade point average, and specific course grades, that will be available to all community colleges but these measures are not required to be validated like assessment tests;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office for California Community Colleges to develop validation standards, similar to those for assessment tests, for any multiple measures that are included in the Common Assessment System; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office for California Community Colleges to ensure that any multiple measures included in the Common Assessment System go through a statewide validation process prior to the full deployment of the common assessment to the California Community Colleges.

Contact: Cheryl Aschenbach, Lassen College, Executive Committee

**21.0 CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

**\*21.01 F16 Faculty Participation in Career Technical Education Regional Consortia Governance**

Whereas, As a condition for receiving funding from the Strong Workforce Program, as defined in Education Code §§88820-88826, regional consortia must develop plans that enact the requirements of the Strong Workforce Program, including the establishment of governance models;

Whereas, The role of faculty in governance is an academic and professional matter under the purview of local senates, and thus local senates must be centrally involved in identifying faculty to serve on regional consortia governance bodies;

Whereas, Career and technical education (CTE) faculty participation in governance bodies established in the regional consortia governance models is essential to effective development and implementation of regional consortia plans, including regionalization of curriculum and allocation of resources such as funding to cover the cost of travel and paid substitute instructors that may be needed to allow CTE faculty to fully participate in the work of regional consortia governance bodies; and

Whereas, Information regarding CTE programs is often disseminated by the regional consortia to CTE administrators, resulting in the exclusion of faculty from regional consortium conversations, information, and decisions;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that the career and technical education (CTE) regional consortium governance models required by the Strong Workforce Program must include faculty as active and voting members;

2016 FALL PLENARY RESOLUTIONS FOR DISCUSSION  
AT AREA MEETINGS

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges assert that local senates should recommend the faculty identified to be potential members of CTE regional consortium governance bodies; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge that the CTE regional consortia provide sufficient resources to enable faculty appointed by the local senates to participate fully in the activities of their governance bodies.

Contact: Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, Mt. Jacinto College, CTE Leadership Committee

**\*21.02 F16 Identify and Disseminate Effective Practices for Career Technical Education Advisory Committees**

Whereas, Practices for establishing and working with career and technical education (CTE) advisory committees, including the recruitment of members and the use of advisory committee recommendations in program development and improvement, vary between colleges and districts; and

Whereas, Successful implementation of the Strong Workforce Program established in Education Code §§88820-88826 will require that colleges establish CTE advisory committees that are highly engaged and work effectively with CTE faculty in developing and improving CTE programs that meet the needs of students and industry;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges distribute a survey to the field by Spring 2017 to identify examples of effective practices for career and technical education (CTE) advisory committees used by CTE programs throughout California's community colleges; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges identify and disseminate effective practices for career and technical education (CTE) advisory committees and present it at the Fall 2017 plenary session for adoption.

Contact: Lorraine Slattery-Farrell, Mt. Jacinto College, CTE Leadership Committee