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Sessions attended:

- **10+1 Ways to Decrease Pressure Between Academic Senates and Curriculum Committees**
  - There is a wide range of structure for curriculum committees; some are connected to the college senate, some are not, some are chaired by administration.
    - It appears that Skyline College has a good structure in that CC is a subcommittee of the AS and it is chaired by faculty.
    - Is the VPI a voting member?
    - What is the actual process of voting at CC? Does approval go straight to district curriculum, who brings it to the BOT?
  - Prediction: increased focus on CTE will put greater pressure on curriculum committees to expedite approval processes in order to take advantage of grant or state funding.
    - Skyline CC has taken steps to ensure a robust and careful process of course approval.
    - What remains is perhaps discussion on how to determine if a course should be credit or noncredit, if noncredit becomes an option
  - Topic of curriculum written by non-faculty. This is not supported by ASCCC at all. *Nonfaculty may not write curriculum*. If curriculum is to be written where no faculty exist, faculty must be hired to do it (temporary or otherwise), and a mentor faculty to guide the process of correct curriculum creation will be paired with that faculty. Administrators do not write curriculum (including former faculty).
  - Discussion of effective practices for curriculum committees
    - Curriculum Committee Chairs should have Senate experience and training, perhaps have held officer positions or even be a past president
    - Curriculum Chair should be at every Senate meeting
    - Senate should be the recommending body, not the curriculum committee operating on its own

- **Noncredit Curriculum in the Age of Equalization**
  - Districts who receive apportionment are now seeing ways to increase revenue to their colleges by creating noncredit courses
    - Gets around repeatability
    - Allows for greater service to the community
    - Free to students
    - Only for eligible courses in noncredit categories: ESL, ABE, short-term CTE, Workforce Preparation classes, High School Diploma/Equivalency, Programs for Apprentices (Music, Dance, Art ineligible)

- **The Pressure and Impact of Change: Course Repetition Yet Again**
  - Repeatability is a numbers game with history:
    - 2006 – we chased FTES
- 2009 – we hit our peak FTES
- 2009-2012 – economic downturn (SMCCCD was spared due to basic aid status)
- 2011 – limits on apportionment
- 2012 – end of repeatability
  - Result: basic skills FTES has dropped and is now flat
  - Huge decline in CTE FTES
  - Declines in programs that never should have been affected; Transfer
  - Declines in Fine Arts, P.E.

○ If SMCCCD doesn't receive apportionment, why does repeatability still apply to us?
  ▪ Answer from ASCCC Curriculum Chair: we are still earning apportionment, but the money designated to it is merely supplanted by our local taxes, not paid by the state.
    - Unanswered question: Shouldn't the taxpayers in San Mateo County weigh in on whether they think courses should be repeatable or not?
    - Since SMCCCD is ineligible for other streams of revenue such SSSP funding for noncredit, it seems a worthy argument to say that we should not be bound to repeatability rules.

○ Ways around repeatability
  - Citrus College created a Commercial Dance Certificate and got it approved as a Dance CTE program, courses of which are eligible for repeatability due to above criteria
  - Noncredit "mirror" courses (What if SMCCCD does not see it economically feasible to create noncredit, which by definition, is free to students? What is the impact on credit instruction if students can take the same course for free? Are there any "backsies" for students who take noncredit and then want it transformed into credit later?)
  - Not-for-credit "mirror" courses (What is the impact on credit instruction if students have an option where they can take the same course without grades for a different fee, such as Paralegal, which is now offered not-for-credit in addition to credit?)
  - Auditing, if credits are not needed (How does that impact teaching load or class size/spaces over time?)
  - CO or course note indicating that the student may be eligible to complete a “Petition to Repeat”
  - Provide students with clear instructions regarding how to petition to repeat a course based on the local policies and procedures. Publish instructions online and in students' advisement documents.
  - Meet with A&R to determine the documentation required to ensure that a petition is approvable and sufficient to establish an audit record. Remove as many barriers for students as possible, for example:
• Collect all statutes related to mandated training related to any program offered at the college. This should not be the responsibility of the student.
• File significant changes to industry or licensure changes with Admissions and Records prior to the registration period so that they are aware petitions may be submitted. Provide documentation about such changes in the audit record.
• Provide access to petition forms in multiple locations/formats. Web-enable the petition process, if possible.

Significant resolutions passed

2.01 S15 Disaggregation of Learning Outcomes Data

6.01 S15 Oppose Expansion of Former CPEC Mission and Creation of a Higher Education Oversight Body That Does Not Contain Segmental Representation (adopted by acclamation)

9.02 S15 Chancellor's Office Interpretation of Education Code and Title 5 Regulations

9.03 S15 The Carnegie Units Worksheet

13.02 S15 Allowed Experiences in Courses Related in Content

Motion Referred:

9.04 S15 Alternative courses for Math Competency Requirements (referred to the Executive Committee for further research and return results to the body by fall 2015)

Session Presented

AB 86 Final Legislative Report and Future Planning

David Norton, Copper Mountain College, ASCCC Noncredit Committee
Leigh Anne Shaw, Skyline College, ASCCC Noncredit Committee
John Stanskas, ASCCC Secretary

In 2014, the California Legislature appropriated $25 million for the AB 86 initiative that called for the California Department of Education and the Chancellor’s Office to form consortia composed of both community college and K-12 adult education programs. The consortia were charged with serving the varied educational needs of adult learners, including elementary and secondary basic skills, English as a Second Language, and adults with disabilities as well as create programs for apprentices and short-term certificate programs with high employment potential. While the focus has been to streamline adult education offerings, many adult educators throughout the state have had concerns about the process, direction, and uncertainty of adult education’s future. The differences in the two systems clearly show that a “one-size-fits-all” model will not work. This session will provide a brief history of noncredit in the California Community College System, the challenges resulting from the AB 86 process as we move from the first year of planning to the second year of implementation, and the future of noncredit instruction for California adult learners. Join us for a discussion regarding what faculty should be doing at your college in the upcoming year in response to AB 86.