

IVC Academic Senate Meeting Agenda

March 17, 2010

1:30 p.m. – Board Room, Building 10

I. Call to Order by the President

Roll Call by Secretary

II. Visitor Comments

At this time persons may speak to the Academic Senate either on an agenda item or on other matters of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Academic Senate. However, please note that this is an open meeting, and anyone may speak to an agenda item during discussion or debate. (Only Senators may move or second any motion, and only Senators may vote.) If you wish to be heard at this time, please stand and identify yourself to the Academic Senate President.

III. Consent Agenda

1. Academic Senate minutes of 3-3-10

IV. Reports – please limit your reports to **3 minutes**

1. President
2. Past President
3. Treasurer
4. VP of Instruction
5. Chief Financial Officer (CFO)
6. Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) Coordinator
7. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Coordinator
8. Associated Student Government (ASG) President

V. Action Items: Academic and Professional Matters

1. Credit by Exam Policy Revision – Committee assessments
2. Dean position – Establishing Screening Committee(s)
3. Student Survey – Authorize before Spring Break
4. Distance Education (DE) Committee Position Papers
5. Tenure Committee – Establishing joint committees
6. Academic Calendar – Establishing joint committees
7. New Faculty Committee – Establishing policy and procedures

VI. Committees

1. Written summaries
2. Curriculum and Instruction
3. College Council
4. Equivalency
5. Budget and Fiscal Planning
6. Learning Support Services
7. Distance Education
8. Other committee reports

VII. Discussion

- 1) AS Spring Fundraiser – tentative dates and activities
- 2) AS Elections for full-time and contingent (part-time) faculty
- 3) AS Senate – Senate Bill 1440: Granting “transfer” degrees
- 4) IVC 2010-11 Draft Budget
- 5) ICOE Hands of Hope Mentoring Program
- 6) AS archives and filing systems
- 7) **“For the Good of The Order”** - suggestions for improvements *and* achievements

VIII. Adjournment

Academic Senate Meetings for Spring 2010

2010	2010
March 17 th	May 5 th & 19 th
April 21 st (April 7 th - Spring Break)	June 2 nd

As you can see, we will only have 4 meeting (after this one) in the Spring, with elections it will be short semester for action.

IVC Academic Senate

Unapproved Minutes

March 3, 2010

- I. The meeting was called to order at 1:31 pm by President White.
- II. **Roll Call**

Present: Krista Byrd, Suzanne Gretz, Daniel Gilison, Cesar Guzman, Michael Heumann, Rosalba Jepson, Eric Lehtonen, Mary Lofgren, Barbara Nilson, Norma Nunez, Thomas Paine, James Patterson, Toni Pfister, Jose Ruiz, Norma Scott, Kevin White, Cathy Zazueta, David Zielinski, Lianna Zhao, Kathy Berry, Bruce Seivertson, Steven Sciaky

Excused: Bruce Seivertson, Norma Scott, Cathy Zazueta

Absent: Russell Lavery

Visitors: Val Rodgers, Taylor Ruhl, Lisa Solomon, Tina Aguirre, Eric Jacobson, Carlos Fuentes, Gaylla Finnell, Frances Beope
- III. **Visitor Comments**
 - Senator Patterson spoke about concerns expressed by many of his colleagues regarding add authorization codes and problems with the current “crashing” system. He suggests that we begin to discuss this issue to find out whether or not the current system is working. He suggested that Gloria Carmona be invited to a future Senate meeting.
 - Senator Patterson also noted that he attended the statewide Senate conference on noncredit last Friday (February 26, 2010). He learned that the minimum qualifications for noncredit faculty are legislated, and there are rumors going around that the legislator will be changing these qualifications in the near future. There has been a push to change this and move the authorization over the minimum qualifications to Ed code so that the Senate can have input in this process (as they do with all other minimum qualifications).
- IV. **Consent Agenda**
 1. Academic Senate minutes of 2-17-10
 2. C&I recommendations of 02-04-10: Adopted 02-18-10—Inactive certificate and major
 3. Distance Education updated purpose statement
 - M/S/C (Patterson/Nunez) to approve the above items.
- V. **Reports**
 1. President
 - President White met with Dr. Gould last week and discussed shared governance, bringing in both the Senate and the College Council.

- There is an accreditation institute in Newport Beach later in March, and he wondered if the college had plans to send representatives. Vice President Berry noted that no one was attending this year, but reps have attended in the past and will attend in the future. Senator Pfister noted that she may or may not be able to attend.
2. Past President
 - Not present
 3. Treasurer
 - \$5,418.85
 3. VP of Instruction
 - Berry noted that the enrollment for spring is at 3066, which is a bit lower than initial projections.
 - Berry has been evaluating faculty over the past few weeks. She has been very impressed with the quality of our faculty.
 4. Chief Financial Officer (CFO)
 - Carlos Fuentes spoke for Vice President Lau. He reported that workload measures have been reduced, so the lower enrollment in Spring is actually in line with the number of students for which we are getting paid.
 - He also noted that some discussion would take place regarding salaries and expenditures at the college. He handed out two pie charts comparing all the expenditures by category to better explain the financial problems in the college. Our expenditures are exceeding our revenues, he said.
 5. Basic Skills Institute (BSI) Coordinator
 - Not present
 6. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Coordinator
 - Senator Pfister stated that she has been working on accreditation. She also sent out emails to the faculty regarding SLOs. She gave a list of all courses to chairs and coordinators to ensure that a person is assigned to each course taught on campus.
 - Note that people need to send her a hard copy of the cycle assessment forms, rather than emailing them to her. They are all going into a binder.
 - She asked whether the cycle assessments should be posted online. Berry noted that the accreditation commission needs to be able to see them before they come to campus. Gaylla Finnell noted that many other colleges make these assessments available online.
 7. Associate Student Government (ASG) President
 - ASG President Sciaky noted that the ASG met last week. Some members resigned or transferred to four-year colleges. They are looking to fill the remaining positions by next week.
 - The student health fair is scheduled for March 17, but it may change due to scheduling conflicts.

- On March 4, there is a statewide day of action by all community college student groups. There will be a voter registration drive scheduled at IVC.
- Senator Heumann announced that the senate election for the 2010-2011 President and the three at-large representatives (terms will go from 2010-2013) would be held on March 31, 2010. The notice of elections will be sent out after the Senate meeting. Nominations will be due on March 24.
- Senator Heumann also announced that there would be a special election for a part-time representative to finish the 2009-10 term vacated by Jean Montenegro.

VI. **Academic and Professional Matters**

1. Accreditation Midterm Progress Report Approval

- M/S/C (Patterson/Gretz) to approve the report
- Berry said that she and Dr. Gould spoke to the chair of the commission yesterday (March 2). During this meeting, they learned that we were continued on warning status because the commission needed to come to campus before they removed us from warning status. This visit will take place in March. When they arrive, they will want evidence for recommendation one (planning) and recommendation five (technology).
- She thanked the writing team for the progress report: Tina Aguirre, Taylor Ruhl, Val Rodgers, Michael Heumann, David Zielinski, James Patterson, all division chairs and division secretaries

2. Academic Reorganization—6 dean structure job descriptions & support details

- M/S/C (Pfister/Patterson) to move the action item to a discussion item
- The department chair positions would still be 199-day positions (like the current division chairs)
- Senator Lehtonen asked who would be in charge of scheduling, the dean or the department chair. Berry noted that it would be a collaborative task (just as it is now). The dean would be accountable for delivering the schedule, but the schedule would be done in collaboration with the faculty and the department chair.
- Senator Patterson noted that the dean structure would allow for better collaboration (something that is difficult to achieve now).
- Senator Byrd noted that she felt the job description for a department chair seems very similar to the job description for a division chair. Berry noted that the job description for a department is actually only half the size of the proposed department chair description.

- The question of reassign time for the department chair was then discussed. Berry noted that the “break-even” point for the college as far as cost was concerned was nine units of release time.
 - Berry noted that the dean will be responsible for program review, accreditation, and evaluations for faculty, both tenure-track and adjunct. The dean will also be responsible for getting schedules in on time. The department chairs will function more like current coordinators. The departments are smaller and the workloads should be less.
 - Lisa Solomon asked whether department chairs would be 199-day positions. Berry noted that they would.
 - Senator Gilson asked about evaluating faculty and tenure committees and the roles that the deans would play in these committees. Berry noted that she would designate deans to serve on the committees. She noted that the current tenure system is broken (particularly the timeline) and needs to be evaluated and revised, and that should be a priority of the Senate. She would like to see the tenure committee expanded, possibly to mirror the tenure process used at Riverside Community College.
 - Senator Lehtonen and Senator Patterson inquired about the concept of a “teaching dean.” Berry noted that this is unlikely given the workload of the dean positions. Lehtonen noted that the deans should only teach during off-hours. Frances Beope and Krista Byrd agreed.
3. Appointment of committee assignments
 - M/S/C (Patterson/Nunez) to approve Javier Rangel to be the faculty representative for the EEO committee.
 4. Cesar Chavez resolution—2nd reading (adding it as an official holiday or “teaching day”)
 - The original resolution was revised to indicate support for a teaching day rather than a holiday.
 - The motion was passed unanimously.
 5. Contingent faculty resolution—2nd reading (creating a comprehensive program for IVC part-timers)
 - Byrd asked whether the dean positions would help facilitate this process. Berry noted that it would. Eric Jacobson noted that he was not certain, but this was a serious issue that needed to be addressed. Berry felt this was a phenomenal resolution and we desperately need more training for our part-timers.

- Senator Gretz suggested that some changes be made to the wording within the resolution. The mover and seconder agreed to these changes.
 - The motion was passed unanimously.
6. Credit-by-exam policy revision—1st reading
- M/S (Patterson/Zhao) to approve this resolution.
 - Frances Beope spoke for Carol Lee and stated that the number of units a student can receive through credit by exam is fifteen units per semester and twenty-five total. The average total number is fifteen units. Therefore, she recommends that we change the twenty-five-unit cap to fifteen units.
 - She would also like to point out that, under the business procedures, there is a proposal to change the fee from \$150 per exam. She wondered if this fee was per unit or per exam.
7. AS Committee/Subcommittee Webpage Updating Resolution
- Senator Patterson motioned to authorize the Senate President to direct all committees and subcommittees reporting to the Academic Senate to update their respective web pages. Current/Updated web pages should include (at the least) the Purpose of the committee, the Composition (membership), and Regular meeting dates/times (if appropriate). Heumann seconds. The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. M/S/C (Heumann/Guzman) to adjourn the meeting at 3:10 pm.

Distance Education Committee Position Papers 2009-2010

Table of Contents

Title	Page Number
Distance Education Course Load	2
Online Course Enrollment Limits	3
Online Office Hours	4
Evaluation of Online or Hybrid Faculty as Part of the Tenure Review Process	5
Stipend for DE Development	6
Intellectual Property Rights for DE	7
Sick Leave for DE	9
Right of First Refusal	10

Committee: DE Committee
Committee Topic: Course Load

Distance Education Course Load

Statement of Current Policy

- No more than 40% of contract load (two [2] courses or six [6] units whichever is lesser) may be taught as distance education, or online, in any given fall or spring semester. (CCA/CTA/NEA Agreement 15.11)
- Faculty who teach four and five credit courses are limited to one DE course, whereas faculty teaching three credit courses may teach two DE courses per term.

DE Committee Involvement and Previous Actions

- DE course demand has increased steadily since the first online courses were offered in 2005.
- ACCESO researched and surveyed faculty opinions in Spring and Summer 2009.
- The DE Committee reviewed the results of the surveys and discussed the item on June 3, 2009, September 17, 2009, and October 15, 2009.

DE Committee Position

- In order to increase class availability and meet student demand, the available DE course load limit for faculty should be increased.
- DE committee recommends increasing the allowable DE course load for faculty. However, the limit should not be eliminated entirely. It is believed that eliminating the limit would allow some faculty to teach fully online, and before that can happen many other issues need to be addressed concerning committee work, office hours, etc.

IT IS THE POSITION OF THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE that the best practice for Imperial Valley College is as follows:

The faculty's DE course load should be set at 67% of contract load (three [3] courses or ten [10] units, whichever is less) in any given fall or spring semester.

NOTE: It is acknowledged that all matters pertaining to hours, wages, and working conditions must be negotiated between the District and Union. The position of the DE Committee is provided to assist in the development of best practices for Imperial Valley College and in no way attempts to bypass the process of collective bargaining.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the above position statement was approved by the DE Committee on November 5, 2009.



Signature of Chair

Committee: DE Committee
Committee Topic: Online Course Enrollment Limits

Online Course Enrollment Limits

Statement of Current IVC Policy

- The enrollment limit of an online course is equal to its face-to-face counterpart.
- There are varying enrollment limits for online courses, ranging from 20 to 40 students.

DE Committee Involvement and Previous Actions

- The DE Committee discussed online course enrollment limits on October 15, 2009, and again on November 5, 2009.
- The DE Committee recognizes that online courses often need more preparation and personal interaction for student success than their face-to-face counterparts.
- The DE Committee acknowledges that most research in the area of online course enrollment recommends course sizes in a range of 15 to 25 students.

DE Committee Position

- The DE Committee acknowledges that course time requirements for preparation, course management and effective communication are often greater in online courses than in their face-to-face counterparts.
- The DE Committee agrees that online courses and their face-to-face counterparts should be examined independently to determine the optimum enrollment limits for quality education.

IT IS THE POSITION OF THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE that the best practice for Imperial Valley College is as follows:

Enrollment limits for online courses should be established independently from their face-to-face counterparts, ensuring optimum enrollment for quality education.

NOTE: It is acknowledged that all matters pertaining to hours, wages, and working conditions must be negotiated between the District and Union. The position of the DE Committee is provided to assist in the development of best practices for Imperial Valley College and in no way attempts to bypass the process of collective bargaining.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the above position statement was approved by the DE Committee on November 19, 2009.



Signature of Chair

Committee: DE Committee
Committee Topic: Online Office Hours

Online Office Hours

Statement of Current Policy

- Currently, faculty members are required to hold five (5) hours of office hours each semester.
- According to the current CTA contract, faculty teaching online/hybrid classes can hold one of those five office hours online.

DE Committee Involvement and Previous Actions

- The DE Committee discussed this issue at the October 15, 2009, and the November 5, 2009, meetings.

DE Committee Position

- The Committee believes that the online office hour limit should be in proportion to the number of online/hybrid classes a given instructor teaches as part of their regular course load.
- In other words, instructors teaching two online classes (six units, or 2/5ths of a full load) should be allowed to hold two of the five office hours online.

IT IS THE POSITION OF THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE that the best practice for Imperial Valley College is as follows:

The online office hour limit should be revised to allow faculty members to hold office hours online in proportion to the number of online/hybrid classes that they teach.

NOTE: It is acknowledged that all matters pertaining to hours, wages, and working conditions must be negotiated between the District and Union. The position of the DE Committee is provided to assist in the development of best practices for Imperial Valley College and in no way attempts to bypass the process of collective bargaining.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the above position statement was approved by the DE Committee on November 19, 2009.



Signature of Chair

Committee: DE Committee

Committee Topic: Evaluation of Online or Hybrid Faculty as Part of the Tenure Process

Evaluation of Online or Hybrid Faculty as Part of the Tenure Process

Statement of Current Policy

- According to section 10.7 of the current Agreement between the CTA and the District:

However, for teaching faculty members who regularly teach online courses as part of their teaching load, the online course evaluation may be used by the evaluation team as an additional peer review of teaching in the contract, regular or tenure review facets of faculty evaluation, though it may not take the place of the formal classroom observations as described in Articles 10 and 11 of this agreement.

DE Committee Involvement and Previous Actions

- The DE Committee discussed this issue on February 25, 2010

DE Committee Position

- Online/hybrid courses taught at IVC need to be part of the regular tenure review process for all online instructors.

IT IS THE POSITION OF THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE that the best practice for Imperial Valley College is as follows:

The language in 10.7 should be changed to indicate that online course evaluation **should** (not may) take place for those teaching online/hybrid classes. Further, the evaluation of online/hybrid classes should also extend to the post-tenure review process.

NOTE: It is acknowledged that all matters pertaining to hours, wages, and working conditions must be negotiated between the District and Union. The position of the DE Committee is provided to assist in the development of best practices for Imperial Valley College and in no way attempts to bypass the process of collective bargaining.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the above position statement was approved by the DE Committee on March 4, 2010.



Signature of Chair

Committee: DE Committee
Committee Topic: Stipends for DE Development

Stipend for DE Development

Statement of Current Policy

According to the Agreement, section 17.14.1,

Compensation of \$540 per lecture unit shall be granted to the faculty member who successfully develops and delivers a complete distance education, or on-line course, for the first time, provided such course is operating on the official census date for the course. If another unit member develops or delivers the same or a different version of the same course during a subsequent semester, no stipend will be paid to this second unit member. For the purposes of this paragraph only, if a unit member develops an on-line non-credit course; one unit shall be defined as the equivalent of 18 hours of non-credit instruction. Payment for such course development shall be paid in one lump sum payment after the end of the semester in which the newly developed course was first offered.

DE Committee Involvement and Previous Actions

- The DE Committee discussed this issue on February 25, 2010

DE Committee Position

- Compensation is an important issue for IVC, not only because of the financial problems throughout the state and the nation but also because the ACCESO Project, which funded all DE development stipends, will end in June 2010.

IT IS THE POSITION OF THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE that the best practice for Imperial Valley College is as follows:

In order to increase our online course offerings and to encourage teachers to develop new online courses, we recommend compensation of some sort. However, alternate forms of compensation would be acceptable if they were deemed valid and mutually agreed upon.

NOTE: It is acknowledged that all matters pertaining to hours, wages, and working conditions must be negotiated between the District and Union. The position of the DE Committee is provided to assist in the development of best practices for Imperial Valley College and in no way attempts to bypass the process of collective bargaining.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the above position statement was approved by the DE Committee on March 4, 2010.



Signature of Chair

Committee: DE Committee
Committee Topic: Intellectual Property Rights for DE

Intellectual Property Rights for DE

Statement of Current Policy

According to the Agreement, section 21.6,

A unit member who develops on-line or distance education course for which s/he has been compensated through a stipend by the District or a District controlled grant is the joint owner of the distance education course with the District. The unit member retains the right to use the course materials at Imperial Valley College and at any other college at which the unit member is teaching or may in the future teach. The unit member is required to submit a complete copy of the distance education course, exclusive of student records, to the Distance Education Office. A copy of the distance education course shall be retained by the Distance Education Office and may be made available for the use of other faculty members at Imperial Valley College who may be assigned to teach the same course in the future. Neither the District nor the unit member has the right to commercially sell the distance education course to a third party without the express permission of the other party.

Unit members who develop an on-line or distance education course and receive no compensation from the District or from a District controlled grant or project retain exclusive rights in that course and have no obligation to share the course materials with the District, or any other party.

DE Committee Involvement and Previous Actions

- The DE Committee discussed this issue on February 25, 2010

DE Committee Position

- Intellectual property is a key issue for online programs throughout the United States.

IT IS THE POSITION OF THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE that the best practice for Imperial Valley College is as follows:

The current language should be modified to indicate that an online instructor is only required to turn in his/her course materials to the DE office once (after the course has been taught for the first time).

NOTE: It is acknowledged that all matters pertaining to hours, wages, and working conditions must be negotiated between the District and Union. The position of the DE Committee is provided to assist in the development of best practices for Imperial Valley College and in no way attempts to bypass the process of collective bargaining.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the above position statement was approved by the DE Committee on March 4, 2010.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'C. M. De' followed by a long horizontal flourish.

Signature of Chair

Committee: DE Committee
Committee Topic: Sick Leave and DE

Sick Leave and DE

Statement of Current Policy

- According to the Agreement, section 6.1.2.4, “Unit members whose teaching assignment, whether as load or overload, includes online or DE courses, shall receive the same number of hours of sick leave as they would be entitled to had the same course been offered as a full-term, traditionally delivered course, whether during the regular semester or during a winter or summer session.”

DE Committee Involvement and Previous Actions

- The DE Committee discussed this issue on February 25, 2010

DE Committee Position

- It is important to ensure that online/hybrid instructors are treated the same was as other instructors.
- Set forth DE Committee’s position statement:

IT IS THE POSITION OF THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE that the best practice for Imperial Valley College is as follows:

The language in the current agreement should remain intact.

NOTE: It is acknowledged that all matters pertaining to hours, wages, and working conditions must be negotiated between the District and Union. The position of the DE Committee is provided to assist in the development of best practices for Imperial Valley College and in no way attempts to bypass the process of collective bargaining.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the above position statement was approved by the DE Committee on March 4, 2010.



Signature of Chair

Committee: DE Committee
Committee Topic: Right of First Refusal

Right of First Refusal

Statement of Current Policy

- Currently, classes are selected by full-time faculty members within a division based upon seniority or a method agreed upon “through the collegial participation of all effected unit members” (15.15).
- As a result, faculty members who develop an online/hybrid course may not be able to teach that course.

DE Committee Involvement and Previous Actions

- This issue was discussed at the November 19, 2009, the February 18, 2010, and the February 25, 2010, meetings of the DE Committee.

DE Committee Position

- This is a central issue for DE faculty because many would not take the time to develop an online class if they were not guaranteed the ability to teach that class.

IT IS THE POSITION OF THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE that the best practice for Imperial Valley College is as follows:

If a faculty member develops an online course through the IVC’s agreed-upon process spelled out in AP 4021, then the faculty member has the right of first refusal to teach the course in question, regardless of the member’s seniority status. This would apply only to the first person to develop and deliver an online version of the course in question.

NOTE: It is acknowledged that all matters pertaining to hours, wages, and working conditions must be negotiated between the District and Union. The position of the DE Committee is provided to assist in the development of best practices for Imperial Valley College and in no way attempts to bypass the process of collective bargaining.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the above position statement was approved by the DE Committee on March 4, 2010.



Signature of Chair

Introduced by Senator Padilla
(Coauthor: Assembly Member Fong)

February 19, 2010

An act to add Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745) to Chapter 9.2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education Code, relating to community colleges.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1440, as introduced, Padilla. California Community Colleges: student transfer.

Existing law establishes the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in this state. These segments include the California State University, the campuses of which are administered by the Trustees of the California State University, the University of California, which is administered by the Regents of the University of California, and the California Community Colleges, which are administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

Existing law establishes community college districts throughout the state, and authorizes them to provide instruction to students at community college campuses.

Existing law, known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, authorizes the community colleges to grant associate in arts and associate in science degrees. The act also requires the regents, the trustees, and the board of governors to have as a fundamental policy the maintenance of a healthy and expanded program to increase the number of transfer students from community colleges.

This bill would enact the Community College Associate Degree and Recognition of Student Transfer Preparation Act, which would authorize a community college to grant an associate degree in the student's field

of study, that is designated as being “for transfer,” to a student who completes 60 transferable semester units or 27 quarter units, as specified, and meets the minimum requirements for transfer to a public university or alternative path to transfer program. The bill would prohibit a community college from imposing any requirements, in addition to these requirements, for the granting of an associate degree with the “for transfer” designation.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: no.
State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the
- 2 following:
- 3 (a) Since the enactment of the Master Plan for Higher Education
- 4 in 1960, preparing students to transfer to a four-year university
- 5 has been a core function of the California Community Colleges.
- 6 (b) Successful progression from lower division coursework to
- 7 degree completion is a basic principle of California higher
- 8 education and is critical to the future of the state’s economy.
- 9 (c) Currently, the coursework necessary to transfer to a campus
- 10 of the California State University or the University of California
- 11 differs from the coursework needed to earn an associate degree.
- 12 As a result, many transfer students leave the community college
- 13 system having completed transfer requirements, but are unable to
- 14 participate in community college graduation ceremonies, do not
- 15 have a degree to show for their work, and are ineligible for some
- 16 awards and scholarships because they did not fulfill current
- 17 requirements for an associate degree.
- 18 (d) Today, one in every four jobs requires an associate degree
- 19 or higher. In the near future, one in every three jobs will require
- 20 an associate degree or higher.
- 21 (e) The community college system allows the state to address
- 22 the serious shortage of educated workers.
- 23 (f) To meet workforce demands in a cost-effective way,
- 24 incentivizing students to earn an associate degree while preparing
- 25 for transfer to a four-year college or university, and recognizing
- 26 that they have completed a transfer preparation course pattern,
- 27 provides students encouragement and support to complete their
- 28 overall educational pursuits.

1 SEC. 2. Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745) is added
2 to Chapter 9.2 of Part 40 of Division 5 of Title 3 of the Education
3 Code, to read:

4
5 Article 3. Associate Degree and Recognition of Student Transfer
6 Preparation
7

8 66745. (a) This article shall be known, and may be cited, as
9 the Community College Associate Degree and Recognition of
10 Student Transfer Preparation Act.

11 (b) It is the intent of the Legislature that, whenever possible, a
12 community college shall consider the requirements for transfer as
13 it develops associate degree requirements and encourages students
14 to take courses that simultaneously meet both of the requirements
15 of Section 66746.

16 66746. A community college may grant an associate degree,
17 in the student's field of study, on which is designated that it is "for
18 transfer," to a student who meets both of the following
19 requirements:

20 (a) Completes a minimum of 60 transferable semester units or
21 90 quarter units, 18 semester units or 27 quarter units of which
22 shall comprise coursework in a major or an area of emphasis, as
23 determined by the college.

24 (b) Meets the minimum requirements for transfer in an approved
25 transfer core curriculum program, approved transfer agreement
26 program, or dual admission program, implemented pursuant to
27 Chapter 9.2 (commencing with Section 66720) of Part 40 of
28 Division 5 of Title 3 or meets the requirements of an alternative
29 path to transfer program, including, but not limited to, the
30 Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum or the
31 California State University General Education Breadth
32 Requirements.

33 66747. If a community college provides a degree with the "for
34 transfer" designation as provided for in Section 66746, the college
35 shall not impose any requirements in addition to the requirements
36 of Section 66746, including any local college or district
37 requirements.

38 66748. (a) A degree granted pursuant to this article shall reflect
39 the completion of lower division general education requirements.

1 (b) The granting of a degree pursuant to this article does not
2 guarantee admission to any institution.

O

March 9, 2010

2010 ASCCC Spring Session Resolutions Relating to SB 1440

(Note – these are being distributed in advance of the publication of Area Meeting materials – minor changes may occur as a result)

4.0 TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION

Note: Resolutions 4.01, 4.02, and 4.03 all address the issue of transfer degrees and several had been referred from the Fall 2009 Plenary Session. These three resolutions conflict with each other but are all presented here in order to offer the Academic Senate delegates a variety of options for dealing with this controversial issue. Please note also that some of these resolutions may ask the Academic Senate to overturn previously established positions, a matter that can be raised and considered during resolution discussions and voting.

4.01 S10 Transfer Degree Paul Setziol, De Anza College

Whereas, State legislators have proposed statewide transfer degrees;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges maintains that the purview of establishing degree definitions in legislation goes against basic higher education principles;

Whereas, The faculty should maintain the right and responsibility to determine graduation degree requirements as specified in Title 5; and

Whereas, Title 5 currently makes no reference to transfer associate degrees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to seek a change to Title 5 requiring colleges to offer a transfer associate degree that consists of a minimum of 18 semester units in a major or area of emphasis as locally defined, a transfer general education pattern (e.g., IGETC or CSU GE), and a minimum of 60 transferable semester units; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges include in Title 5 language the provision that any local requirements for the degree are to be governed by existing Title 5 language on graduation requirements.

Note: This resolution was referred to the Executive Committee (see Resolution 4.04 R F09) to collect further information and return in Spring 2010.

March 9, 2010

**4.02 S10 Response to SB 1440: “Transfer Degree”
Stephanie Dumont, Golden West College, Executive Committee**

Whereas, Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla) as of March 1, 2010 would authorize a community college to award an associate degree in a major or area of emphasis designated “for transfer” to students who complete a minimum of 60 transferable semester units consisting of an approved transfer general education program (e.g., IGETC or CSU GE) and a major or area of emphasis as locally defined and requires colleges that do so to refrain from requiring additional local requirements that are not included in the GE package or the major/area of emphasis;

Whereas, A great deal of support exists in the Legislature and public for the concept of a “transfer degree,” raising the possibility that a bill will move forward that would put California community college degrees in statute rather than in Title 5, and such a bill could require degree standards that could be inconsistent with the Academic Senate positions; and

Whereas, Placing any degree in statute is inappropriate and could effectively lead to legislative curriculum dictates, but making a change in Title 5 regulations would retain control of degrees within the California Community Colleges and codify degrees that many colleges are already awarding;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to change Title 5 regulations such that colleges would be permitted to award an associate degree in a major or area of emphasis “for transfer” (e.g., “Psychology for Transfer”) to students who complete at least 60 transferable semester units including a minimum of 18 semester units in a major or area of emphasis that meet the requirements of transfer institutions and a transfer general education pattern, and require the colleges that choose to offer such a degree do not impose any additional local graduation requirements.

Note: This resolution was referred to the Executive Committee (see Resolution 4.03 R F09) to collect further information and return in Spring 2010.

March 9, 2010

The following resolution is new:

**4.03 S10 Title 5 Changes Defining a Transfer Associate Degree
Elizabeth Atondo, Counseling, Los Angeles Pierce College, Transfer and
Articulation Committee**

Whereas, The California community colleges have multiple missions, one of which is to prepare our students for transfer, and do an exemplary job of providing transfer students with their lower-division baccalaureate education;

Whereas, Transfer students who complete a minimum of 60 baccalaureate units, including general education and major preparation coursework, are experiencing a delay in reaching their educational goals due to the competitiveness for university admission as well as the disproportionate and excessive fee increases, making a bachelor's degree out of reach for many California community college students;

Whereas, The coursework necessary for upper-division transfer to the California State University and the University of California systems, while including the most rigorous courses offered at the California community colleges, differs from the coursework needed to earn an associate degree, and as a result many transfer students leave the community college system not eligible for an associate degree; and

Whereas, Students, community colleges, universities, legislators and the general public share a desire to minimize unnecessary classes and units and maximize efficiency and wise use of taxpayer resources;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to enact changes to Title 5 that would define distinct associate degree requirements for students who are attending a California community college preparing to transfer to a UC or CSU campus, and these requirements would include a minimum of 60 baccalaureate units, full certification of the IGETC or CSU GE Plan, and articulated major preparation coursework based on the upper-division transfer admission requirements of the receiving institution; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend a policy to local senates to align the courses and units required for Associate Degree transfer majors so as not to exceed the lower-division major requirements at the universities and to refrain from adding any additional local graduation requirements.

March 9, 2010

2009 ASCCC Fall Session Resolutions Relating to AB 440

Adopted

**4.02 F09 Maintain Local Autonomy over Degree Requirements
Chris Hill, Grossmont College**

Whereas, Assembly Bill 440 (Beall), in an attempt to remove perceived barriers to transfer for community college students, recently proposed legislation that would remove local autonomy for degrees by placing degree requirements into statute and could effectively lead to legislative curriculum dictates;

Whereas, Placing any degree requirements in statute is in direct contradiction to Education Code §70902(b)(7), which clearly puts responsibility for curriculum and academic standards under the joint responsibility of the local board and the academic senates of a district;

Whereas, Title 5 already grants community colleges the right to develop degrees with a minimum of 60 transferable semester units consisting of an approved transfer general education program (e.g., IGETC or CSU GE) and a major or area of emphasis as locally defined, and allows local colleges the ability to create degree variations that best serve their students' ability to transfer; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges previously affirmed its support for local autonomy in several of the 10+1 areas, including curriculum (Resolution 6.02 F03 and 18.03 F07);

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose any legislation that seeks to alter its curriculum, degree, and certificate requirements and reaffirm its support of local autonomy and faculty primacy over the same.

MSC Disposition: Chancellor's Office, Local Senates
Assigned: President

March 9, 2010

Referred

**4.03 F09 Response to AB 440: “Transfer Degree”
Stephanie Dumont, Golden West College, Executive Committee**

Whereas, Assembly Bill 440 (Beall) as of July 2, 2009 would authorize a community college to award an associate degree in a major or area of emphasis designated “for transfer” to students who complete a minimum of 60 transferable semester units consisting of an approved transfer general education program (e.g., IGETC or CSU GE) and a major or area of emphasis as locally defined and requires colleges that do so to refrain from requiring additional local requirements that are not included in the GE package or the major/area of emphasis;

Whereas, There is a great deal of support for the concept of a “transfer degree” in the legislature and public, and it is possible that a bill will move forward that would put California community college degrees in statute rather than in Title 5, and such a bill could require degree standards that could be inconsistent with the Academic Senate positions; and

Whereas, Placing any degree in statute is inappropriate and could effectively lead to legislative curriculum dictates, but making a change in Title 5 regulations would retain control of degrees within the California Community Colleges and codify degrees that many colleges are already awarding;

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to change Title 5 regulations such that colleges would be permitted to offer associate degrees in a major or area of emphasis designated for transfer to students who complete GE (IGETC or CSU GE) and 60 transferable semester units with a minimum of 18 semester units in a major or area of emphasis and require the colleges that do so to refrain from requiring additional local requirements that are not included in the GE package or the major/area of emphasis.

MSR Disposition: Referred to the Executive Committee to collect further information and return in Spring 2010.

**4.03.01 F09 Amend Resolution 4.03 F09
Stephanie Dumont, Golden West College**

Amend the resolve:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to change Title 5 regulations such that colleges would be permitted to award an associate degree in a major or area of emphasis designated “for transfer” (e.g., “Psychology for Transfer”) to students who complete at least 60 transferable semester units including a minimum of 18 semester units in a major or area of emphasis

March 9, 2010

that meet the requirements of transfer institutions and a transfer general education pattern, and require the colleges that choose to offer such a degree do not impose any additional local graduation requirements.

MSR Disposition: Referred to the Executive Committee to collect further information and return in Spring 2010.

4.04 F09 Transfer Degree
Paul Setziol, De Anza College

Whereas, State legislators have proposed statewide transfer degrees;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges maintains that the purview of degree definitions in legislation goes against basic higher education principles embedded in past practice;

Whereas, The faculty should maintain the right and responsibility to determine graduation degree requirements as specified in Title 5; and

Whereas, Title 5 currently makes no reference to transfer associate degrees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to seek a change to Title 5 requiring the colleges to offer a transfer associate degree; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges include in Title 5 language the provision that any local requirements for the degree are to be governed by existing Title 5 language on graduation requirements.

MSR Disposition: Referred to the Executive Committee to collect further information and return in Spring 2010.

4.04.01 F09 Amend Resolution 4.04 F09
Paul Setziol, De Anza College

Add second resolve:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges define a transfer associate degree to be a degree, the successful completion of which certifies that a student meets the requirements for transfer to UC and or CSU.

MSR Disposition: Referred to the Executive Committee to collect further information and return in Spring 2010.



Hands of Hope

ACADEMIC MENTORING

Is a collaborative between Imperial County Office of Education
Student Well-Being & Family Resources and the United States Office of Education

OVERVIEW

- **Hands of Hope is a school-based educational mentoring program funded by the United States Office of Education.**
- **The program is intended to address the academic and social needs of students in grades 4th-8th.**
- **Schools in program improvement years 3-5 are targeted.**

GOALS

- **INCREASE** academic performance, attendance, and reduce suspensions, and discipline referrals.

Schools Participating in Hands of Hope

Calexico:

Rockwood Elementary

Mains Elementary

Jefferson Elementary

De Anza Jr. High School

Willie Moreno Jr. High School

Brawley:

Barbara Worth Jr. High

Phil Swing Elementary

Others:

Christ Community School

El Centro:

Lincoln Elementary School

Washington Elementary School

Kennedy Middle School

Wilson Jr. High School

COMPONENTS

- **Commitment** – Mentors are asked to make a 12 month commitment to each student.
- **Sessions** - 1 hour a week minimum, at the mentees school.
- **Mentors** – Adults from your community and youth volunteers (17 and over, attending high school and in good academic standing.
- **Parent & School Involvement** – Parents & school personnel are part of the mentor & mentee match process.
- **Background Checks** – Eligible Mentors will be fingerprinted & must receive fingerprint clearance before being considered for acceptance into the program.
- **Referrals** – Are generated from school personnel, partner agencies, and Hands of Hope Mentoring Specialists.

➤ **Collaboration** – We have a strong

For More Information Contact:
Janette M. Durazo, Mentoring Specialist
Christine Gomez, Mentoring Specialist
Timothy Druihet, Program Manager

Tel: (760) 312-6498

Or (760) 312-6189

tempps@icoe.org

tdruihet@icoe.org

Funded by U.S. Department of Education



Manos De La Esperanza

Mentoría Académica

Es un programa colaborativo entre el Departamento de Educación Del Condado De Imperial Departamento De Bienestar Estudiantil Y Recursos Familiares Y La Oficina De Educación De EU.

Vista General Del Programa

- **Las Manos De La Esperanza es un programa de mentor basado en las escuelas. El programa es fundado por la Oficina de Educación de los Estados Unidos.**
- **La intención de este programa es para atender las necesidades académicas y sociales de los estudiantes de los grados 4-8.**
- **Escuelas en el programa de mejoría años 3-5 tendrán los servicios.**

Metas Del Programa:

Incrementar desempeño académico, asistencia escolar, Y **Reducir** suspensiones, y notas disciplinarias.

Escuelas participando en Manos de la Esperanza

Calexico:

Rockwood Elementary

Mains Elementary

Jefferson Elementary

De Anza Jr. High School

Willie Moreno Jr. High School

Brawley:

Barbara Worth Jr. High

Phil Swing Elementary

Others:

Christ Community School

El Centro:

Lincoln Elementary School

Washington Elementary School

Kennedy Middle School

Wilson Jr. High School

COMPONENTES

- **Compromiso** – Se les pide a los mentores que hagan un compromiso de 12 meses y 4 horas por mes (1 hora a la semana mínimo).
- **Mentores** – Adultos de tu comunidad y jóvenes voluntarios (17 años de edad y asistiendo la preparatoria y en buena posición académica).
- **Participación De Padres y Escuela** – Los padres y personal escolar son parte del proceso de selección de mentor.
- **Reviso Personales** – Mentores elegibles pasaran un reviso personal antes de ser considerados e aceptados para el programa de mentor. Parte del proceso es de tomar las huellas digitales.
- **Referencias** – Son generadas de personal escolar (maestros, consejeros, y agencias de la comunidad).
- **Colaboración** – Tenemos un gran deseo de colaborar con el programa

Para Más Información Comuníquese con:

Janette M. Durazo, Mentoring Specialist

Christine Gomez, Mentoring Specialist

Timothy Druihet, Program Manager

Tel: (760) 312-6498

Or (760) 312-6189

tempos@icoe.org

tdruihet@icoe.org

Financiado Por Departamento de Educación de USA.