Minutes
Norco Academic Senate Meeting
On April 20, 2026
1:30 - 3:30 PM | CSS-217 & via Zoom

Meeting called to order at 1:33 PM.

1. Attendees

Officers, Senators, Alternates, and Committee Chairs & Liaisons: Laura Adams, Maria Adams, John Alpay, Darnell Bing, Michael Bobo, Meghan Chandler, Erin Deck, Jared Evangelista, Vivian Harris, Marie Hicks, Dan Reade, Tim Russell, Jody Tyler, Patty Worsham, Jim Thomas

Guests: Charise Allingham, Hayley Ashby, Cheryl Cox, Ashley Etchison, Sonia Gonzalez, Monica Green, Tenisha James, Arezoo Marashi, Tiesha Stewart, Kaneesha Tarrant

2. **Approval of Agenda**

M/J. Alpay, S/J. Drainville; Approved by Consensus

3. **Approval of Minutes for March 2, 2026 & April 6, 2026**

M/J. Alpay, S/D. Reade; Approved by Consensus
M/J. Alpay, S/M. Hicks; 1 abstention, Approved by Consensus w/ corrections

4. Comments from the Public

5. **CTA Report** (Araceli Covarrubias, Norco College Faculty Association Vice President & Michelle Ramin, Norco College Faculty Association Representative)

- No Report

6. ~~**Action Item: Ratification of Senate President Appointments (K. Bell)**~~

- None

7. **Action Item: 2026 Norco Institutional Self-Evaluation Report Draft (**1st Read) (T. James)

- Draft ISER was introduced as a first read and will return May 4, 2026 for a second read with possible action.
- Faculty were reminded to review the draft and submit evidence to support standards as soon as possible. The district timeline requires approval by the end of May, with submission due August 1.
- Dr. James explained that while the core narrative is in place, evidence and supporting documentation may continue to be added through the summer before the peer review team begins reviewing in the fall. The site visit is anticipated for spring 2027.
- Faculty are encouraged to provide feedback directly to the accreditation team to strengthen the final submission.

(Senate #8)

8. Information Item: Summer/Fall 2026 Registration (S.Gonzalez)

- Programs are being flagged this week, and registration appointments will be available April 27. Summer/Fall registration opens May 4.
- Two major changes were highlighted:
- Priority registration windows have been removed – once a student's registration opens, it remains open through the start of the term.
- Promise students are now included in Group 3 priority registration, allowing earlier access to courses if enrolled full-time.
- Unit limits remain in place during priority registration, with the opportunity to register beyond 13 units during general enrollment beginning May 11.
- Faculty were reminded that any district-wide changes affecting registration priorities should be brought to Academic Senate for consultation.

(Senate #5)

9. ~~Discussion Item: Access to Disaggregated Course-Level SLO Data to Support Equity and Student Success~~ ~~(K.Bell or designee)~~

- Postponed to May 4, 2026

10. Action Item: 2025-26 Update to the DAS Constitution and Bylaws (K.Bell)

- Revisions to the District Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws were presented, with the primary focus on adjusting district senate membership to improve functionality.
- The updates were reviewed by district leadership and legal counsel. Standing committee revisions are still under review and will be addressed later.
- Concerns raised regarding whether local senates have authority to approve bylaw amendments, noting that the constitution specifies district senate authority. It was clarified that local senate approval authorizes the district representative to vote in favor at DAS.
- Color coding in the document indicated:
    - Yellow = proposed changes
    - Blue = areas that could not be changed due to Title 5/legal guidance

Motion with the understanding that this is a flawed document by Alpay, second by Reade; Approved by Consensus

(Senate #7)

11. Officer Reports

A. Secretary/Treasurer (Erin Deck)
- No Report

B. Vice-President (Dan Reade)
- Three elections will be held this semester:
- Part-Time Faculty Senator – nominations open this week, election next week
- Distinguished Faculty Speaker – follows the same two-week process

- General Faculty Representative for College Council – follows the Faculty Speaker election
- Faculty were encouraged to nominate part-time faculty candidates. All nominations should be sent to Dan Reade.

C. President (Kimberly Bell)
- ASCCC Sp26 Plenary Resolutions
- Kim, Dan, and Erin attended the ASCCC Spring Plenary, where statewide faculty issues were discussed.
- Emphasized that the ASCCC is an advocacy body, not a governing body, but its resolutions shape statewide faculty advocacy priorities. Faculty were encouraged to review the attached plenary resolutions.
- Standing committees needing to elect new chairs were reminded to complete elections soon, and Senate leadership offered support with election procedures.
- Noted that there are four Senate vacancies and outreach has been sent to department chairs to ensure representation for next fall.

12. College Reports

A. Associated Students Senate Representative (H. Mobin)
- ASNC elections for next year's executive cabinet have received 19 applications, a record high.
- Upcoming student events:
  - Election forums to meet candidates; tomorrow
  - Barbershop event offering free haircuts; tomorrow
  - NOMU festival planned for May

B. President (Monica Green)
- Chancellor visit: next Tuesday, 9 a.m. – 5 p.m.
- College Partnership Event: May 1st
- UCR/RCCD Joint Cabinet Meeting to review data for improving graduation/transfer rates, dual enrollment, 2+2 and 2+3: May 4th
- University of La Verne will be holding a Community College Leadership Symposium w/ professional development on Thursday, May 7th-all day event.
- CNUSD will be having their second Strategic Planning Steering Committee Meeting on May 7th; I will be representing the college.
- JFK Middle College High School Graduation will take place on June 3rd; Faculty are encouraged to attend.
- Norco College Commencement: June 12th
- Recruitment is underway for the Riverside City College President; expect forums and final interviews the last week of May.
- Recruitment is underway for Norco for the VP of Academic Affairs; expect forums and final interviews the third week of May
- Friday, June 12th NC Commencement

- We're finishing our final review and edits on the collective bargaining agreement; expect to have on Friday, June 5th at 10 a.m, a webinar to go over those, changes, modifications.

C. Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs (Quinton Bemiller)
   - No Report

D. Vice President of Planning and Development (Tenisha James)
   - The upcoming IEGC meeting will include updates on faculty and classified professional development, equity leadership work, first-year experience planning, case management initiatives, and the strategic plan dashboard; Will bring a more formal presentation in May
   - A Norco College team attended an ACCJC convening in Long Beach focused on post-completion success and economic mobility. The discussion emphasized the need to connect academic pathways to living wage careers and improve post-completion outcomes.
   - Thanked Dr. Laura Adams for her work leading the ISER draft, noting the document tells Norco College's story well and reflects a major accomplishment in the accreditation process.

E. Vice President of Student Services (Kaneesha Tarrant)
   - A district workgroup is examining mounting student debt and considering policy recommendations to reduce financial barriers for students.
   - Reported issues with Smart Plan, affecting registration for short-term classes, which have been escalated to district leadership.
   - Upcoming Senate presentations from Student Services will include:
     - Outreach efforts, including dual enrollment
     - Student Services contributions to district KPIs
     - Tutoring and tutorial support updates, presented by Damon Nance; more information will be shared in May.

13. **Standing Committees & Liaisons Reports**

A. Academic Senate Standing Committees: APC, Assessment, CMAC, Curriculum, DE, FPDC, Library/LRC, Program Review, TLC
Academic Senate Liaisons: Accreditation, CSEA, CTE, DBAC, DEMC, DSPC, GLSA, DSSC, Guided Pathways, LGBTQ+ Advocates, Prison Education Program, Equity, PGSL

14. Meeting adjourned at 2:28 PM.

NORCO COLLEGE

Institutional Self-Evaluation Report

in Support of an Application for

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Submitted by

Norco College
2001 Third Street
Norco, CA 92860

to

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

[insert date of submission: Month Year]

Certification

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

From: Dr. Monica Green
Norco College
2001 Third Street
Norco CA 92860

This Institutional Self-Evaluation Report is submitted to ACCJC in support of an Application for Reaffirmation of Accreditation. The Institutional Self-Evaluation Report reflects the nature and substance of this institution, as well as its best efforts to align with ACCJC Standards and policies, and was developed with appropriate participation and review by the campus community.

Signatures:

[Chief Executive Officer of Multi-College District, if applicable] [Date]

[Chief Executive Officer] [Date]

[Chairperson, Governing Board] [Date]

[Name, Title, Representing] [Date]

[Name, Title, Representing] [Date]

[Name, Title, Representing] [Date]

[Name, Title, Representing] [Date]

Update the table of contents prior to submission. To update, click anywhere in the table of contents and select "Update Table" on the tab that appears above the table of contents header. When prompted, select "Update entire table."

Contents

Forward to the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report 1

A. Introduction: Institutional Context 1

B. Institutional Self-Evaluation of Alignment with Accreditation Standards 1

Standard 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness 2

Standard 2: Student Success 7

Standard 3: Infrastructure and Resources 18

Standard 4: Governance and Decision-Making 26

C. Required Documentation 31

Standard 1: Mission and Institutional Effectiveness 31

Standard 2: Student Success 32

Standard 3: Infrastructure and Resources 34

Standard 4: Governance and Decision-Making 35

Other Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies 35

D. Appendix 1: Verification of Catalog Requirements (ER 20) 36

E. Appendix 2: Organizational Structure 37

F. Appendix 3: Approved Locations 38

Forward to the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report

Provide a **very brief** (1 page maximum) overview of the high-level themes and findings that emerged from the institution's self-evaluation process. The forward is intended to provide readers with a sense of what the institution learned from its self-reflection (including areas of strength and opportunities for institutional growth). ACCJC staff recommend writing this section last, after the rest of the institutional narrative has been completed.

[Insert the Forward to the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report.]

A. Introduction: Institutional Context

Provide a brief introduction to the institution and its context. Include a brief history of the institution, including the year of establishment. Provide data and/or narrative to help readers understand the community and student population the institution serves as it implements its mission, and highlight any major events or developments that have occurred at the institution since the last comprehensive review. Suggested length is 3-5 pages of narrative (not including any charts, tables, or other visuals).

[Insert the Introduction.]

B. Institutional Self-Evaluation of Alignment with Accreditation Standards

For each numbered Standard below (i.e., 1.1, 2.4, 3.2, etc.), provide a narrative response that analyzes the institution's alignment with the Standard. The narrative should address the review criteria and provide supporting evidence, data, and examples as appropriate. The narrative should also address opportunities for innovation and areas for improving alignment to the Standard that were identified during the self-evaluation process.

As you prepare to draft your response, it may be helpful to reflect on the following questions:

- What does the institution do to align with the Standard?
- What are the results of these actions? How effectively do the actions support equitable student success? How do you know?
- What did the institution learn?
- What will the institution do differently as it moves forward? How will the institution's learning inform its plans for action, improvement, and/or innovation?

Standard 1: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The institution has a clearly defined mission that reflects its character, values, organizational structure, and unique student population. The mission outlines the institution's explicit commitment to equitable student achievement and serves as a guiding principle for institutional planning, action, evaluation, improvement, and innovation.

1.1. The institution has established a clearly defined mission that appropriately reflects its character, values, structure, and unique student demographics. The institution's mission articulates its commitment to ensuring equitable educational opportunities and outcomes for all students. (ER 6)

Norco College's mission reflects the students and community it serves: "Norco College is an open-access college that supports every learner on their educational path. We help diverse students grow, succeed, and change their lives through education." The Mission, Vision, and Core Commitments (MVCC) were developed through a structured, college-wide process that engaged faculty, classified professionals, students, and administrators, and approved by the Board of Trustees on November 18, 2025. (Mission and Core Commitments) The SPGM 2025–2030 codifies mission review as a five-year cycle, with the next review scheduled for Spring 2030, ensuring this remains a standing institutional responsibility rather than an ad hoc undertaking. (SPGM 2025–2030, MVCC Review Procedures)

Because the Board approved the revised mission on November 18, 2025, institutional effectiveness data, planning documents, and structured reflection activities completed prior to that date reference the College's prior mission language. Those sources are cited throughout this standard as evidence that mission-reflection processes are institutionalized and that their findings informed the revision; they do not constitute evaluation of the current Board-approved mission. The 2025–26 academic year is the first full cycle in which the revised MVCC serves as the reference point for institutional effectiveness instruments, program review, and structured reflection activities.

The mission reflects Norco College's student population and regional context. The College enrolls a student population that is 58.9% Hispanic/Latinx and 7.2% Black or African American — together representing 65% of first-time college students and 78% of first-generation students — and most students attend part time. (Norco College At-a-Glance 2025) As a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI), Black-Serving Institution (BSI), and Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institution (AANAPISI), and the only public higher education institution on the I-15 corridor, the College serves communities with historically limited access to higher education. The Student Equity Plan 2022–2025 documents these demographics alongside the outcome metrics the College monitors to ensure that commitment to access translates into equitable outcomes. (Student Equity Plan 2022–2025, Section II)

The five Core Commitments — Nurture Students First, Open Doors to Equity, Rise Together, Commit to Integrity, and Own Our Growth — translate the mission into shared institutional expectations across faculty, classified professionals, administrators, and students. The SPGM 2025–2030 embeds the MVCC as the foundation for institutional planning, governance, and continuous improvement, connecting mission language to measurable goals and decision-making structures. (Mission and Core Commitments; SPGM 2025–2030, College Alignment)

This commitment to equitable outcomes is grounded in data. (DI) for Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx students across all five equity metrics. As of January 2025, Black/African American students' successful enrollment rate stood at 12.8%, compared to 20% for the broader student population, and the Hispanic/Latinx transfer gap continued to widen. (Student Equity Plan 2025–2028, Figure 2) The Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey (IEPS) embeds annual mission-review questions that invite faculty and classified professionals to assess how their work connects to institutional outcomes — a process that predates the current mission and will be updated to reflect the revised language beginning in 2025–26. (IEPS Mission Review Survey Results 2024–25) These mechanisms ensure that the mission's commitment to "every

learner" is evaluated against evidence, not assumed.

Both the SPGM 2025–2030 and the Educational Master Plan align institutional goals and programmatic priorities with mission-driven outcomes including transfer, workforce preparation, and certificate and degree completion.. (SPGM 2025–2030, College Alignment; Educational Master Plan 2030)

Moving Forward

The 2025–26 academic year is the first full cycle under the revised mission. The 2025–2026 Catalog retains prior mission language from the preceding cycle; the College website and high-visibility materials already reflect the Board-approved mission. (Mission and Core Commitments; Norco College 2025–2026 Catalog) The Office of Planning and Development is coordinating remaining updates, monitored through the College's governance processes. IEPS mission review questions will be updated beginning in 2025–26 to establish a baseline for evaluating the revised mission's reach across the institution.

1.2. The institution establishes meaningful and ambitious goals for institutional improvement, innovation, and equitable student outcomes.

Norco College establishes institutional goals through an integrated, evidence-informed planning process documented in the SPGM 2025–2030. Goals are set at the college level through strategic objectives and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), connected to unit-level work through program review and administrative assessment, and evaluated on an annual cycle. (SPGM 2025–2030, Strategic Objectives and KPIs) The 2025–2030 objectives were developed using multi-year KPI trend data from the prior planning cycle — including areas where progress was insufficient — ensuring that goals reflect honest institutional assessment rather than directional aspirations. Some evidence cited in this section references 2020–2025 KPIs and objectives; those documents are included to demonstrate the continuity of the College's goal-setting processes across planning cycles.

Equitable student outcomes are embedded in the goal structure, not treated as supplementary concerns. Two of the 2025–2030 KPIs explicitly target the elimination of equity gaps: Objective 3.1 for Black/African American students and Objective 3.2 for Hispanic/Latinx students. (SPGM 2025–2030, Strategic Objectives and KPIs) The Student Equity Plan 2022–2025 reinforces this alignment by documenting the disproportionate impact methodology the College uses to identify gaps and the inquiry-based strategies designed to close them across five metrics: successful enrollment, persistence, transfer-level completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer. (Student Equity Plan 2022–2025)

Institutional goals are coherent across planning documents because the SPGM 2025–2030 functions as the integrating framework. Strategic objectives cascade into the Educational Master Plan, the Student Equity Plan, and the Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Plan 2024–2027, which aligns enrollment strategy to institutional priorities including access, persistence, completion, and equity. (Educational Master Plan 2030; SEM Plan 2024–2027) This coherence ensures that goal-setting is a shared responsibility across governance structures rather than an administrative function.

Moving Forward

The goal-setting infrastructure is in place and producing results. The immediate priority is ensuring VP-level administrative assessments of the 2025–2030 strategic objectives are completed and documented, providing the evidence base for the annual KPI progress review cycle. As multi-year data accumulates under the new planning cycle, the College will continue refining how KPI trend data is communicated to constituents — deepening shared understanding of where progress is sufficient and where sustained effort is needed. (SPGM 2025–2030, Strategic Objectives and KPIs)

1.3. The institution holds itself accountable for achieving its mission and goals and regularly reviews relevant, meaningfully disaggregated data to evaluate its progress and inform plans for continued improvement and innovation. (ER 3, ER 11)

Norco College holds itself accountable for institutional performance through a layered system of published standards, annual data review, and structured improvement cycles that connect evidence to action across every level of the institution. Institution-set standards (ISS) establish published benchmarks for student achievement that are monitored annually and brought forward to participatory governance venues including the Academic Senate, supporting shared understanding of institutional performance and improvement expectations. (ISS Procedural Response; Academic Senate Presentation)

The SPGM 2025–2030 structures annual monitoring of college-level KPIs across eight areas including equitable access, equitable success, and institutional effectiveness, ensuring that progress toward strategic objectives is reviewed on a regular cycle. (SPGM 2025–2030, Strategic Objectives and KPIs) Program review reinforces this accountability at the unit level: the Program Review and Resource Request Procedure uses outcomes assessment data as a scoring element for resource requests, creating a direct link between evidence of program effectiveness and budget prioritization. (Program Review and Resource Request Procedure) Administrative assessment connects operational decision-making to KPI-linked evaluation — the Office of the President, for example, explicitly identifies monitoring FTES, success rates, and equity factors before and after SEM Plan implementation as a core assessment responsibility.

Disaggregated data is central to how Norco identifies gaps and plans responses. The Student Equity Plan 2022–2025 documents the College's disproportionate impact methodology and an inquiry-team model that uses qualitative and quantitative methods to investigate root causes of persistent equity gaps for Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx students. (Student Equity Plan 2022–2025) SEP Research Highlights translate student-experience evidence into actionable recommendations — including strengthening student awareness of available supports — ensuring that planning reflects what students report experiencing, not only what institutional data shows. (Student Equity Plan Research, Campus Area Highlights 2023–24) Disaggregated KPI equity data has also driven specific staffing and resource responses. Analysis of degree attainment and transfer gaps for Men of Color and Hispanic/Latinx students supported the creation of a full-time Student Success Coach position; persistent equity gaps in degree and certificate attainment for LGBTQ+ students prompted a documented action plan to transition the Student Resource Specialist from part-time to full-time and establish ongoing funding for the Phoenix Scholars Program. (KPI Equity Reports; Student Services Annual Update 2025)

The transition to Canvas-based SLO data collection represents a significant advance in the College's assessment infrastructure: for the first time, results can be compared on a common scale and tracked over time across disciplines (Five-to-Thrive Presentation to BOT). Nuventive displays these results in a dedicated dashboard that disaggregates SLO mastery data by demographic group, making equity patterns in student learning visible alongside the achievement data faculty already review in program review. As of Fall 2025, 22% of course outcomes data has been collected in Canvas, up from 15% at the end of 2024-2025 — reflecting how early the College is in this transition. A college-wide campaign is underway to expand faculty participation and build consistent assessment practice across all programs. (Annual Assessment Report 2024-2025; Canvas SLO Data Collection Process)

Moving Forward

Two areas are in active development. The first is SLO documentation in program review: the College is piloting a structured approach in Nuventive so that program review consistently captures where SLO results influenced improvement decisions and resource requests — strengthening the evidence trail from assessment to action. The second is dashboard granularity: the Nuventive SLO dashboard currently displays mastery data disaggregated by student demographics at the aggregate level, combining results across

courses and outcomes. Developing course-level disaggregation is a priority, as more granular data is a condition for the targeted, faculty-led equity analysis the College's inquiry model depends on. (Annual Assessment Report 2024-2025; Program Review and Resource Request Procedure; SPGM 2025–2030)

1.4. The institution's mission directs resource allocation, innovation, and continuous quality improvement through ongoing systematic planning and evaluation of programs and services. (ER 19)

Norco College's mission directs resource allocation and continuous quality improvement through an integrated planning system that connects unit-level program review to college-level priorities and budget decisions. Program review is the primary mechanism through which instructional, student services, and administrative units evaluate effectiveness, identify improvement priorities, and connect planning to the College's strategic objectives. (SPGM 2025–2030) The Program Review and Resource Request Procedure defines how units document needs, link requests to Educational Master Plan goal areas and mission-aligned priorities, and submit evidence in support of resource allocation decisions — ensuring that funding follows institutional purpose rather than precedent. (Program Review and Resource Request Procedure)

Resource requests move through a sequenced governance pathway — leadership council ranking followed by College Council review — before final funding decisions are made, reinforcing consistency and transparency. (Program Review and Resource Request Procedure) Faculty hiring requests illustrate how this works in practice: units document alignment to EMP goals, specify the requested resource, and identify the funding source in support of mission-directed capacity building. (Sample Faculty Hiring Request, 2025) These processes ensure that the mission's commitment to open access and equitable student success is operationalized through how the College allocates its resources.

Program review operates on a three-year cycle with optional annual updates and is accepted as the basis for resource requests at all campus locations. Continuous quality improvement is also reflected in the College's ongoing refinement of its planning documentation through participatory governance — including SPGM revisions reviewed and approved through the Academic Senate — demonstrating that planning structures themselves are subject to the same improvement cycle they govern. (SPGM 2025–2030; Academic Senate Minutes, November 2024)

Moving Forward

Norco College's planning systems are functioning and well integrated. The College is exploring whether aligning comprehensive program review timing with the five-year strategic planning cycle would strengthen coherence across planning systems and support longer-range analysis of program effectiveness. This evaluation will be carried out through the College's participatory governance processes, with findings informing the next SPGM revision cycle.

1.5. The institution regularly communicates progress toward achieving its mission and goals with internal and external stakeholders in order to promote understanding of institutional strengths, priorities, and areas for continued improvement. (ER 19)

Norco College communicates institutional progress through recurring, high-visibility forums and public-facing channels that connect evidence to shared understanding of priorities. Town Hall presentations share KPI results with the full campus community, framing progress against targets, identifying areas of strength, and naming focus areas for improvement. (NC KPI Progress Report) The SPGM 2025–2030 establishes KPI progress reporting and communication expectations as standing governance responsibilities, ensuring that transparency about institutional performance is built into how the College operates. (SPGM 2025–2030)

Program reviews are written, stored in Nuventive, and publicly posted on the Program Review Committee

website, providing all employee groups, students, and community members access to program-level evaluation and improvement planning. (Program Review Committee Website) The Regular Update, distributed to all faculty and classified professionals on a published schedule, was developed through the prior accreditation cycle to connect institutional news and activity to strategic direction. Most items are explicitly tagged to a named strategic goal, making the connection between daily institutional work and college priorities visible on an ongoing basis. (Regular Update Website) Beyond internal channels, the College's strategic planning documents — including the SPGM, Student Equity Plan, and Educational Master Plan — are publicly accessible, ensuring that any stakeholder can examine institutional goals, equity commitments, and improvement priorities directly. Beyond campus, the College communicates progress through community forums — including a 2025 presentation to the Eastvale Chamber of Commerce updating local business and community stakeholders on institutional facilities development, state-funded construction projects, and the new Corona Educational Center. (Eastvale Chamber of Commerce Presentation 2025)

Data and evidence actively inform institutional dialogue — not only what is shared but how priorities are set and decisions are made. The College's equity research and inquiry work illustrates this most clearly: SEP research highlights translate qualitative student-experience findings into actionable priorities, elevating student voice in institutional decision-making. (Student Equity Plan Research, Campus Area Highlights 2023–24) The Spring 2025 State of the College materials demonstrate closing the loop — reporting a marked reduction in fraud indicators following coordinated institutional actions, showing constituents that evidence-informed decisions produce measurable results. (State of the College, Spring 2025)

Moving Forward

Norco College's channels for communicating progress are established and active. The next step is systematizing how the College closes the loop — establishing a consistent reporting cycle that communicates back to campus and community how KPI, Student Equity Plan, and program review findings have resulted in specific policy, process, and service changes. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Vice President of Planning and Development are developing an IE report addressing progress toward the 2020–2025 strategic plan goals and objectives; going forward, this will become an annual report providing constituents with a structured account of institutional improvement across planning cycles.

Standard 2: Student Success

In alignment with its mission, the institution delivers high-quality academic and learning support programs that engage and support students through their unique educational journeys. Academic and learning support programs promote equitable student success, and the institution evaluates student learning and achievement data to inform improvements and advance equitable outcomes.

Suggested length for Standard 2 is no more than 20 pages.

2.1. Academic programs at all locations and in all modes of delivery are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution's mission and reflect appropriate breadth, depth, and expected learning outcomes. (ER 3, ER 9, ER 12)

Norco College's academic programs are developed and maintained through a structured, faculty-driven curriculum process that runs from initial concept through Board of Trustees approval. Faculty-initiated proposals must document alignment with the College's mission and Educational Master Plan before advancing through governance review, ensuring that program development is grounded in institutional purpose from the outset. (Curriculum Development Process) The programs that emerge from this process span the full range of pathways described in the mission: in 2022–23 the College conferred 2,342 total credentials across associate degrees, Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs), and certificates. (SEM Plan 2024–2027, Figure C.04.03)

Breadth and rigor are maintained through layered review. Board Policy governing associate degrees assigns the Chancellor, in consultation with the District Academic Senate, responsibility for ensuring all courses used to fulfill degree and general education requirements meet established standards, while the Curriculum Committee exercises local oversight of proposal quality and alignment. (BP/AP governing associate degrees) The Academic Council's 2025–2030 charge includes systematic review of program design and delivery across all modalities, with equitable attainment of learning outcomes as a standing evaluation criterion, and the Program Review Committee conducts regular reviews of program effectiveness and equity. (SPGM 2025–2030, Academic Council charge)

The College's commitment to Open Doors to Equity shapes how this portfolio is evaluated. The Student Equity Plan 2025–2028 identifies persistent disproportionate impact for Black/African American students in successful enrollment and persistence, and for Hispanic/Latinx students in transfer-level English and math completion and transfer. (Student Equity Plan 2025–2028) These gaps inform ongoing program evaluation and the Academic Council's review priorities.

Academic standards extend equally to students at all locations. The Rising Scholars program at the California Rehabilitation Center (CRC) has awarded more college degrees than any other California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation institution — 84 students earned ADTs in the most recent reporting period — demonstrating that the College's commitment to breadth, rigor, and equitable access applies across every instructional context. (Rising Scholars Program Annual Report)

The same expectations for breadth, depth, and rigor apply across all delivery modalities. Policies and procedures governing online and hybrid course development ensure that courses offered by distance education meet the same curricular standards as in-person instruction. (Curriculum Handbook; DE Addendum)

Moving Forward

[Re-evaluate: The Academic Council's systematic review of program design and delivery across all modalities, launched under the 2025–2030 SPGM, will generate the next cycle of evidence on whether programs are achieving equitable learning outcomes across student populations. As that review matures, findings will

inform program development priorities and resource allocation decisions.]

2.2. The institution, relying on faculty and other appropriate stakeholders, designs and delivers academic programs that reflect relevant discipline and industry standards and support equitable attainment of learning outcomes and achievement of educational goals.
(ER 3, ER 9, ER 11, ER 14)

Norco College's curriculum is designed, reviewed, and revised through faculty-led governance processes that ensure currency, rigor, and alignment with discipline standards. District policy establishes the framework for curriculum and program development and affirms Academic Senate authority over curriculum, while the Curriculum Committee exercises local oversight. Course Outlines of Record (CORs) embed discipline standards directly — PSYC-C1000, for example, specifies required topical coverage, evaluation methods, and SLOs aligned with external discipline expectations. (COR, PSYC-C1000) Curriculum currency is monitored systematically through Nuventive, where disciplines confirm whether courses are current within a four-year cycle and document plans for updating out-of-date courses as part of program review. (Nuventive Curriculum Review Screenshots)

Program review is the primary mechanism through which the College evaluates whether programs are achieving equitable outcomes. The Program Review Committee (PRC), a standing committee of the Academic Senate, establishes guidelines and content requirements for comprehensive review. Nuventive prompts require disciplines to analyze multi-year trends in success, retention, awards, and equity indicators, and embedded dashboards support disaggregated analysis by student subgroup. (Program Review Data Review Screenshots) A standardized feedback tool strengthens review quality and consistency by prompting reviewers to verify that equity gaps are identified and that action plans are stated when gaps exist. (Program Review Feedback Tool 2024–27)

Where relevant to the discipline, workforce and industry feedback inform program development and review. Advisory board involvement is documented in program development materials — the Biomedical Electronic Equipment Repair Certificate, for example, documents external partner need as part of the proposal — ensuring that program design reflects regional labor market conditions alongside discipline standards. (Biomedical Electronic Equipment Repair Certificate Program Development Materials)

The Norco College Assessment Committee (NAC), a standing committee of the Academic Senate, supports assessment practice and learning improvement. The College has transitioned to Canvas-based SLO data collection, enabling results to be disaggregated by demographic group and tracked over time. NAC built PLO assessment capability in Canvas during Fall 2025, with initial data beginning to be collected. Spring 2026 marks the first major campaign to drive systematic PLO assessment participation across disciplines, with programs developing assessment schedules and taking ownership of program-level outcomes. (Annual Assessment Report 2024-2025)

Moving Forward

Norco College's assessment infrastructure is established and improving. Two priorities are underway. The first is formalizing and publishing a collegewide SLO and PLO assessment cycle — with clear timelines, documentation expectations, and integration points with program review — to ensure complete and verifiable assessment loops across all programs. The second is implementing structured reflection and improvement documentation within Nuventive, so that faculty dialogue, equity analysis, instructional adjustments, and reassessment outcomes are consistently captured as part of the review cycle. Both initiatives are led by NAC and reflect what program review cycles have demonstrated: outcomes-focused improvement is strongest when equity-minded analysis and follow-through are embedded in routine practice, not treated as optional additions. (Learning Outcome Assessment Status Briefing; NAC Charter)

2.3. All degree programs include a general education framework to ensure the development of broad knowledge, skills, and competencies related to communication, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, information literacy, civic responsibility, and the ability to engage with diverse perspectives. (ER 12)

Norco College's general education framework is grounded in Riverside Community College District policy, which articulates general education as central to the associate degree and emphasizes coherent, integrated learning rather than the accumulation of units. (BP 2025) The District Academic Senate holds authority for developing, revising, and maintaining associate degree requirements and the General Education Student Learning Outcomes (GELOs), and the College Catalog publishes GELOs and their definitions across four interdisciplinary domains, making the framework visible and accessible to students. (Norco College 2025–2026 Catalog)

All associate degree programs include a structured general education pattern requiring coursework across foundational communication and quantitative reasoning as well as broad disciplinary engagement in the arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and natural sciences. (GE Courses 2025–26) The California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) provides a parallel transfer-aligned pathway, requiring coursework across the same core competency areas and ensuring that students pursuing transfer meet lower-division general education norms. (Cal-GETC Pattern) Academic support services reinforce core competencies across the curriculum — the Library provides research instruction and support for information literacy, and the Learning Resource Center supports quantitative reasoning and writing skills. (Library and LRC Catalog Description)

District assessment committees, including Norco College participation, have identified opportunities to improve GELO outcome clarity and measurability and advanced a formal governance pathway for reviewing and revising ILO and GELO language. (Process for Updating ILO Language, Academic Senate Presentation)

Moving Forward

No GELOs were assessed in 2024-2025 as the Canvas infrastructure for direct GELO assessment was being built. NAC began importing GELOs into Canvas in Fall 2025 alongside PLOs, and Spring 2026 marks the first major campaign to drive systematic GELO assessment participation across disciplines. The immediate priority is establishing a Norco-specific cycle of GELO assessment — including regular analysis, disaggregation by student population, and structured faculty reflection — that connects general education outcomes to the same improvement infrastructure being built for course and program-level assessment. (Annual Assessment Report 2024-2025)

2.4. The institution communicates clear, accurate, and accessible information regarding programs, services, and resources that foster success in students' unique educational journeys. (ER 20)

Norco College communicates student learning outcomes through multiple aligned, publicly accessible channels. Course-level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are established in approved Course Outlines of Record (CORs), where General Education Student Learning Outcomes (GELOs) are also linked to SLOs where appropriate. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are published in the College Catalog within degree and certificate program listings. CORs are publicly accessible through CurricUNET, making course-level outcomes and requirements available to prospective and current students. Faculty syllabi communicate course-level outcomes and expectations directly to enrolled students, and the Improvement of Instruction (IOI) process ensures syllabi accurately reflect approved curriculum through mandatory review for contract faculty and regular review for tenured faculty. (Norco College 2025–2026 Catalog; CurricUNET; IOI Process; Syllabus Shell Template)

Students access program requirements, support services, and institutional resources through a coordinated

set of channels designed to serve students across entry points and throughout their educational journey. The College Catalog and published class schedule provide foundational information on program requirements, course offerings, and key academic policies. A centralized services hub on the College website directs students to core academic and student support resources, and the Student Handbook Canvas shell places those same resources within the learning management environment students use daily. (Student Support Services Catalog; Student Support Links on Website) The College communicates in multiple modalities — including social media to amplify information about courses, programs, and events — and provides a website translation tool to support multilingual students and community members. (Website Translation Tool; NC Instagram) [Evidence Needed: EduNav student-facing degree progress screenshots — incorporate when available to demonstrate how students track progress toward completion.]

Norco College reviews its communication practices to ensure clarity, accuracy, and relevance. The College Catalog is reviewed and updated annually, and the IOI process provides recurring review of instructional communications to ensure syllabi accurately reflect approved curriculum. (Norco College 2025–2026 Catalog; IOI Process) [Evidence Needed: Web/communications review log or analytics snapshot — evidence of periodic review of high-impact webpages and whether findings inform updates. Check SPGM for policy.]

Moving Forward

Norco College's priority in this area is adding a student feedback dimension to existing communication review mechanisms — incorporating student perspectives on the clarity and accessibility of program requirements, support services, and academic planning tools into the College's institutional effectiveness processes. This will complement the accuracy-focused review already in place and provide evidence that communications are not only correct but navigable for the students they serve.

2.5. The institution holds itself accountable for students' success by scheduling courses in a manner that ensures degree and certificate programs can be completed in the expected period of time. (ER 9)

Norco College builds its course schedule to ensure that every student who commits to a degree or certificate can find the courses they need, in the sequence they need them, within a reasonable time. The Academic Council (AC), which holds primary institutional responsibility for this standard under the SPGM 2025–2030, coordinates scheduling oversight with the Academic Planning Chairs (APC) — a body of department chairs and deans of instruction that builds and maintains the schedule each term. (SPGM 2025–2030, Academic Council Charter; SEM Plan 2024–2027, Chapter 4)

Schedule construction follows written Guiding Principles codified in the SEM Plan 2024–2027. These principles require balancing general education sections across morning, afternoon, and evening time blocks and across multiple day configurations so that students with constrained schedules encounter sufficient sections of required courses. The College's scheduling grid is designed to minimize class overlap, allowing students to move between three-unit and four-unit courses without time conflicts. All pathway courses rotate on a two-year cycle, ensuring every course required for a degree or certificate is available at least once per academic year; CTE completions and Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) pathway maps are explicit rotation requirements. (SEM Plan 2024–2027, Appendix B.01)

The College protects pathway access through a deliberate section cancellation policy. Sections with fill ratios below 70% are eligible for cancellation, but the policy codifies four exceptions: sections essential to completing a pathway, capstone courses on a two-year rotation, sections tied to existing industry partnerships, and sections belonging to newly developed programs. (APC Minutes, October 3, 2025) That exception framework reflects a specific institutional judgment — that canceling a required course can set a student back a full year, and that efficiency metrics should not override completion access. When sections are added, a new section is typically opened once a waitlist reaches half the enrollment capacity of the class, with counseling informing which late-start courses are prioritized based on student need. (APC Minutes,

December 6, 2024; APC Minutes, September 12, 2025)

Multi-year planning is supported by PathMaker technology, which allows deans and department chairs to project schedules with room utilization, FTES generation estimates, and efficiency metrics across multiple terms. As of December 2024, Norco was actively scheduling two terms out, with multi-year scheduling under active development through the District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC). A district-developed course demand dashboard, built from approved Student Education Plans, gives department chairs direct visibility into projected course need for future terms. (DEMC Minutes, December 12, 2024)

Scheduling effectiveness is evaluated through multiple data streams reviewed by the APC, the AC, and DEMC on a recurring basis. Fill rates, waitlist counts, enrollment targets, and efficiency metrics are standing monitoring items; as of spring 2025, Norco was operating at 101% of its annual enrollment target with an efficiency metric of 14.61. (APC Minutes, March 14, 2025) When data surfaces a scheduling need, the College responds. In fall 2024, retention and success data comparing short-term and full-term sections found that retention is stronger in short-term formats; the College responded by substantially expanding late-start and 8-week section offerings. (APC Minutes, September 13, 2024) [FLAG: Insert section counts — Fall 2019 vs. Fall 2025 — once schedule analysis is complete.]

The College's most documented example of scheduling responding to completion data comes from its participation as a Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP) pilot college beginning in fall 2017. Identifying that students were not completing transfer-level English in a timely manner, Norco began placing students directly into transfer-level English, removing a structural scheduling and placement barrier. The results were measurable: access for Black/African American students increased 117% and for Hispanic/Latinx students 75%. (Norco College Guided Pathways Self-Assessment, 2020–21) That decision — tracing a completion problem to a scheduling structure and redesigning it — is the model the College continues to apply.

[Evidence Needed: We need evidence showing whether students from specific racial/ethnic groups have equal access to the courses they need to complete their degrees on time. I searched Academic Council, APC, and DEMC minutes but may have missed it.]

Under SEM Plan Goal 4 — decreasing student time to completion — the College has committed to refining multi-year schedule development informed by student educational plans, reaffirmed its Schedule Development Guiding Principles, and identified monitoring of success across all instructional modalities as a standing priority. (SEM Plan 2024–2027, Goal 4) The SEM Workgroup will assess progress annually against Vision Goal Completion and transfer-within-three-years metrics. (SEM Plan 2024–2027, Chapter 6) The infrastructure for deeper scheduling accountability is in place: PathMaker for multi-year schedule projection, the DEMC course demand dashboard drawing from approved Student Education Plans, and district PowerBI dashboards monitoring student success metrics. The 2025–2028 Student Equity Plan identifies Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx students as experiencing the most persistent disproportionate impact in completion and transfer — the populations whose outcomes should anchor any recurring analysis connecting scheduling decisions to completion results. (Student Equity Plan 2025–2028)

Moving Forward

The infrastructure for scheduling accountability is in place — PathMaker for multi-year projection, the DEMC course demand dashboard built from approved Student Education Plans, and district PowerBI dashboards monitoring student success metrics. The next step is connecting these tools to a recurring analysis of whether scheduling decisions are producing equitable completion outcomes, with particular attention to Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx students.

[FLAG — This may need to be revised if we find evidence of this occurring.]

2.6. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that meet student and curricular needs and promote equitable student learning and achievement.

Norco College offers instruction across in-person, hybrid, and online modalities and holds itself accountable for whether each modality is working equitably. In 2022–23, distance education courses carried a success rate of 70.2%, compared to 72.6% for non-distance education — a pattern that has persisted for four years. Closing that gap is part of what SPGM 2025–2030 Objective 2.1 is designed to accomplish: increasing course success rates across all modalities by 5% by 2030. (SPGM 2025–2030, Objective 2.1; SEM Plan 2024–2027, Figure C.04.01) Program review is the mechanism through which disciplines examine this pattern at the course and program level, with Nuventive dashboards providing faculty disaggregated data by modality and student population embedded directly into the three-year review cycle. (Nuventive Program Review Dashboard Screenshots)

Distance education faculty teach under a policy and credentialing framework that establishes RSI expectations before instruction begins. AP 2105 and BP 2105 define RSI requirements aligned with Title 5; faculty are required to acknowledge RCCD RSI guidelines before approving online teaching assignments. All DE faculty must hold the RCCD Online Teaching Certification by June 2026, earned through either a peer-to-peer review process developed collaboratively by faculty across all three RCCD colleges, or an equivalency pathway for faculty with recognized prior training through @ONE or another institution. The certification establishes that faculty know and are equipped to implement RSI expectations in their courses. (RCCD BP/AP 2105; RCCD Online Teaching Certification Documentation) The Distance Education Committee has formally and consistently advocated for a local Peer Online Course Review (POCR) process — a state-wide initiative that would elevate the College's distance education program beyond certification, creating a faculty-led culture of continuous improvement in course design across all dimensions of online teaching. (Distance Education Committee Minutes; DEC POCR Request Documentation)

[NOTE: add most up to date count of faculty certified to date across both pathways.]

In Summer 2025, the RSI Workgroup conducted an internal Mock Review of 20 course sections using the ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education. The results were instructive. On substantive interaction, 90% of sections demonstrated at least two qualifying interaction types, indicating that faculty are engaging with students in meaningful ways. The gap was in regular interaction: only 35% of sections demonstrated both required elements — predictable engagement and active monitoring of student progress. The most common issue was the absence of communication and monitoring expectations in the syllabus or Canvas shell.

In Summer 2025, while the certification process was being rolled out, the RSI Workgroup conducted an internal Mock Review of 20 course sections using the ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education — the first systematic, section-level assessment of actual RSI practice at the College. The results were instructive. On substantive interaction, 90% of sections demonstrated at least two qualifying interaction types, indicating that faculty are engaging with students in meaningful ways. The gap was in regular interaction: only 35% of sections demonstrated both required elements. The most common issue was the absence of communication and monitoring expectations in the syllabus or Canvas shell. The College responded with a college-funded faculty support campaign in Fall 2025, directly targeting the regular and substantive interaction and incorporating communication and monitoring expectations into the college syllabus shell (NOTE: in progress). The College also draws on ongoing district-level support: RCCD District DE provides faculty with continuing professional development opportunities and resources related to RSI.

The Mock Review demonstrated the value of systematic assessment of RSI practice to ensure that policy expectations translate into consistent faculty practice. The College is committed to institutionalizing a

recurring RSI evaluation process that generates comparable evidence across terms and connects findings to faculty support and course design decisions. [NOTE: in progress] (RSI Mock Review Results, Summer 2025; RSI Campaign Wrap-Up and Next Steps; APC Minutes — Syllabus Shell; RCCD District DE RSI Resources)

Moving Forward

Norco College's near-term focus is completing faculty certification through the RCCD Online Teaching Certification process and developing a mechanism for a recurring RSI evaluation that connects results to faculty support and practice. The Distance Education Committee's longstanding formal request for a local Peer Online Course Review (POCR) process reflects the College's broader aspiration for a mature distance education program — one where course design is systematically reviewed and faculty grow as a community of practice across all dimensions of online teaching quality. (Distance Education Committee Minutes; DEC POCR Request Documentation)

[FLAG: Add governance documentation — DEC, NAS, APC, College Council minutes showing discussion of RSI compliance

2.7. The institution designs and delivers equitable and effective services and programs that support students in their unique educational journeys, address academic and non-academic needs, and maximize their potential for success. Such services include library and learning resources, academic counseling and support, and other services the institution identifies as appropriate for its mission and student needs. (ER 15, ER 17)

Norco College designs student support services around documented student need, beginning at entry. The Holistic Student Support (HSS) Survey, embedded in new student orientation, assesses academic, non-academic, wellness, and basic needs, providing the College with student-level data that informs proactive outreach and service coordination. (Holistic Student Support Survey) Orientation and counseling services guide students through educational planning across multiple modalities, and the Library and Learning Resource Center (LRC) Open House provides a recurring, student-facing entry point to learning supports across service areas. (Library and LRC Open House Materials)

Learning support is delivered through the Library and LRC, which serve as a central hub for library collections, instruction, tutoring, and writing and reading support, with in-person and online access options. (LRC Webpage) In Fall 2025, the LRC recorded 10,431 total visits — a 43% increase from Fall 2024 — with 1-on-1 tutoring appointments growing 200% from 183 to 549 over the same period. The volume of study space usage (8,392 hours) confirms that students use the LRC as a primary academic workspace, not only a tutoring resource. (LRC Usage Report, Fall 2025) Tutoring and learning labs are available through drop-in, study groups, embedded tutoring, and virtual access, and the Math and Science Success Center provides discipline-focused support through the same access pathways. (Math and Science Success Center Webpage) Academic Counseling supports timely educational planning through multiple access modalities, including online counseling. (Academic Counseling Catalog)

Targeted learning communities and categorical programs extend support to students with specific needs. TRIO Student Support Services (SSS and SSS-STEM), EOPS/CARE/NextUp, CalWORKs, the Disability Resource Center (DRC), and veterans services provide counseling, financial assistance, and specialized academic support to students who face additional barriers to success. (EOPS/CARE Catalog; DRC Catalog; Veterans Services Catalog) The Transfer Center and Career Services support students' onward planning through workshops, student-facing calendars, and resources that connect educational pathways to career and transfer outcomes. (Transfer Center Materials; Career Services Materials)

The College communicates support services consistently through the catalog, which provides baseline

descriptions and access information for counseling, the Disability Resource Center, the Library and LRC, veterans services, and other student-facing programs. (Norco College 2025–2026 Catalog — Academic Counseling; DRC; Library and LRC; Veterans Services) All support services are evaluated through the institutional program review cycle, in which units complete comprehensive review every three years and may submit annual updates connecting service data, equity analysis, and resource requests to institutional priorities. (Program Review and Resource Request Procedure)

Moving Forward

Program review provides the evaluation cycle through which student support services identify needs and document improvement responses. The next step is strengthening the documentation infrastructure that connects what students report to what the College changes — a need the Standard of Care framework being developed through the IEPI Partnership Resource Team is directly designed to address. The tutoring service area is already piloting this approach, gathering data through surveys and focus groups in collaboration with Institutional Research and using findings to improve services. As the Standard of Care framework matures, its documentation and assessment expectations will extend across student support services broadly. (Bellwether Consortium Slides; President's Memo 2024–25)

2.8. The institution fosters a sense of belonging and community with its students by providing multiple opportunities for engagement with the institution, programs, and peers. Such opportunities reflect the varied needs of the student population and effectively support students' unique educational journeys. (ER 15)

Norco College fosters belonging and community through a broad, intentionally varied ecosystem of engagement opportunities that connect students with the institution, academic programs, and one another. Student-led organizations form the foundation: the College supports over 40 active clubs and organizations through the Associated Students of Norco College (ASNC) and the Inter Club Council, providing students with structured opportunities for leadership, identity expression, and peer connection. (Student Life Annual Update) Career and Academic Pathway (CAP) Hour events create recurring, low-barrier opportunities for students to connect with programs, faculty, and professional networks across all four Schools. (CAP Hour Event Materials)

Campuswide cultural events celebrate and validate diverse student identities. The DEIA Committee and student equity programs host recurring events including a Lowrider Car Show and History Lecture, a Diwali Festival of Lights, a Día de los Muertos celebration, and a Black History Month program — each designed to affirm the identities and histories of Norco's student community. (DEIA Event Documentation) The college-wide Read 2 Succeed shared reading program brings together students, faculty, classified professionals, administrators, and local community members around a common text each semester, with multiple structured points of connection including book discussions, author events, and community conversations. A recent selection, Illegally Yours by Rafael Agustín, opened college-wide dialogue about the undocumented student experience — directly relevant to a student population that is 58.9% Hispanic/Latinx. (Read 2 Succeed Program Materials) The 28th Annual Harvest Festival, presented by ASNC and the Inter Club Council, is a free, public-facing community event that extends belonging beyond the campus boundary. (Harvest Festival Documentation)

Norco College's engagement ecosystem is designed around the documented needs of its student population, with particular attention to students who have been historically under-resourced. Umoja fosters student success, community, and leadership with an emphasis on the African-American population; Puente supports Hispanic/Latinx students through culturally relevant mentorship and academic pathways. (Special Programs Annual Update) The Promoting Achievable College Transitions (PACT) program, made possible through an award from the Inland Empire Regional K-16 Collaborative, creates structured engagement spaces for

neurodiverse students. (PACT Program Documentation) Mental health programming reflects the specific stressors and cultural contexts of Norco's student population, recognizing that belonging and wellness are interconnected. (Mental Health Programming Documentation)

Engagement design also responds to material realities impacting students. The #RealCollege Survey documented that 47% of Norco students experience food insecurity and 58% experience housing insecurity — findings that directly informed the College's decision to scale its Basic Needs response, growing from a food pantry to a comprehensive Basic Needs Hub. (RealCollege Survey; Student Life Annual Update)

Engagement quality is assessed at multiple levels. At the institution level, outcomes data from the Special Programs Annual Update shows that students participating in CalWORKs, the Disability Resource Center, and EOPS achieve success rates comparable to or exceeding the general student population. (Special Programs Annual Update) At the activity level, CAP Hour events consistently embed participant feedback mechanisms. The Holistic Student Supports model includes a belongingness and connection domain in new student orientation, with a structured follow-through process connecting identified needs to outreach. (Holistic Student Support Survey) The College is piloting Case Note Templates in Colleague, SARS, and Element 451 to document student interactions, referrals, and service utilization — building the infrastructure that connects individual student need to institutional response. (Bellwether Consortium Slides) [FLAG: Confirm whether Case Note Templates are still in pilot or more broadly implemented before submission.]

Moving Forward

Consistent, program-level documentation of how engagement activities drive specific improvements is an area the College is actively strengthening. Through a Partnership Resource Team supported by the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI), Norco College is developing a Standard of Care framework for holistic student support, led by Dr. Kaneesha Tarrant and David Schlanger. The framework builds in accountability through assessment as a core principle — defining metrics and outcomes, establishing documentation expectations for support units, and embedding continuous improvement into how engagement programs connect findings to service changes. [FLAG: Consensus definition of Standard of Care not yet reached as of drafting — confirm status and update tense before submission.] (Bellwether Consortium Slides; President's Memo 2024–25)

2.9. The institution conducts systematic review and assessment to ensure the quality of its academic, learning support, and student services programs and implement improvements and innovations in support of equitable student achievement. (ER 11, ER 14)

Norco College conducts systematic program review and outcomes assessment through interlocking governance structures, documented cycles, and data infrastructure designed to make disaggregated evidence of student learning and achievement central to program improvement. The Program Review Committee (PRC), a standing committee of the Academic Senate, governs a three-year comprehensive review cycle for all instructional, student services, and administrative units, with annual update options for units with active goals or resource requests. (Program Review and Resource Request Procedure) The Norco Assessment Committee (NAC), also a standing committee of the Academic Senate, maintains a parallel six-year outcomes assessment rotation plan and holds primary governance responsibility for measuring student learning across instructional programs and learning support services. (NAC Charter; Assessment Rotation Plan)

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) supports both processes by providing disaggregated data on student success, retention, and outcomes by race/ethnicity, gender, and learning modality through embedded dashboards in Nuventive, integrating evidence directly into the review workflow rather than requiring users to locate data independently. Student services units use the same PRC framework and Nuventive infrastructure for annual program updates, analyzing disaggregated enrollment, success, and service-utilization data and documenting planned responses as part of the program review cycle. (Nuventive

Program Review Dashboard Screenshots)

Disaggregation consistently surfaces equity patterns that program averages conceal — success and retention gaps by race/ethnicity, gender, and learning modality that vary significantly across disciplines and that would be invisible in aggregated reporting. (Nuventive Program Review Dashboard Screenshots) Where faculty have engaged directly with that data, the process generates dialogue that moves from evidence to action. In Psychology, faculty confronting consistent underperformance on SLO3 (research methods) convened three assessment meetings in Fall 2025 to examine whether assessment design, instructional approach, or equity factors were driving the pattern — producing concrete instructional adjustments and a plan for reassessment. (Psychology Program Review Documentation) These examples reflect the system working where conditions are right. As of Fall 2025, 22% of active courses had collected SLO data in Canvas, up from 15% at the end of 2024-2025, and systematic documentation of reflection and improvement actions was not yet in place across disciplines — the gap the College's governance response has been designed to close. (Learning Outcome Assessment Status Briefing; Annual Assessment Report 2024-2025) Where review cycles have had sufficient time to complete, the College can point to confirmed improvements: the Administration of Justice program review documents that two equity gaps among African American and Hispanic/Latina female students, identified in prior review cycles, have since closed. (ADJ Program Review Report 2024–27) For student services, the Special Programs annual update shows that students in special programs completed Student Educational Plans at a rate significantly higher than the general population, with honest identification of remaining gaps alongside evidence of effectiveness. (Special Programs Annual Update)

[FLAG: Additional faculty dialogue examples needed — two or three more instances of disaggregated data moving to documented action, with named disciplines and citations. Check program review submissions and NotebookLM before submission.]

[FLAG: Current examples are isolated rather than institution-wide. Maybe one of these would help: number of program reviews documenting equity gap analysis, PRC feedback tool results showing how many submissions include documented action plans.]

Norco College's review processes have generated three institutional insights that are actively shaping improvement work. Disaggregated data reveals equity gap complexity that requires differentiated, coordinated responses rather than uniform interventions. Structural conditions matter as much as data — where dedicated time for discipline-level dialogue, accessible disaggregated data, and shared interpretive frameworks are present together, the review process generates genuine improvement; where any of these conditions are absent, the process tends toward compliance rather than learning. The third is that the pathway from review findings to institutional action is most reliable when it is made explicit — the Chemistry instrumentation request and the ADJ equity gap closures both demonstrate that naming the connection between evidence and resource decision produces more accountable improvement planning. (President's Memo 2023–24; Chemistry Program Review Annual Update 2023; ADJ Program Review Report 2024–27) Program review findings and disaggregated outcome data feed into the annual KPI review cycle through which the College evaluates progress toward its 2025–2030 strategic objectives and adjusts institutional priorities accordingly. (SPGM 2025–2030, Strategic Objectives and KPIs)

Moving Forward

Norco College's improvement work in this area is organized around strengthening the connective infrastructure between review findings and documented action. Through governance presentations to NAC, the Academic Senate, College Council, and the Academic Planning Chairs in Fall 2025, the College identified assessment compliance risks and mobilized a coordinated response. (Learning Outcome Assessment Status Briefing; APC Minutes, November 2025) NAC is actively transitioning from data collection to a full assessment cycle that includes observation, analysis, action planning, implementation, and monitoring. The College is piloting a structured approach in Nuventive to capture faculty dialogue, improvement actions, and reassessment outcomes — building the documentation infrastructure that makes loop closure visible and

verifiable across all disciplines, not only in individual cases. A coordinated assessment action plan guides this work and will be incorporated into this section before submission. [Flag: update specifics and evidence]

NAC has identified course-level disaggregation of SLO data as a priority condition for more precise equity-minded faculty dialogue and is advancing a proposal through the College's shared governance process. PLO and GELO assessment campaigns are running simultaneously in Spring 2026, building toward a complete assessment infrastructure across course, program, and institutional levels. The goal is not compliance alone — it is a functioning, equity-minded assessment culture that generates the kind of discipline-level dialogue the College's best program reviews already demonstrate is possible. (Annual Assessment Report 2024-2025; SPGM 2025–2030)

Standard 3: Infrastructure and Resources

The institution supports its educational services and operational functions with effective infrastructure, qualified personnel, and stable finances. The institution organizes its staffing and allocates its physical, technological, and financial resources to improve its overall effectiveness and promote equitable student success. The institution actively monitors and assesses resource capacity to inform improvements to infrastructure and ensure long-term health and stability.

Suggested length for Standard 3 is no more than 20 pages.

3.1. The institution employs qualified faculty, staff, administrators, and other personnel to support and sustain educational services and improve student success. The institution maintains appropriate policies and regularly assesses its employment practices to promote and improve equity, diversity, and mission fulfillment. (ER 8, ER 14)

Norco College employs qualified faculty, classified professionals, and administrators, each hired through processes governed by Riverside Community College District (RCCD) Board Policies and Administrative Procedures and administered by the RCCD Human Resources and Employee Relations (HRER) office. Staffing needs are identified through the three-year program review cycle, in which every academic, student services, and administrative unit submits data-grounded resource requests tied explicitly to college mission, Educational Master Plan objectives, and strategic plan priorities. Requests are ranked by the appropriate governance council and forwarded to Executive Cabinet for final determination. (Program Review and Resource Request Procedure; Business Services Manager Leads PRRR Prioritization Process 2023)

The December 2025 Academic Senate meeting illustrates this process in action. The College President allocated 14 planned new faculty positions using Power BI efficiency data, approving a Disability Resource Center (DRC) Counselor and an Engineering/Environmental faculty member based on documented need, while declining an Art/Ceramics position due to insufficient curriculum and facilities readiness and a General Counselor position because the existing ratio already met the 500:1 FTES standard. The DRC Counselor approval — grounded in documented enrollment growth among students with disabilities — reflects the College's understanding that hiring decisions are student success interventions, not only organizational planning. (Academic Senate Minutes, December 2025)

All employees are hired against qualifications appropriate to their role. Faculty must meet California Community Colleges minimum qualifications per BP 6120; administrators must meet Education Code minimum qualifications per AP 6120A; and classified professionals must meet position-specific education and experience requirements defined in their job descriptions. (BP 6120 Recruitment and Hiring; AP 6120A; sample job descriptions) Faculty job descriptions enumerate the full scope of faculty responsibility, including curriculum development and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment as defined components of the workload. RCCD verifies the education, training, and experience of all new hires, including equivalency evaluation for degrees earned at non-U.S. institutions, in accordance with BP 6126. (BP 6126)

The RCCD EEO Plan, reviewed and revised at minimum every three years, governs recruitment district-wide and requires disaggregated workforce and applicant pool monitoring across all job categories. All screening and selection committee members must complete Title 5-required EEO training before participating in any hiring process, documented through signed certification forms. (RCCD EEO Plan; EEO 2022 Workforce Report; Title 5 EEO Training Form) The College's workforce diversity has improved measurably over the review period, and ongoing efforts to strengthen applicant pool outreach and screening committee practices reflect the College's commitment to a workforce that mirrors the community it serves.

Moving Forward

Hiring processes are systematically governed and mission-aligned. As the College enters the 2025–2030

planning cycle, it will continue to monitor workforce diversity trends through the EEO Plan review cycle and program review staffing requests, using findings to inform recruitment practices and ensure the College's workforce reflects the community it serves.

3.2. The institution supports its employees with professional learning opportunities aligned with the mission and institutional goals. These opportunities are regularly evaluated for overall effectiveness in promoting equitable student success and in meeting institutional and employee needs.

Norco College's professional learning system is built around a coordinated Flex Day calendar governed by RCCD Board Policy 6160 (BP 6160), which requires that full-time faculty complete 24 hours of professional development annually — 8 of which must be equity-related — and that all programs be evaluated for effectiveness. (BP 6160) Recent Flex programming has centered equity as an organizing theme, with sessions including "Seeing Beyond Bias: PANning towards Justice and Equity," "ALASS: Advancing Equity Together," Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) in online courses, and zero-textbook-cost (ZTC) course development. (Flex Day Schedule and Session Materials) Faculty Communities of Practice in English and Mathematics extend professional learning beyond episodic training into sustained, discipline-specific inquiry, producing shared instructional strategies and equity-focused assessment practices targeted at closing achievement gaps in gateway courses. (Communities of Practice Documentation)

Professional learning opportunities extend across all employee groups. Classified professionals and confidential employees access professional growth through RCCD's Professional Growth Program, which provides monetary incentives for approved coursework and development activities. Administrators participate in leadership development through district-coordinated programs and external conferences. The College's professional learning infrastructure also includes the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC), which provides faculty with resources, consultations, and programming on pedagogy, technology, and instructional design throughout the academic year. (TLC Documentation; RCCD Professional Growth Program)

To identify professional learning needs, the College uses multiple methods. The Institutional Effectiveness and Planning Survey (IEPS), administered annually to all employee classifications, includes questions on professional development satisfaction and needs. [Evidence Needed: IEPS professional development results] Following the 2023 Guided Pathways Summer Institute, the College used participant reflection and institutional data to evaluate impact on teaching practice and student outcomes, demonstrating a structured approach to assessing whether professional learning translates into improved practice. (Guided Pathways Summer Institute Evaluation)

Moving Forward

Professional learning at Norco College is equity-focused and actively evolving. The College is strengthening its evaluation infrastructure by developing more consistent mechanisms for documenting how professional learning participation connects to changes in instructional practice and student outcomes — moving beyond satisfaction data toward evidence of impact. The IEPS provides an annual baseline for this work; the next step is building out structured follow-through documentation that captures what employees do differently as a result of professional learning and how those changes affect students.

3.3. The institution evaluates its employees regularly, using clear criteria that align with professional responsibilities and reflect the institution's mission and goals.

Norco College evaluates all personnel on a regular, systematic cycle governed by RCCD Board Policy 6150 (BP 6150) and applicable collective bargaining agreements. Evaluation criteria are explicitly aligned to professional responsibilities and the College's mission to support every learner on their educational path. (BP 6150) RCCD Human Resources and Employee Relations (HRER) coordinates evaluation cycles across all

employee groups: contract faculty are evaluated each fall for their first four years; tenured faculty are evaluated once every three years; associate faculty are evaluated in their first term and periodically thereafter; classified professionals are evaluated annually; and managers and administrators are evaluated annually. (BP 6150; Collective Bargaining Agreements)

Evaluation criteria reflect the full scope of each employee group's professional responsibilities. Faculty evaluations address teaching effectiveness, professional development, curriculum oversight, and SLO assessment — the same responsibilities enumerated in faculty job descriptions. Management goal-setting forms, completed as part of each evaluation cycle, require managers to identify specific professional goals aligned to institutional priorities, creating a structured mechanism for connecting individual performance to college mission. (Management Goal-Setting Form) The evaluation process also includes structured mechanisms for identifying the support employees need to succeed in their roles, reflecting the Core Commitment to Own Our Growth at every level of the institution.

[Evidence Needed: Documentation demonstrating how aggregate evaluation results are reviewed to inform hiring, retention, and employment practices is not yet confirmed. Check with RCCD HRER – does this occur at the district level?]

Moving Forward

Evaluation cycles are consistent and systematically administered across all employee groups. One area the College is working to strengthen is documentation of how aggregate evaluation findings inform employment practices — demonstrating not only that evaluations occur but that reviewing patterns across evaluations produces institutional learning. The College will clarify with RCCD Human Resources and Employee Relations whether aggregate evaluation data is currently compiled and reviewed at the district level, and identify how those findings, if available, can be incorporated into College-level planning and practice improvement.

3.4. The institution develops, maintains, and enhances its educational services and operational functions through the effective use of fiscal resources. Financial resources support and sustain the mission and promote equitable achievement of student success. (ER 18)

Norco College connects fiscal resources to mission through an integrated planning architecture that links department-level needs to institutional priorities at every stage of the budget cycle. The primary college-level mechanism is the annual Program Review and Resource Request cycle, a formalized process governed by the Budget and Planning Manual in which departments author resource requests within a three-year program review cycle, with annual update provisions for urgent mid-cycle needs. (Budget and Planning Manual; Program Review and Resource Request Procedure) Annual budget priorities, approved each fall by College Council, establish the governing criteria against which all requests are evaluated — explicitly mandating that allocations support the College's Student Transformation strategic direction, including the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan and equity objectives. (College Council Budget Priorities)

The process funds enhancement as well as sustainability when evidence warrants it. The 2023 Guided Pathways Schools Reorganization illustrates this: following faculty and administrative review, the Academic Senate and College Council approved an expansion from four Schools to five, with accompanying resource allocation to support the new structure and its equity-focused design. (Academic Senate and College Council Minutes, Schools Reorganization 2023) [Evidence Needed: department-initiated Program Review resource request that resulted in a funded instructional or programmatic change]

At the district level, Norco receives general fund unrestricted resources through the RCCD Budget Allocation Model (BAM), which operates on principles of fairness, equity, and transparency. The BAM's Phase III methodology establishes median cost-per-FTES as the allocation basis, ensuring that funding is distributed

equitably across colleges relative to student enrollment. Phase IV — establishing a parallel allocation approach for the District Office — is under development with an anticipated completion of June 2026. District investment in student-facing support has accompanied the College's structural changes: the Chancellor committed $2.0 million annually to support the Guided Pathways Schools Reorganization. (BAM Documentation; Chancellor's Commitment Documentation)

Long-term fiscal sustainability is supported by the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) and the Educational Master Plan, which project capital outlay and programmatic needs against enrollment targets and extend resource planning beyond the annual cycle. Resource requests for off-site locations — the Corona Regional Campus (CRC), John F. Kennedy (JFK) Middle College, and Stokoe Campus — move through the same prioritization cycle as main campus requests, ensuring equitable resource consideration across all instructional sites. (Facilities Master Plan; Program Review and Resource Request Procedure)

Moving Forward

Esource allocation processes are integrated across planning cycles and explicitly tied to mission. The College continues to refine the BAM framework as Phase IV development proceeds and will monitor the impact of the $2.0 million annual district investment in Guided Pathways Schools on student outcomes over the 2025–2030 planning cycle. As program review cycles mature under the 2025–2030 SPGM, the College will strengthen documentation of how funded resource requests connect to measurable improvements in educational services and student success.

3.5. The institution's mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning. Financial information is disseminated to support effective planning and decision-making and provide opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the development of plans and budgets.

Norco College's mission as "an open-access college that supports every learner on their educational path" is the explicit foundation from which financial planning proceeds, not a framing device applied after budget decisions are made. This design reflects the core commitment to Commit to Integrity: resource decisions are traceable to institutional priorities at every stage of the budget cycle.

Norco College operates within the budget framework established by the Riverside Community College District (RCCD). At the district level, the RCCD Board of Trustees adopts the annual budget, and the District Budget Advisory Council (DBAC) — a district-level shared governance body including administrators, faculty, classified professionals, and students — develops budget assumptions and recommendations. (DBAC Charter) Within that framework, Norco College conducts a structured annual planning and budget development cycle documented in the Norco College Planning and Budget Manual. Each February, College Council discusses and recommends Annual Budget Priorities grounded in the College's three strategic goals — Student Transformation, Regional Transformation, and College Transformation — establishing the mission-aligned criteria against which all resource requests are evaluated. (Planning and Budget Manual; College Council Budget Priorities)

The College's planning processes are structurally equity-explicit. The 2025–2030 SPGM embeds the elimination of equity gaps for Black/African American students (Objective 3.1) and Hispanic/Latinx students (Objective 3.2) as named KPIs that drive resource requests across all divisions. (SPGM 2025–2030, Strategic Objectives and KPIs) Financial information reaches planners through structured, timely channels. The Budget Development Calendar sequences information-sharing from February end-of-year projections through September distribution of adopted budget assumptions to the Resources Council, ensuring that council rankings occur against an accurate and current fiscal picture. (Budget Development Calendar)

The College's planning processes are functioning well. Three areas of active deepening are underway. The Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs and Deans of Instruction are developing FTES enrollment targets

by School and by discipline — a level of specificity that will allow program review resource requests to be evaluated against projected student demand. The Vice President of Business Services is developing multi-year projections to support longer-range planning. And the College is working to expand constituent understanding of the budget development process and the criteria by which resource requests are prioritized. (SPGM 2025–2030; Planning and Budget Manual)

Moving Forward

Financial planning infrastructure is in place and functioning as designed. The three areas of active deepening — enrollment target specificity, multi-year projections, and constituent budget literacy — represent the next cycle of integration work, each designed to make the connection between institutional priorities and resource decisions more visible, more data-driven, and more broadly understood across the College community.

3.6. The institution ensures the integrity and responsible use of its financial resources and regularly evaluates its fiscal outcomes and financial management practices to promote institutional mission fulfillment.

Norco College and the Riverside Community College District (RCCD) maintain financial integrity through layered automated controls, documented procedures, independent auditing, and transparent stakeholder communication — reflecting the College's core value of Commit to Integrity.

RCCD's Galaxy financial system blocks transactions when funds are insufficient and restricts budget overrides to designated personnel. Invoice approvals follow a multi-signature workflow; year-end accruals require VP-level authorization. Norco College administers 94 grants and categorical projects totaling over $24 million, each governed by documented expenditure controls and compliance tracking. (RCCD Galaxy Financial System Documentation; Grant Administration Documentation)

An independent certified public accounting firm audits RCCD's financial statements, federal awards, and state compliance programs annually; the District qualifies as a low-risk auditee under federal Uniform Guidance. Across the current accreditation cycle, every audit has returned an unmodified opinion — the highest level of assurance available. (Annual Audit Reports) The Board of Trustees receives monthly financial reports, quarterly financial status reports, and annual budget documents; Board Policy 5200 mandates a published budget calendar and public hearing each year. Audit reports and annual fiscal reports are submitted to ACCJC each December and posted publicly, ensuring external accountability alongside internal oversight. (BP 5200; Annual Fiscal Reports)

Moving Forward

Norco College and RCCD will continue to maintain the audit and financial reporting cycle that has produced a clean compliance record across the current accreditation period, with Board oversight and transparent stakeholder communication as the ongoing accountability mechanism.

3.7. The institution ensures financial solvency. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities and future obligations to ensure sustained fiscal stability. (ER 18)

Norco College and the Riverside Community College District (RCCD) ensure financial solvency by continuously learning from past results, adapting to current conditions, and planning ahead for long-term obligations — reflecting the core value of Own Our Growth.

The District's Budget Allocation Model applies an escalation factor to prior year cost-per-student data each cycle, incorporating actual changes in retirement contribution rates, negotiated contracts, and cost-of-living

adjustments to derive the current year allocation rate. A foundational operating reserve policy ensures that the District maintains reserves sufficient to sustain operations through foreseeable disruptions. (BAM Documentation; Reserve Policy)

RCCD maintains actuarially grounded plans for each category of long-term liability, integrating these obligations into the annual budget before discretionary allocations are made. The District's total Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) liability as of June 30, 2024 stands at $93,262,887. Since 2016, the District has addressed this liability through a dedicated OPEB trust, with annual contributions structured to reduce the unfunded portion over time. (OPEB Trust Documentation; Annual Audit Reports)

Moving Forward

Norco College and RCCD will continue to monitor long-term liability obligations and maintain the actuarially grounded planning practices that have supported sustained fiscal stability across the current accreditation cycle.

3.8. The institution constructs and maintains physical resources to support and sustain educational services and operational functions. The institution ensures safe and effective physical resources at all locations where it offers instruction, student services, and/or learning supports.

Guided by the core commitment to Own Our Growth, Norco College and the Riverside Community College District (RCCD) align facilities planning with educational priorities through an integrated chain of documents and decisions. The 2020 Facilities Master Plan (FMP), updated through the annual capital outlay planning process, projects space needs against enrollment targets and guides both short-term maintenance and long-term construction priorities. (Facilities Master Plan 2020; Capital Outlay Planning Documentation)

Safety infrastructure operates through layered systems at both the college and district levels. The college-level Safety Workgroup — established in FY 2021–22 under the Safety and Emergency Planning Coordinator with a formal charge referencing ACCJC standards — holds quarterly open forum meetings, conducts annual campus safety inspections, and coordinates emergency preparedness activities. (Safety Workgroup Charge and Meeting Documentation) At the district level, the District Safety and Security Council (DSSC) provides governance oversight of safety policy and emergency management across all RCCD campuses.

Norco College offers instruction at off-campus locations including dual enrollment courses at Corona Norco Unified School District (CNUSD) campuses, college courses at the California Rehabilitation Center (CRC) through the Rising Scholars program, and instruction at the Stokoe Campus. Physical resource standards and safety requirements apply equally across all instructional locations. (Off-Campus Instructional Site Documentation)

Norco College evaluates physical resource effectiveness through a structured assessment cycle with results feeding directly into resource decisions. The FUSION database tracks building efficiency, cap load ratios, and facility deficiencies; 2023 assessments documented a $240 million scheduled maintenance backlog, informing capital outlay prioritization in the FMP update. (FUSION Database Reports; FMP Update Documentation)

Moving Forward

Norco College continues to address the $240 million scheduled maintenance backlog identified in the 2023 FUSION assessments through the capital outlay planning cycle, prioritizing projects that most directly support instructional effectiveness and student safety.

3.9. The institution implements, enhances, and secures its technology resources to support and sustain educational services and operational functions. The institution clearly communicates requirements for the safe and appropriate use of technology to students and employees and employs effective protocols for network and data security.

Reflecting the core commitment to Own Our Growth, Norco College aligns technology planning with institutional priorities through a governance structure that connects college-level needs to district-level investment. The 2025–2030 SPGM identifies technology infrastructure and planning as a strategic priority area, and the Resources Council provides the governance venue through which technology needs are assessed and prioritized. (SPGM 2025–2030; Resources Council Charter)

RCCD IT maintains the technology infrastructure that sustains Norco College's educational and operational functions. In 2023, RCCD unified Technology Support Services across all three colleges under a single district IT department; email support backlog decreased from 44 days to 2 days following consolidation. (RCCD IT Consolidation Documentation) RCCD communicates technology use requirements through policy and training. BP/AP 2720 — Computer and Network Use, revised November 19, 2024 — establishes requirements for all users and requires each student, faculty member, classified professional, and administrator to sign a Computer and Network Use Agreement before accessing institutional systems. (BP/AP 2720)

RCCD protects institutional data and network integrity through layered security controls — Azure Active Directory single sign-on centralizing identity management since spring 2021, a Palo Alto Firewall, Microsoft Data Loss Prevention and Intune, Multi-Factor Authentication for all employees, and offsite cloud backups of critical data. (RCCD IT Security Documentation)

Technology effectiveness is evaluated through a sustained cycle of surveys and plan-level assessment. Faculty satisfaction with technical support rose from 68% in 2019 to 86% in 2020 and 89% in 2023; in the same period, 18 of 21 non-faculty employee satisfaction indicators improved. (IEPS Technology Satisfaction Data)

Moving Forward

The ad hoc workgroup convened through the Resources Council will complete targeted updates to align Norco College's technology priorities with the RCCD District Technology Plan, producing a prioritized college technology needs list to guide future investment decisions. (Resources Council Technology Workgroup Documentation)

3.10. The institution has appropriate strategies for risk management and has policies and procedures in place to implement contingency plans in the event of financial, environmental, or technological emergencies and other unforeseen circumstances.

Norco College's approach to risk management reflects the core commitment to Commit to Integrity — following through on institutional obligations and building trust with the campus community through deliberate, documented preparedness. The College operates within RCCD's risk management architecture, which addresses emergency preparedness, insurance and self-insurance, and data security through layered systems at both the college and district levels.

Norco College exercises its emergency response capacity through a documented annual cycle of drills, inspections, and plan reviews. In spring 2024, the College conducted a lockdown drill on March 26, with building and floor captain training completed in advance, access control systems tested, and post-drill debriefs documented. (Emergency Preparedness Documentation; Lockdown Drill Report, Spring 2024) The College's capacity for large-scale contingency response is grounded in demonstrated institutional experience. When COVID-19 required full operational disruption beginning spring 2020, RCCD developed an Emergency Conditions Recovery Plan, BOT-approved August 16, 2022, with a midyear update submitted to the Board in

February 2023. (Emergency Conditions Recovery Plan)

Norco College, as a college of RCCD, is covered through a multi-layered insurance architecture that transfers risk across several Joint Powers Authorities (JPAs) while maintaining self-funded reserves for retained exposures. For fiscal year 2022–23, the District participated in the Southern California Schools Risk Management JPA for property and liability coverage and the Schools Excess Liability Fund for excess coverage. (RCCD Insurance Documentation) The District reviews and updates its insurance and self-insurance programs on an annual cycle, with findings reported to the DSSC. RCCD engaged Centric Actuarial Solutions to complete an independent actuarial analysis of workers' compensation liabilities, informing reserve adequacy determinations. (Actuarial Analysis — Workers' Compensation)

RCCD protects sensitive institutional data through layered technical controls and established backup protocols, including a Palo Alto Firewall, Microsoft Data Loss Prevention, Multi-Factor Authentication for all employee groups, and offsite cloud backups of critical data. (RCCD IT Security Documentation)

Moving Forward

RCCD IT's Data Access and Security Taskforce will complete the district's formal information security policies and procedures through the newly formed Information Security Sub-Committee, and the Technology Continuity Plan will integrate technology recovery protocols with the broader emergency preparedness framework. (Information Security Sub-Committee Documentation)

Standard 4: Governance and Decision-Making

The institution engages in clear and effective governance practices that support the achievement of its mission. Governance roles and responsibilities are delineated in widely distributed policies, and institutional decision-making processes provide opportunities for meaningful participation and inclusion of relevant stakeholders.

Suggested length for Standard 4 is no more than 12 pages.

4.1. The institution upholds an explicit commitment to principles of academic freedom, academic integrity, and freedom of inquiry. (ER 13)

Norco College's commitment to academic freedom and academic integrity is grounded in the core commitment to Commit to Integrity — following through, owning institutional impact, and building trust with every member of the college community. At the district level, RCCD Board Policy 2030 affirms that academic freedom is essential to the College's educational mission and establishes the right of faculty to teach and students to learn without interference. (BP 2030: Academic Freedom)

Academic integrity expectations reach every student through a layered, multi-channel system. BP 3500: Standards of Student Conduct defines plagiarism and cheating, establishes a range of faculty responses to academic dishonesty, and outlines the formal appeal process. The mandatory syllabus template requires faculty to include academic integrity expectations in every course, ensuring that standards are communicated consistently at the start of each term. (BP 3500: Standards of Student Conduct; Syllabus Template)

BP/AP 1800: Institutional Code of Professional Ethics, reviewed September 2022, extends integrity expectations beyond the classroom to all employees and students. The policy requires that employees not seek to abridge the freedoms of other employees or students for any purpose. (BP/AP 1800: Institutional Code of Professional Ethics) Norco College follows clearly communicated, multi-stage procedures for addressing academic dishonesty, published across all primary student-facing channels. Procedures for addressing violations of academic freedom principles are similarly documented and communicated. (Academic Dishonesty Procedures; Student-Facing Publications)

In September 2025, the RCCD Board of Trustees approved an agreement with the Community College League of California for Turnitin, a plagiarism detection platform, making the commitment to academic integrity a funded institutional priority. (Board of Trustees Minutes, September 2025)

Moving Forward

Norco College is strengthening its academic integrity infrastructure to keep pace with evolving instructional contexts. The 2025 syllabus template already prompts faculty to establish course-level AI policies; as the College expands its guidance on artificial intelligence in instruction, academic integrity expectations will be explicitly addressed in that framework. (Syllabus Template 2025; AI Guidance Documentation — in development)

4.2. Roles, responsibilities, and authority for decision-making are clearly defined and communicated throughout the institution. The institution's structure for decision-making provides opportunities for stakeholder participation and ensures the inclusion of relevant perspectives.

Norco College's decision-making structure ensures that every constituency group has a defined role, legal standing, and genuine opportunity to shape institutional direction. At the district level, RCCD Board Policy 1430: Delegation of Authority to Chancellor and Presidents, revised June 2022, establishes the authority chain from the Board through the Chancellor to college presidents, and defines the scope of each role in institutional decision-making. (BP 1430: Delegation of Authority to Chancellor and Presidents)

At the college level, the 2025–2030 Strategic Planning and Governance Manual (SPGM), approved by the RCCD Board of Trustees on November 18, 2025, defines the College's participatory governance framework. The SPGM provides every constituent group the opportunity to participate in the College's planning and decision-making processes through clearly defined council and committee structures, charter-based responsibilities, and documented participation rights. (SPGM 2025–2030) Governance procedures are documented in the SPGM and made available to all members of the college community through the College's public-facing website. The SPGM establishes consensus as the primary decision-making method, with voting as the documented fallback and quorum set at 50% plus one of voting members.

The 2020 ISER identified governance role clarity as an improvement area, and Norco College's response was comprehensive. The SPGM was drafted by a broadly representative subgroup of the Institutional Strategic Planning Council — the predecessor body to the current Institutional Effectiveness and Governance Council (IEGC)-led governance structure — with broad constituent input, approval through Academic Senate and College Council, district review, and Board of Trustees adoption. The resulting document established clear delineation of roles, responsibilities, and authority across all governance bodies. (SPGM 2025–2030; Academic Senate and College Council Approval Minutes)

Moving Forward

As the College enters the 2025–2030 SPGM cycle, the IEGC will conduct the next formal evaluation of governance structures and procedures in Fall 2026. Findings from the Survey of Effectiveness, administered across all leadership councils, will be reported to College Council and used to update council charters and inform the comprehensive governance process review scheduled for that year. (SPGM 2025–2030, Governance Self-Evaluation Procedures)

4.3. The institution's decision-making structures are used consistently and effectively. Institutional decision-making practices support a climate of collaboration and innovation that advances the mission and prioritizes equitable student outcomes.

Norco College's governance structures drive institutional decisions, reflecting the core commitment to Own Our Growth: learning from institutional experience and acting with purpose. The College holds itself accountable for consistent stakeholder inclusion through two institutional mechanisms that operate on defined cycles — the Survey of Effectiveness, which evaluates governance body performance, and the comprehensive SPGM review, which evaluates the governance system itself. (SPGM 2025–2030, Governance Self-Evaluation Procedures)

The structure also produces institutional innovation. In Spring 2025, the College completed a six-step Mission, Vision, and Core Commitments (MVCC) revision process: the Vice President of Planning and Development and the Faculty Accreditation Co-Chair led a college-wide survey, shared findings with constituents, brought proposed revisions to Academic Senate and College Council as action items, forwarded recommendations to the College President, initiated district review, and secured Board of Trustees approval on November 18, 2025. The revised mission — simpler, more student-centered, and grounded in constituent feedback — demonstrates that Norco College's governance structures produce meaningful outcomes, not procedural compliance. (SPGM 2025–2030, MVCC Review Procedures; Academic Senate and College Council Minutes; Board of Trustees Minutes, November 2025)

The 2022–2023 Schools Reorganization was grounded in Student Equity Plan data documenting persistent equity gaps for Hispanic/Latinx and Black/African American students in transfer-level completion and transfer rates. The restructuring from four Guided Pathways Schools to eight Career and Academic Pathways (CAP) moved through the College's shared governance process — faculty review, Academic Senate deliberation,

College Council action — before implementation, demonstrating that data-informed institutional change moves through governance structures rather than around them. (Student Equity Plan 2022–2025; Academic Senate and College Council Minutes, Schools Reorganization 2022–2023)

Norco College evaluates its governance structures on a formal, codified cycle. The SPGM requires all councils and committees to administer the Survey of Effectiveness in the fall of years two and four of each five-year planning cycle, discuss results at the final fall meeting, document improvements, and report findings to College Council. That evaluation cycle produced its most significant outcome in Spring 2025, when the IEGC led a comprehensive revision of the SPGM for the 2025–2030 cycle, incorporating stakeholder feedback, strengthening transparency requirements, and codifying the new council charter Equity Focus section. (SPGM 2025–2030; Survey of Effectiveness Results)

Moving Forward

As the College enters year two of the 2025–2030 SPGM cycle, the IEGC will administer the Survey of Effectiveness across all leadership councils in Fall 2026. Findings will be used to revise council charters and inform the comprehensive governance procedures evaluation scheduled for Fall 2027. (SPGM 2025–2030, Governance Self-Evaluation Procedures)

4.4. Acting through policy, the governing board takes responsibility for the overall quality and stability of the institution, and regularly monitors progress towards its goals and fiscal health. (ER 7)

The RCCD Board of Trustees governs Norco College's quality and stability through a policy framework that explicitly delineates Board accountability across academic and fiscal dimensions. At the district level, BP 2500: Accreditation requires the Chancellor to provide the Board with a summary of any accreditation findings and the College's response, ensuring that Board-level oversight extends to accreditation status and institutional quality. (BP 2500: Accreditation)

The RCCD Board of Trustees regularly reviews academic quality indicators and institutional plans through structured cycles of presentations and formal actions. In September 2024, Norco College faculty presented to the Board on cross-disciplinary collaboration supporting equity and Guided Pathways, demonstrating that Board review includes substantive engagement with instructional priorities and student success strategies, not only fiscal and compliance matters. (Board of Trustees Minutes, September 2024; Faculty Presentation Documentation)

Fiscal monitoring operates across multiple timeframes. The Board receives quarterly financial status reports filed with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, receives and permanently records independent audit findings annually, and adopts the annual budget through a public hearing process mandated by BP 5200. (Quarterly Financial Status Reports; Annual Audit Reports; BP 5200)

Moving Forward

The RCCD Board of Trustees evaluates and revises its policies through a documented, multi-step process operating on a five-year cyclical review plan covering all Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. The Midterm Report confirmed the District instituted this cycle with a structured chapter sequence, ensuring all policies receive systematic review for currency and relevance. (Board Policy Review Cycle Documentation; Midterm Report 2024)

4.5. The governing board selects and evaluates the institution's chief executive officer (CEO). The governing board gives the CEO full authority to implement board policies and ensure effective operations and fulfillment of the institutional mission.

The RCCD Board of Trustees selects its chief executive officers through documented, constituent-centered processes that ensure broad constituent participation and transparent decision-making at every stage. BP 1431: Chancellor Selection establishes the Board's authority to define the selection process and requires constituent input throughout. The College President is selected through a parallel process governed by BP 1432: President Selection, which similarly requires broad participation from faculty, classified professionals, students, and administrators. (BP 1431: Chancellor Selection; BP 1432: President Selection)

The RCCD Board of Trustees delegates full executive authority through a clearly documented three-tier chain. BP 1430: Delegation of Authority to Chancellor and Presidents establishes that the Board delegates to the Chancellor executive responsibility for administering Board policies and executing all Board decisions, and that the Chancellor delegates college-level authority to the College President. This chain ensures that the College President has the full authority to implement Board policies and ensure effective college operations. (BP 1430: Delegation of Authority to Chancellor and Presidents)

Moving Forward

The RCCD Board of Trustees evaluates the Chancellor at least annually using a process developed and jointly agreed to by the Board and the Chancellor. Evaluation criteria are based on Board Policy, the Chancellor job description, and performance goals developed in accordance with BP 1430. The College President is evaluated through a parallel process. Both evaluation cycles ensure ongoing Board accountability for executive performance and mission fulfillment. (BP 1430: Delegation of Authority to Chancellor and Presidents; Chancellor and President Evaluation Documentation)

4.6. The governing board functions effectively as a collective entity to promote the institution's values and mission and fulfill its fiduciary responsibilities. The governing board demonstrates an ability to self-govern in adherence to its bylaws and expectations for best practices in board governance. (ER 7)

The RCCD Board of Trustees functions as a collective governing entity guided by BP 1715: Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice, which establishes standards of ethical conduct, collective decision-making, and conflict of interest prevention for all trustees. The policy explicitly requires trustees to subordinate personal interests to the good of the institution and to support Board decisions once made, regardless of individual position during deliberation. (BP 1715: Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice)

The RCCD Board of Trustees maintains an ongoing education program codified in BP 1740: Board Education. The program commits the Board to new member orientation, study sessions, reading materials, and conference attendance to foster continuous trustee development. In November 2024, a trustee reported attending a statewide conference focused on community college governance and fiscal sustainability, illustrating active participation in ongoing Board education. (BP 1740: Board Education; Board of Trustees Minutes, November 2024)

The RCCD Board of Trustees conducts an annual self-evaluation under BP 1745: Board Self-Evaluation, reflecting the core commitment to Own Our Growth: learning, adapting, and leading with purpose. The evaluation requires the Board to assess its performance as a collective body, prioritizing shared accountability over individual review.

[FLAG: The most recent posted board self-evaluation is from 2019. If completed but not posted, easy fix. If

not completed, this is a potential compliance gap.]

Moving Forward

As the Board continues to strengthen trustee training and development, the annual self-evaluation cycle under BP 1745 provides the mechanism for documenting and communicating that progress to the broader college community. Ensuring the most current self-evaluation is completed and publicly posted is the immediate priority before submission. (BP 1745: Board Self-Evaluation)

C. Required Documentation

Within the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report, the institution should provide narratives and a variety of evidence sources to describe and demonstrate alignment with each Standard and related Commission policies. Institutions must also include the required items below. This documentation can be included as supporting evidence for the Standard narratives if appropriate, or they may be provided as stand-alone files. Peer Review Teams will confirm these items during the comprehensive review process.

Insert a hyperlink (or hyperlinks) to documentation for each required checklist item below. Be sure to provide a clear, descriptive name for each document listed. Your institution may have included some of this documentation as part of the supporting evidence for your narrative responses above. **If so, please link to the page in the ISER where the item is discussed so your team can see the item in context**.

Standard 1: Mission and Institutional Effectiveness

Required Item	Documentation
i. Documentation of institution's authority to operate as a post-secondary educational institution and award degrees (e.g., degree-granting approval statement, authorization to operate, articles of incorporation) (ER 1)	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
ii. Procedures/practices for periodic review of mission/mission-related statements, including provisions for revision (if/when revisions are needed) that allow for participation of institutional stakeholders, as appropriate for the character and context of the institution	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
iii. Documentation of the governing board's approval of the institutional mission (ER 6)	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
iv. Procedures/practices for setting institutional goals, including provisions for the inclusion of input from relevant institutional stakeholders, as appropriate for the character and context of the institution	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
v. Documentation that the institution has established standards and goals for student achievement (i.e., institution-set standards), including but not limited to standards and goals for successful course completion, certificate completion, degree completion, transfer rates, job placement rates, and licensure examination pass rates, at the institutional and program levels (ER 2, ER 11)	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]

Standard 2: Student Success

Required Item	Documentation
i. Documentation that the institution's practices for awarding credit reflect generally accepted norms in higher education, including: • Commonly accepted minimum program lengths for certificates, associate degrees, and baccalaureate degrees • Written policies for determining credit hours that are consistently applied to all courses, programs, and modalities • Adherence to the Department of Education's standards for clock-to-credit hour conversions, if applicable (ER 10) • Methodology to reasonably equate the direct assessment program to credit or clock hours, if applicable (See Commission *Policy on Competency Based Education* and *Policy on Credit Hour, Clock Hour, and Academic Year*)	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
ii. Documentation that the institution's transfer of credit policies include the following: • Any established criteria the institution uses regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution • Any types of institutions or sources from which the institution will not accept credits • A list of institutions with which the institution has established an articulation agreement • Written criteria used to evaluate and award credit for prior learning experience including, but not limited to, service in the armed forces, paid or unpaid employment, or other demonstrated competency or learning See *Policy on Transfer of Credit*	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
iii. Documentation of the institution's advertising and recruitment policies, demonstrating alignment with the *Policy on Institutional Advertising and Student Recruitment* (ER 16)	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
iv. Documentation of clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, including: • Evidence that these policies/procedures are accessible to students in the catalog and online; • Evidence that that institution provides contact information for filing complaints with associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
v. Verification that the institution maintains files of formal student complaints received throughout the current accreditation cycle (i.e., since the last site visit), demonstrating: • Accurate and consistent implementation of complaint policies and procedures • No issues indicative of noncompliance with Standards	No link required; to be verified by the team during in-person site visit
vi. Verification that student records are stored permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup	No link required; to be verified by the team during in-person site visit
vii. Documentation of the institution's policies and/or practices for the release of student records	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]

Required Item	Documentation
viii. Documentation that the institution's policies and procedures for program discontinuance provide enrolled students with opportunities for timely completion in the event of program elimination	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
FOR TITLE IV PARTICIPANTS:	
ix. Documentation of institution's implementation of the required components of the Title IV Program, including: • Findings from any audits and program/other review activities by the U.S. Department of Education (ED) • Evidence of timely corrective action taken in response to any Title IV audits or program reviews See *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH DISTANCE EDUCATION AND/OR CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION:	
x. Documentation of institution's: • Procedures for verifying that the student who registers in a course offered via distance education or correspondence education is the same person who participates in the course and receives academic credit • Policies and/or procedures for notifying students of any charges associated with verification of student identity (if applicable) • Policies regarding protection of student privacy See *Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education*	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
REQUIRED ONLY IF APPLICABLE	
xi. Documentation demonstrating how the institution distinguishes its pre-collegiate curriculum from its college-level curriculum	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
xii. Documentation of policies and/or procedures for awarding credit for prior learning and/or competency-based credit	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
xiii. Documentation of agreements with other external parties regarding the provision of student and/or learning support services	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
xiv. Policies and/or other documentation related to institutional expectations of conformity with any specific worldviews or beliefs	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]

Standard 3: Infrastructure and Resources

Checklist Item	Documentation
i. Written policies and procedures for human resources, including hiring procedures	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
ii. Employee handbooks or similar documents that communicate expectations to employees	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
iii. Annual financial audit reports - 3 prior years (include auxiliary organizations, if applicable) (ER 5)	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
iv. Practices for resource allocation and budget development (including budget allocation model for multi-college districts/systems)	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
v. Policies guiding fiscal management (e.g., related to reserves, budget development)	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
vi. Policies, procedures, or agreements (e.g., AUAs) related to appropriate use of technology systems	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
FOR TITLE IV PARTICIPANTS:	
vii. Documentation that the institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by ED, or – if rates fall outside the acceptable range - documentation of corrective efforts underway to address the issue	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
REQUIRED ONLY IF APPLICABLE	
viii. Documentation of any agreements that fall under ACCJC's *Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-accredited Organizations*	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
ix. Written code of professional ethics for all personnel including consequences for violations	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]

Standard 4: Governance and Decision-Making

Checklist Item	Documentation
i. Governing board policies/procedures for selecting and regularly evaluating its chief executive officer	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
ii. Documentation or certification that the institution's CEO does not serve as the chair of the governing board (ER 4)	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
iii. Governing board policies/procedures/bylaws related to Board Ethics	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]
iv. Governing board policies/procedures/bylaws related to conflict of interest	[Insert document name(s) and link(s)]

Other Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

Checklist Item	Documentation
i. Documentation of the institution's appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of the Focused Site Visit and – if applicable - cooperate with the review team in any necessary follow-up See *Policy on Rights, Responsibilities, and Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions*, Section D	[Insert link to documentation]
ii. Documentation that the institution provides accurate information for the public concerning its accredited status with ACCJC on its institutional website, no more than one page (one click) away from the home page See *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status*	[Insert link to documentation]

D. Appendix 1: Verification of Catalog Requirements (ER 20)

ER 20 requires colleges to provide specific information in their official catalog. In the table below, list the location in the current catalog where each element can be found. Your team will verify the locations in the current catalog that you submit with this ISER as part of their review process.

REQUIRED ELEMENT	CATALOG LOCATION
General Information	
Official Name, Address(es), Telephone Number(s), and Website Address of the Institution	
Educational Mission	
Representation of accredited status with ACCJC, and with programmatic accreditors, if any	
Course, Program, and Degree Offerings	
Student Learning Outcomes of Programs and Degrees	
Academic Calendar and Program Length	
Academic Freedom Statement	
Available Student Financial Aid	
Available Learning Resources	
Names and Degrees of Administrators and Faculty	
Names of Governing Board Members	
Requirements	
Admissions	
Student Tuition, Fees, and Other Financial Obligations	
Degrees, Certificates, Graduation and Transfer	
Major Policies and Procedures Affecting Students	
Academic Regulations, including Academic Honesty	
Nondiscrimination	
Acceptance and Transfer of Credits	
Transcripts	
Grievance and Complaint Procedures	
Sexual Harassment	
Refund of Fees	
Locations or Publications Where Other Policies May be Found	
[Insert additional rows as needed]	

E. Appendix 2: Organizational Structure

Provide organizational charts for the major functional areas to help readers understand the institution's structure. For institutions with a corporate structure or reporting relationship to another external body, also include charts that show the relationship between the corporation/external organization and your institution.

[Insert organizational information.]

F. Appendix 3: Approved Locations

If applicable, provide the addresses of approved locations or campus sites where students may complete 50% or more of a credit-bearing degree or certificate program. If your institution does not have additional locations, you may delete this section.

Students may complete 50% or more of a degree or certificate program at the following locations:

[Insert the addresses of additional approved locations.]

CONSTITUTION OF THE
RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
ACADEMIC SENATE

Amended and Restated: *DATE OF Approval will go here*

ARTICLE I. NAME AND MISSION

Section 1. The name of the representative organization hereby established shall be the Academic Senate for the Riverside Community College District, hereafter called the District Academic Senate.

Section 2. Mission of The District Academic Senate:
A. The District Academic Senate operates pursuant to Title 5, Subchapter 2, Sections 53200 - 53206, California Code of Regulations and Education Code Sections 70900-70902.

B. The District Academic Senate is the duly elected official voice of the Academic Senates of the Riverside Community College District, and is comprised of representatives from each of the College Academic Senates within the District. It is an official vehicle for communication between the Riverside Community College District Board of Trustees, the Riverside Community College District Administration, and College faculties. It is recognized as a body through which dialog necessary to the formulation of District policy and recommendations in academic and professional matters may take place, particularly in the following areas (Title 5, Section 53200):

1. curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines;
2. degree and certificate requirements;
3. grading policies;
4. educational program development;
5. standards or policies regarding student preparation and success;
6. district and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles;
7. faculty roles and involvements in accreditation processes, including self study and annual reports;
8. policies for faculty professional development activities;
9. processes for program review;
10. processes for institutional planning and budget development;
11. other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the Board of Trustees and the District Academic Senate.

The Board of Trustees “relies primarily” or reaches “mutual agreement” on the recommendations of Academic Senate(s) on items #1-11 above as indicated in Board Policy.

ARTICLE II. POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The powers of the District Academic Senate shall be:

Section 1. To provide coordination among the faculties and Academic Senates of the Colleges within the Riverside Community College District.

Section 2. To participate in the formation of policies and procedures in academic and professional matters.

Section 3. To coordinate the academic and professional development of a multi-college district.

Section 4. To facilitate communication between the Board of Trustees, the Administration, faculty, and students in all matters relating to community college education.

Section 5. The District Academic Senate is recognized by the Board of Trustees as a consultant body to the Board of Trustees and to the Chancellor.

Section 6. The District Academic Senate may accept any powers and responsibilities delegated to it by law and by the Board of Trustees. Further, it is recognized as a partner in developing the policies of participatory governance for the District.

Section 7. The District Academic Senate may accept any powers and responsibilities delegated to it by joint resolution of the Academic Senates of the Colleges.

Section 8. The President of each College Academic Senate shall have a recognized chair at all formal meetings of the Board of Trustees. The District Academic Senate President shall be empowered to speak to the items under consideration.

Section 9. The Academic Senate of a College within the District may present views and recommendations to the Chancellor for inclusion in the Board Agenda as information items. The Board of Trustees shall consider and respond to such views and recommendations (Title 5, Section 53200).

Section 10. Initiate research relating to policies and procedures on academic and professional matters.

Section 11. Participate in Board of Trustees Subcommittees with governing board representatives in the development of key institutional policies, including but not limited to minimum qualifications, equivalencies, and hiring procedures; and collaborate with the bargaining agent, in the development of personnel policies (e.g., tenure review, evaluation procedures, and faculty service areas).

Section 12. Provide a mechanism for the selection of the Distinguished Faculty Lecturer.

ARTICLE III. LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY

Section 1. The District Academic Senate is comprised of representatives from the Academic Senates from the Colleges of the District, and must provide a forum for the expression of concerns from these separate entities. Constituent Academic Senates shall enjoy equality in the deliberative process, and through the District Academic Senate be heard as one voice.

Section 2. District decisions may only be made by the District Academic Senate. It is expected that a culture of collegiality will prevail and consensus will be reached. However, when consensus is not reached, a majority vote may be used. When no agreement exists, a joint session of the College Senates may be called by two out of three College Academic Senate presidents or two out of three College Academic Senates.

Section 3. If a joint session of the College Senates does not produce consensus, a College Academic Senate President may demand that a majority vote be taken. At the discretion of the dissenting College Academic Senate, a minority report may be presented to the Board of Trustees.

ARTICLE IV. REPRESENTATION

Section 1. The District Academic Senate (DAS) shall consist of seven voting members: the Academic Senate President and Vice President from each of the Academic Senates from the Colleges of the Riverside Community College District, and the Secretary-Treasurer or senate designee from the college of the District Academic Senate President. Each academic year, the seat of DAS President and seventh member will rotate by college. The DAS President will serve as chair and is not permitted to vote except in the event of a tie. Voting by proxy is not permitted.

Section 2. The District Academic Senate will also include non-voting members consisting of a chairperson from each of the Standing Committees established by the By-laws of the District Academic Senate ~~and the Chancellor's designee~~.

Section 3: All meetings of the District Academic Senate, and all standing committees authorized under District Academic Senate auspices, are governed by the Ralph M. Brown Act and shall be open to all members of the faculty, the Administration, staff, students, and the public.

Section 4: Public Comments The public may comment on any agenda item and items not included on the District Academic Senate (DAS) agenda during the “Public Comments” portion only.

- Total time for public comments will be 10 minutes but may be extended by a majority vote of the District Academic Senate.

- Time limits for each individual speaker will be 3 minutes unless there are several speakers, in which case individual speaker time may be reduced or total time may be extended by majority vote.

- DAS shall adhere to the decorum rules set forth in Board Policy for conduct of meetings.

- DAS members may not discuss nor may they take action on public comments associated with items not on the agenda. If a DAS member determines that the issue needs further discussion, the member may submit an agenda item dedicated to the issue at a subsequent meeting. [Leaving alone upon counsel review]

Section 5. When the membership of the District Academic Senate does not include a faculty member from a

vocational area, the District Academic Senate may appoint a faculty member to serve in a non-voting capacity for one academic year.

Section 6. The District Academic Senate shall hold regular meetings not less than once a month during the full semesters of the academic year. The time and place of regular meetings shall be determined by the District Academic Senate. A quorum of the District Academic Senate will be four of seven voting members and must include at least one college Academic Senate President.

ARTICLE V. OFFICERS

Section 1. Officers for the District Academic Senate shall include a President, a Vice-President, and a Secretary.

Section 2. The office of the District President shall rotate annually among the Presidents or designees of the College Academic Senates next in alphabetical order according to the names of the Colleges

Section 3. The incoming President shall designate the Vice-President and Secretary, subject to the agreement of those nominated. Appointments take effect immediately upon agreement of those serving.

Section 4. The officers of the District Academic Senate shall serve terms of office of one year.

Section 5. The President and Vice President of the District Academic Senate may not hold the office of the President or Vice President of RCC-CTA concurrently.

Section 6. The officers of the District Academic Senate serve for the fiscal year (July 1-June 30.).

Section 7. The District Academic Senate President shall:

A. develop agendas and conduct meetings of the District Academic Senate;

B. regularly meet with the District Chancellor, with other administrators and staff as needed, and report to the District Academic Senate on relevant issues;

C. represent before the Board of Trustees any faculty matter within the purview of the District Academic Senate;

D. represent the District Academic Senate on any District-wide and/or administrative council;

E. represent the District Academic Senate in consultation with RCC-CTA, CSEA, and the District Student Senate;

F. upon approval of the District Academic Senate, register District Academic Senate endorsement of documents sent to relevant federal, state, and regional authorities;

G. address academic and professional aspects of regulatory issues in the Education code and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, and organize a District Academic Senate response in a timely manner;

H. make appointments not otherwise provided for in this Constitution, such appointments to be ratified by agreement of the District Academic Senate.

Section 8. The District Vice-President shall:

A. act in the capacity of the President in any case where the President is unable to serve;

B. participate with the District Academic Senate President in monthly meetings with the Chancellor of the District, and with others as needed.

Section 9. The District Secretary shall:

A. keep minutes of the District Academic Senate meetings, keep minutes of any general faculty meeting called by the District Academic Senate, make these records available to the entire faculty following District Academic Senate approval, maintain a file of all minutes and official documents (e.g. dated copy of Constitution and By-Laws of the District Academic Senate, expiration dates of all terms of office of officers and committee members);

B. ensure that all written material be prepared in a timely manner for dissemination at general sessions of the District Academic Senate;

C. participate with the District Academic Senate President in monthly meetings with the Chancellor of the

District, and with other administrators and staff as needed;

ARTICLE VI. DISTRICT ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES

Section 1. The District Academic Senate shall create such District Standing Committees as it deems necessary for the fulfillment of its role in the governance of the District. Standing committees shall be listed, their functions and their membership described, and their membership selection processes explained in the District Academic Senate By-Laws. With the exception of the Curriculum Committee, Standing Committees shall be composed of two members from each of the Colleges in the District, designated in a fashion determined in the Constitutions and Bylaws of the College Academic Senates. DAS standing committees shall be subject to the Brown Act.

Section 2. The District Academic Senate shall create ad hoc committees as needed to conduct the business of the District Academic Senate or to fulfill any of its governance responsibilities. Membership on ad hoc committees may come from the District Academic Senate or from the faculty at large or from a combination of sources as the District Senate determines. The District Academic Senate President shall name members of ad hoc committees contingent upon the approval of the District Academic Senate. DAS ad hoc committees are not subject to the Brown Act.

Section 3. Senate-appointed District Committees are those committees established by Board Policy or Chancellor action that address academic and professional matters as defined in Article I.B. of this Constitution and/or specific matters identified under Title 5. The District Academic Senate shall exercise the right to appoint Senate members to such District Committees. Senate-appointed District Committees shall maintain Senate purview over the academic and professional matters under the committee's charge. Senate-appointed District Committees are not subject to the Brown Act.

ARTICLE VII. BY-LAWS AND AMENDMENTS

Section 1. Subject to the approval of a majority vote of each of the College Academic Senates in the District, any article or section of this Constitution may be amended.

Section 2. Amendments may be proposed by any College Academic Senate in the District.

Section 3. The By-Laws of the District Academic Senate shall be enacted or amended by the District Academic Senate in accordance with the Constitution of the Senate.

ARTICLE VIII. EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 1. This District Academic Senate Constitution will take effect upon the approval of the faculty of the Riverside Community College District. Until such time as the Riverside Community College District is composed of separately accredited colleges, the District Academic Senate President shall represent all faculty, organized on campuses of the District. To the extent possible, the principles embodied in this document will be honored as the District works toward separate accreditation for its colleges.

Section 2. This District Academic Senate Constitution shall be re-authorized by each of the College Academic Senates upon the Re-Accreditation of the Riverside Community College District as a multi-college district, whichever comes later.

BY-LAWS OF THE RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT ACADEMIC SENATE

ARTICLE I. COMMITTEE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Section 1. The purpose of Standing Committees is to facilitate the work of the District Academic Senate in the areas described in I.2.B of the Constitution. Each Committee shall, at its first meeting and under the supervision of the President of the District Academic Senate, elect a chairperson to serve for one year and to represent the committee on the District Academic Senate. Each committee shall meet regularly, but not less than once monthly during the fall and spring semesters. The chairperson of each Standing Committee shall represent the Committee on the District Academic Senate. With the approval of the committee, the chairperson may delegate this duty to any willing member of the committee. Chairs of the Standing Committees shall rotate annually among the Colleges on an alphabetical basis.

Section 2. Each Standing Committee will be composed of six members serving staggered two-year terms. Two faculty members shall be chosen from each College in a fashion designated by the Constitutions/By-Laws of the

College.

Section 3. The primary purpose of District Standing Committees shall be to discuss and inform the College Academic Senates in order to empower them to make decisions in academic and professional interests of their faculty. Where a District Standing Committee believes a change in District Board Policy is needed, its members shall recommend changes to and through their College Academic Senates.

Section 4. Each Standing Committee of the District Academic Senate shall identify an Administrator to serve as non-voting co-chair and to provide a liaison to the Administration. [Keith—noticing this now and wondering about PGSL??]

ARTICLE II. STANDING COMMITTEES

Section 1. The Curriculum Committee

A. The District Curriculum Committee shall be the coordinating voice of faculty in the District with regard to Title 5 California Code of Regulations Section 53200.1, "Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines"

B. The District Curriculum Committee shall be made up of faculty representatives from each College, in the manner determined by the Constitution and By-laws of the College.

C. All curricular matters of relevance to a single College shall be resolved by the curriculum committee of the College affected.

D. All curricular matters which impact two or more Colleges must come before the District Curriculum Committee. The District Curriculum Committee shall have the power to recommend resolution of curricular conflicts between Colleges to the District Academic Senate. The chairperson of the District Curriculum Committee shall represent the District Curriculum Committee to the District Academic Senate, which shall make the final decision in areas of curricular conflict.

Section 2. The Professional Growth and Sabbatical Leave Committee

A. The District Professional Growth and Sabbatical Leave Committee shall be the coordinating voice of faculty in the District with regard to Title 5 California Code of Regulations Section 53200.8, "policies for faculty professional development activities"

Section 3. Academic Standards Committee

A. The Academic Standards Committee shall be the coordinating voice of faculty in the District with regard to Title 5 California Code of Regulations Section 53200(c)(2) and (c)(3), "degree and certificate requirements" and "grading policies"

Section 4. Assessment and Accreditation Committee

A. The District Assessment and Accreditation Committee shall be the coordinating voice of faculty in the District with regard to Title 5 California Code of Regulations Section 53200(c)(5) and (c)(7), "standards or policies regarding student preparation and success" and "faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self study and annual reports"

Section 5. Program Review Committee

A. The District Program Review shall be the coordinating voice of faculty from college Program Review Committees in the District with regard to Title 5 California Code of Regulations Section 53200(c)(9), "processes for program review."

Section 6. Part-Time Faculty Committee

A. The District Academic Senate shall establish a Part-Time Faculty Committee to report on issues relating to part- time faculty.

B. The Part-Time Faculty Committee shall establish a liaison with CTA.

ARTICLE III. Senate-appointed District Committees

Section 1. District Equivalency Committee: Pursuant to District Administrative Procedure 6210[A], the District Equivalency Committee shall be appointed by the District Academic Senate.

A. At the end of each academic year, or upon District Academic Senate request, the equivalency committee will deliver an activity report to the District Academic Senate (total equivalencies granted and denied, disciplines requested, total procedural appeals if any). The committee may

also recommend or request a review of the equivalency procedure.

ARTICLE IV. THE FACULTY LECTURE

Section 1. The District Academic Senate shall designate the Distinguished Faculty Lecturer. The Faculty Lecturer shall not normally come from the same college in any two subsequent years. The District Academic Senate may delegate the means of selecting the Distinguished Faculty Lecturer to a College in the District.

ACADEMIC SENATE
for California Community Colleges
LEADERSHIP · EMPOWERMENT · VOICE

2026 Spring Plenary Session Resolutions

For Discussion and Debate on
April 11, 2026

DISCLAIMER |

The enclosed resolutions do not reflect the position of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, its Executive Committee, or its standing committees. They are presented for the purpose of discussion and debate by the field on Saturday, April 11, 2026, at the 2026 Spring Plenary Session.

ASCCC RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE 2025-2026 |

Chair | Mark Edward Osea, ASCCC Area B Representative
2nd Chair | Erik Woodbury, ASCCC North Representative
Area A | Yuting Lin, Sierra College
Area C | Rhonda Williams, Pasadena City College
Area D | Jerome Hunt, Long Beach City College
Executive Director (Interim) | Austin J. Webster

Table of Contents

Plenary Resolutions Process | 4
ASCCC 2026 Spring Plenary Session Resolutions Timeline | 4
Parliamentary Microphone Response Guide | 6
Parliamentary Motions | 7
CONSENT CALENDAR | 9
RESOLUTIONS CATEGORIES | 11
101. CURRICULUM | 12
#101.01 S26 Clarification, Recognition, and Inclusion of Specific Course Designators Within the Four Autonomous Core Disciplines 12
*^101.01.01 S26 Amend #101.01 S26 Clarification, Recognition, and Inclusion of Specific Course Designators Within the Four Autonomous Core Disciplines 12
102. DEGREE AND CERTIFICATE REQUIREMENTS | 13
#102.01 S26 From EdTech to TechEd: Building a Future-Ready Technology Education Framework in Title 5 13
103. GRADING POLICIES | 14
104. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT | 14
*+104.01 S26 Faculty and Local Academic Senate Role in College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Agreements 14
*^104.01.01 SP26 Amend +104.01 S26 Faculty and Local Academic Senate Role in College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Agreements 15
+104.02 S26 Strengthening Noncredit Student's Pathways to Credit Bearing Academic Programs 15
*+104.03 S26 Affirming the Integral Role of Journalism Programs in the California Community Colleges 16
#104.04 S26 Affirming Art History and Studio Arts as Essential Components of STEAM and Student Success in California Community Colleges 17
105. STUDENT PREPARATION AND SUCCESS | 18
+105.01 S26 Protecting the Integrity of Student Course Information 18
+105.02 S26 Transparency of Estimated Weekly Student Time Commitment in Course Schedules and Registration Systems 18
+105.03 S26 Supporting Systemwide Academic Integrity and Infrastructure for Distance Education in the Age of Agentic Artificial Intelligence 19
*^105.03.01 S26 Amend +105.03 S26 Supporting Systemwide Academic Integrity and Infrastructure for Distance Education in the Age of Agentic Artificial Intelligence 20
*#105.04 S26 Estimating Student Savings and Standardizing OER/ZTC Savings Estimates 20
106. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES | 21
#106.01 S26 Supporting Equitable Faculty Leadership and Governance Practices in Local Academic Senate 21
107. ACCREDITATION | 22
107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data 22
*#107.01.01 S26 Amend 107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data 23
*^107.01.02 S26 Amend 107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data 23
108. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT | 23
*+108.01 S26 Use of Student Data in Artificial Intelligence Tools and AI Detection Technologies 23
+108.02 S26 Ensuring Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and Technology Platforms to Protect Student and Institutional Data 24

*^108.02.01 Amend +108.02 S26 Ensuring Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and Technology Platforms to Protect Student and Institutional Data 25
+108.03 S26 Ensuring Accessibility and Universal Design for Learning Across Instructional Modalities 25
+108.04 S26 Mathematics Pedagogy in the California Community Colleges 26
109. PROGRAM REVIEW | 27
110. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND BUDGET DEVELOPMENT | 27
111. ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES | 27
*111.01 S26 Adopt the 2026–2029 ASCCC Strategic Directions and Goals 27
*+111.02 S26 Review of ASCCC Executive Leadership Term Lengths 28
+111.03 S26 Study the Unified Faculty Model in Place in British Columbia in Terms of Academic Freedom and Student Success 29
*+111.04 S26 Promising Practices for Mental Health Counseling Faculty in the California Community Colleges 30
+111.05 S26 Defending Students and Faculty, Especially People of Color and Immigrants, Against Federal Attacks and Retaliation, and Restricting ASCCC Investments that Support Military Operations 30
*^111.05.01 S26 Amend +111.05 S26 Defending Student and Faculty, Especially People of Color and Immigrants, Against Federal Attacks and Retaliation, and Restricting ASCCC Investments that Support Military Operations 31
*+111.06 S26 Update the ASCCC Paper, “Protecting the Future of Academic Freedom During a Time of Significant Change” 32
#111.07 S26 Condemning Cesar E. Chavez Sexual Abuse and Honoring Survivors and the Farmworkers Movement 33
#111.08 S26 ASCCC Support for International Women’s Day as a Holiday 34
112. HIRING, MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS, EQUIVALENCY, AND EVALUATIONS | 34
112.01 S26 Disciplines List - Counseling: Mental Health 34
112.02 S26 Disciplines List - Mathematics 35
112.03 S26 Disciplines List - Uncrewed Aircraft Systems (UAS) Technology 35
*+112.04 S26 Update the ASCCC Tenure Review resources: “Towards A Model Four-Year Tenure Process” and “Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective” 36
113. LEGISLATION AND ADVOCACY | 36
*+113.01 S26 Support for AB 2301 (Soria, as introduced February 19, 2026) to Establish a Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program 36
*+113.02 S26 Support for AB 2694 (Alvarez, as introduced February 20, 2026) to Modernize Regional Duplication Standards for Baccalaureate Programs 37
*+113.03 S26 Support for SB 960 (Cabaldon, as introduced February 3, 2026) to Expand Baccalaureate Degrees in Impacted Regions 38
*+113.04 S26 Support for Full Implementation of 2025 Gender Equity Report Recommendations 39
*+113.05 S26 Support for Sustained and Adequate Funding for High-Cost Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs in Higher Education and Reduction of Student Material Costs 40
*+113.06 S26 Providing Dedicated Funding to Support California Community College Faculty to Develop and Integrate Environmental Equity Education Across All Disciplines 41
114. CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE | 42
*114.01 S26 Electronic Versions of the Program and Course Approval Handbook and Minimum Qualifications Handbook 42
*+114.02 S26 Promising Practices for Comprehensive Student Education Planning 42
*+114.03 S26 Adopt Procedures for Progress Renewal to Increase Student Equity and Success 43

#114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request 43
*+114.04.01 S26 Amend #114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request 44
*^114.04.02 S26 Amend #114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request 45

PLENARY RESOLUTIONS PROCESS |

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

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

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

- Senate Delegate Roles and Responsibilities (found in *Local Senates Handbook*)
- Resolution Procedures (Part II in *Resolutions Handbook*)
- Resolution Writing and General Advice (Part III in *Resolutions Handbook*)
- Explore California legal codes via the California Legislative Information website.
- Explore California Code of Regulations, including title 5, via Westlaw's California Code of Regulations website.

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

- Consent Calendar resolutions and amendments are marked with *
- Resolutions and amendments submitted at Area Meetings are marked with +
- Resolutions and amendments submitted from **March 14, 2026 to March 27, 2026** are marked with #
- Amendments and urgent resolutions submitted **March 28, 2026 to April 10, 2026** are marked with ^

ASCCC 2026 SPRING PLENARY SESSION RESOLUTIONS TIMELINE |

- **January 28, 2026 |** Pre-Area Meeting Resolutions from the ASCCC Executive Committee, its standing committees, and its subsidiary grant programs due.
- **February 27, 2026 |** Pre-Area Meeting Resolutions packet distributed to the field.
- **March 13, 2026 |** *2025 Fall Area Meetings.* This is the first opportunity to propose resolutions to be considered by the area to be moved forward.
- **March 13, 2026 |** *Mandatory Contact Meeting.* After the Area Meetings, there will be a mandatory contact meeting for contacts of resolutions and/or amendments forward by the area. Time TBD.
- **March 14, 2026 to March 27, 2026 |** *Post-Area Meeting Submission Period.* Faculty who are ***registered to attend the 2026 Spring In-Person Plenary Session*** may submit resolutions and/or amendments ***accompanied by the emails and contact information of four delegate seconders.***
- **March 27, 2026 |** *Last Day of Resolutions Submission.* Only ***amendments and urgent resolutions*** may be submitted after this date.
- **March 28, 2026 to April 10, 2026 |** *Amendments and Urgent Resolutions Submission Period.* Faculty who are ***registered to attend the 2026 Spring In-Person Plenary Session*** may submit ***amendments and urgent resolutions accompanied by the emails and contact information of four delegate seconders.***
- **March 31, 2026 |** *Mandatory Contacts Meeting at 4:00 p.m.* This is a mandatory contact meeting for faculty who submitted resolutions and/or amendments between March 14, 2026 to March 27, 2026.
- **April 10, 2026 |** *Friday of Plenary Session at 1:30 p.m.* Last day to submit amendments and urgent resolutions.

- **April 10, 2026 |** *Friday of Plenary Session. Time TBD. Mandatory Contact Meeting.* This is a mandatory contact meeting for faculty who submitted amendments and urgent resolutions between March 28, 2026 to April 10, 2026

In order to propose amendments or urgent resolutions **from March 28, 2026 to April 10, 2026**, you must be a registered **faculty** plenary attendee and provide your name and college, along with four registered delegate seconders. Amendments and Urgent resolutions must be emailed to resolutions@asccc.org a**nd** submitted electronically using the submission link on the resolutions process page. Please email the Resolutions Committee if you have any questions.

***Urgent** is defined in the *Resolutions Handbook* as, "a time critical issue [that] has emerged after the resolution deadline" on **March 27, 2026** and new information is presented between **March 28, 2026 to April 10, 2026** (by the time indicated in the plenary program), which requires an established Academic Senate position before the next plenary session (pg. 3).

PARLIAMENTARY MICROPHONE RESPONSE GUIDE |

To support smooth, consistent, and inclusive deliberations on resolutions, the following guide outlines how the Chair (ASCCC President) will respond to motions, inquiries, or comments received at the parliamentary microphone.

The 15-minute limit per resolution is all inclusive, including debate, use of parliamentary microphone, and any additional votes required by motion.

Comment, Motion, or Question Received	Action
Parliamentary Motion	- Chair may consult with the Parliamentarian or ASCCC Resolutions Committee regarding proper steps to be taken to carry out the motion.
Parliamentary Inquiry	- Chair may consult with Parliamentarian regarding how to achieve desired outcome of the parliamentary inquiry. - Chair provides an opinion, and therefore cannot be appealed.
Point of Information (Point of Clarification)	- Chair may respond directly. - Chair may ask another participant to respond to the participant's question. - Chair may consult the Parliamentarian or the ASCCC Resolutions Committee Chair and rule point out of order (not relevant, dilatory, or is debate) - Time is deducted from the alloted three minutes of the initiator at the parliamentary microphone. - Chair, in consultation, with the ASCCC Resolutions Committee, will inform the initiator of time limit.
Point of Order (Addresses Rules)	- Chair may consult with parliamentarian or ASCCC Resolutions Committee Chair. - Chair will decide whether the rules are being followed as it pertains to the point of order.
Appeal Ruling of Chair	- If a delegate appeals the ruling of the Chair, and there is a second, the Chair has the opportunity to provide a statement to explain the basis of the ruling. - Once a statement is provided, the Chair will then pose the question to the delegates, "The Chair has ruled... Do you wish to sustain the decision of the Chair?" - If the yes votes prevail or results in a tie, the Chair's decision stands. - If the no votes prevail, the Chair's decision is overruled.
Move to Approve by Acclamation	- If a delegate moves to approve a resolution by acclamation, and there is a second, the Chair will ask if there are any objections. - If there is an objection, debate will continue. - If there are no objections, the Chair will declare the resolution has been approved by acclamation.

Motion to split resolved statements	- If a delegate moves to split resolves in a resolution, and there is a second, a vote will immediately take place. (This motion is not debatable.) - If a vote to split the resolves passes, the chair will conduct the debate on the resolves as directed by the motion. - Once the approved resolved statements have been voted in, the chair will conduct one final vote on the perfected resolution. - Debate and voting for each of the individual resolves must be conducted within the 15 minute allotment.
Motion extend time for debate	- If a delegate moves to extend time for debate, and there is a second, a vote will immediately take place on the motion. (This motion is not debatable.)
Motion to re-order items	- If a delegate moves to re-order the items on the agenda, and there is a second, a vote will immediately take place on the motion. (This motion is not debatable.)
Point of Privilege (addresses personal complaint such as noise, temperature, or difficulty with zoom)	- Chair may respond directly. - The time for debate will be paused to address points of privilege.

PARLIAMENTARY MOTIONS |

Any ***registered delegate*** may make the following motions at the parliamentary microphone during the debate:

Motion	Debatable?	Second Required?	Votes Needed to Pass
Move to Approve by Acclamation*	No	Yes	N/A
Move to Re-Order Items	No	Yes	2/3
Move to Extend Debate (up to five minutes; may be used only once)	No	Yes	Majority
Move to Divide the Resolution or Split the Resolves	No	Yes	Majority
Move to Postpone (within the same plenary session)	Yes	Yes	Majority
Appeal Decision of Chair	Yes	Yes	Majority
Move to Reconsider (by proponent)	Yes	Yes	Majority
Move to Close Debate	No	Yes	2/3

NOTES |

*Acclamation is a specific form of unanimous approval, typically expressed through a voice vote with clapping or cheering. The ASCCC often uses acclamation to highlight strong support for a resolution and to underscore its importance. However, delegates are encouraged to use acclamation selectively to ensure it retains its sense of significance and distinction.

QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS |

We welcome any California Community College faculty to provide comments or questions to the resolutions presented in this packet. Please visit the ASCCC Resolutions Process page or complete the 2026 Spring Plenary Resolutions and Amendments Comment or Questions Submissions Form to submit your comments or questions.

CONSENT CALENDAR |

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

To remove a resolution from the Consent Calendar, please see the Consent Calendar section of the Resolutions Procedures for the Plenary Session. Reasons for removing a resolution from the Consent Calendar may include moving of a substantial amendment, a desire to debate the resolution, a desire to divide the motion, a desire to vote against the resolution, or even a desire to move for the adoption by the body by acclamation, however no reasons need to be given to remove an item from consent.

101. CURRICULUM | 12

*^101.01.01 S26 Amend #101.01 S26 Clarification, Recognition, and Inclusion of Specific Course Designators Within the Four Autonomous Core Disciplines 12

104. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT | 14

*+104.01 S26 Faculty and Local Academic Senate Role in College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Agreements 14

*^104.01.01 SP26 Amend +104.01 S26 Faculty and Local Academic Senate Role in College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Agreements 15

*+104.03 S26 Affirming the Integral Role of Journalism Programs in the California Community Colleges 16

105. STUDENT PREPARATION AND SUCCESS | 18

*^105.03.01 S26 Amend +105.03 S26 Supporting Systemwide Academic Integrity and Infrastructure for Distance Education in the Age of Agentic Artificial Intelligence 20

*#105.04 S26 Estimating Student Savings and Standardizing OER/ZTC Savings Estimates 20

107. ACCREDITATION | 22

*#107.01.01 S26 Amend 107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data 23

*^107.01.02 S26 Amend 107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data 23

108. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT | 23

*+108.01 S26 Use of Student Data in Artificial Intelligence Tools and AI Detection Technologies 23

*^108.02.01 Amend +108.02 S26 Ensuring Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and Technology Platforms to Protect Student and Institutional Data 25

111. ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES | 27

*111.01 S26 Adopt the 2026–2029 ASCCC Strategic Directions and Goals 27

*+111.02 S26 Review of ASCCC Executive Leadership Term Lengths 28

*+111.04 S26 Promising Practices for Mental Health Counseling Faculty in the California Community Colleges 30

*^111.05.01 S26 Amend +111.05 S26 Defending Student and Faculty, Especially People of Color and Immigrants, Against Federal Attacks and Retaliation, and Restricting ASCCC Investments that Support Military Operations 31

*+111.06 S26 Update the ASCCC Paper, "Protecting the Future of Academic Freedom During a Time of Significant Change" 32

112. HIRING, MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS, EQUIVALENCY, AND EVALUATIONS | 34

*+112.04 S26 Update the ASCCC Tenure Review resources: "Towards A Model Four-Year Tenure Process" and "Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective" 36

113. LEGISLATION AND ADVOCACY | 36

*+113.01 S26 Support for AB 2301 (Soria, as introduced February 19, 2026) to Establish a Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program 36

*+113.02 S26 Support for AB 2694 (Alvarez, as introduced February 20, 2026) to Modernize Regional Duplication Standards for Baccalaureate Programs 37

*+113.03 S26 Support for SB 960 (Cabaldon, as introduced February 3, 2026) to Expand Baccalaureate Degrees in Impacted Regions 38

*+113.04 S26 Support for Full Implementation of 2025 Gender Equity Report Recommendations 39

*+113.05 S26 Support for Sustained and Adequate Funding for High-Cost Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs in Higher Education and Reduction of Student Material Costs 40

*+113.06 S26 Providing Dedicated Funding to Support California Community College Faculty to Develop and Integrate Environmental Equity Education Across All Disciplines 41

114. CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE | 42

*114.01 S26 Electronic Versions of the Program and Course Approval Handbook and Minimum Qualifications Handbook 42

*+114.02 S26 Promising Practices for Comprehensive Student Education Planning 42

*+114.03 S26 Adopt Procedures for Progress Renewal to Increase Student Equity and Success 43

*+114.04.01 S26 Amend #114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request 44

*^114.04.02 S26 Amend #114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request 45

RESOLUTIONS CATEGORIES |

New resolutions categories that more closely align with the purview of the ASCCC were piloted for the 2024 Spring Plenary Session and approved for post-pilot use by the ASCCC Executive Committee at its May 2024 meeting. Numbering of these new categories begin from 101 for the first category, 102 for the second category, and so forth to distinguish them from the old categories. The approved new categories are:

101. Curriculum
102. Degree and Certificate Requirements
103. Grading Policies
104. Educational Program Development
105. Student Preparation and Success
106. Governance Structures
107. Accreditation
108. Professional Development
109. Program Review
110. Institutional Planning and Budget Development
111. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
112. Hiring, Minimum Qualifications, Equivalency, and Evaluations
113. Legislation and Advocacy
114. Consultation with the Chancellor's Office

101. CURRICULUM |

#101.01 S26 Clarification, Recognition, and Inclusion of Specific Course Designators Within the Four Autonomous Core Disciplines

Whereas, Within the past 50 years, courses with specific cultural content and identifiers (course designators such as, FILI, FILAM, FIL-Filipino American Studies, and KUMY-Kumeyaay Studies, and any course designator that represents American Indian/Native American sovereign tribal nations) were developed and are recognized to date as belonging to one of the four autonomous disciplines — African American Studies, Asian American Studies, American Indian/Native American Studies, and Chicana/o/x Latina/o/x Studies - commonly referred to as ethnic studies;

Whereas, These courses with specific ethnic-foci and corresponding course designators were created prior to the passage of AB 1460 (Weber, 2020) of which may appear in various institutional forms, and reflect the historical development of their respective disciplines of study; and

Whereas, These courses having long-standing established articulation agreements and approvals with the California State University and University of California campuses, including those recognized within California General Education Transfer Curriculum;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community College Chancellor's Office and the California Community College Ethnic Studies Faculty Council to advocate to the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates and the California State University Chancellor's Office to formally retain and recognize course designators that existed prior to AB 1460 (Weber, 2020)—such as FILI, FILAM, FIL-Filipino American Studies, and KUMY-Kumeyaay Studies, as well as any course designator representing American Indian/Native American sovereign tribal nations—as belonging to one of the four autonomous disciplines commonly referred to as ethnic studies, and that courses bearing these ethnic-focused designators within these disciplines have their existing designators, articulation agreements, and approved California General Education Transfer Curriculum status retained and recognized; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognize and honor these course designators as being part of one of the four autonomous disciplines commonly referred to as ethnic studies to preserve and uphold their approved articulation and transfer status.

CONTACT | Dr. Tamara Cheshire, Folsom Lake College

*^101.01.01 S26 Amend #101.01 S26 Clarification, Recognition, and Inclusion of Specific Course Designators Within the Four Autonomous Core Disciplines

Amend the 1st Resolved |

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community College Chancellor's Office and the California Community College Ethnic Studies Faculty Council to advocate to the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, the University of California Office of the President, and the California State University Chancellor's Office to formally retain and recognize course designators that existed prior to AB 1460 (Weber, 2020)—such as FILI, FILAM (Filipino American Studies), and KUMY (Kumeyaay Studies), as well as any course designator representing American Indian/Native American sovereign tribal nations—as belonging to one of the four autonomous disciplines commonly referred to as ethnic studies, and that courses bearing these ethnic-focused designators within these disciplines have their existing designators, articulation agreements, and approved California General Education Transfer Curriculum status retained and recognized; and

Amend the 2nd Resolved |

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) ~~recognize~~ affirm and honor these course designators as being part of one of the four autonomous disciplines commonly referred to as ethnic studies to preserve and uphold their approved articulation and transfer status, which aligns with the spirit of ASCCC's mission.

CONTACT | Dr. Tamara Cheshire, Folsom Lake College

102. DEGREE AND CERTIFICATE REQUIREMENTS |

#102.01 S26 From EdTech to TechEd: Building a Future-Ready Technology Education Framework in Title 5

Whereas, The California Community Colleges currently lack a consistent, statewide title 5 framework that defines student competencies in technology, resulting in uneven preparation across districts, as title 5 does not explicitly establish a systemwide technology or artificial intelligence literacy requirement;

Whereas, Advances in artificial intelligence and emerging technologies have broadened the skills needed for workforce participation and civic engagement, as reflected in recent California legislation, including AB 2487 (Ahrens, as amended on March 19, 2026), which addresses artificial intelligence education and workforce development[1];

Whereas, Artificial intelligence literacy is most effectively addressed within a broader Technology Education framework that can adapt to evolving technologies over time, supporting the Vision 2030 goal of preparing students for an evolving workforce and digital economy[2]; and

Whereas, Faculty have primary purview over curriculum, degree requirements, and standards related to student preparation and success under title 5 §53200[3], and courses and degree expectations are governed by the standards outlined in title 5 §55002[4] and §55060[5];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop and share recommendations on Technology Education literacies, including artificial intelligence literacy, to share with the field for consideration in local curriculum;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to collaborate with the ASCCC to explore potential title 5 language that defines Technology Education as a student competency;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to consider integrating Technology Education competencies, including artificial intelligence literacy, across disciplines, consistent with course standards and degree expectations outlined in Title 5 §55002 and §55060; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges collaborate with system partners to monitor and assess emerging technologies, including regular and periodic reviews, and provide professional development support for faculty in engaging with these technologies.

CONTACT | Carlos Guerrero, ASCCC Executive Committee

---

[1] AB 2487 (Ahrens, as amended on March 19, 2026)
[2] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *Vision 2030: The July 2025 edition.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/vision2030/vision-2030-report.pdf
[3] Title 5 §53200
[4] Title 5 §55002
[5] Title 5 §55060

103. GRADING POLICIES |

104. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT |

*+104.01 S26 Faculty and Local Academic Senate Role in College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Agreements

Whereas, The College and Career Access Pathways program, established by AB 288 (Holden, 2015)[6] and codified in Education Code §76004[7], authorizes community college districts to enter into dual enrollment agreements with K–12 partners to expand access and promote equitable pathways to college for high school students;

Whereas, College and Career Access Pathways agreements require that community college courses offered to high school students be equivalent in rigor, learning outcomes, assessment, and academic standards to courses offered on college campuses and include assurances related to instructor qualifications and non-displacement of faculty and students[8];

Whereas, Local academic senates, under California Code of Regulations title 5 §53200[9] and the "10+1" academic and professional matters, hold primary responsibility for curriculum, academic standards, and faculty minimum qualifications, all of which are directly implicated in the development and implementation of College and Career Access Pathways agreements; and

Whereas, Faculty and local academic senate review of College and Career Access Pathways agreements is essential to ensuring academic integrity, alignment with college mission and educational planning, compliance with title 5, and the use of student outcome data to support continuous improvement and equity;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges reaffirm that faculty and local academic senates should play a central role in the development, review, implementation, and renewal of College and Career Access Pathways agreements as part of their authority over academic and professional matters;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates to work collegially with college administrations to establish formal processes ensuring faculty review of College and Career Access Pathways course offerings, curriculum alignment, instructor qualifications, and assurances of non-displacement prior to governing board approval;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to participate in ongoing evaluation of College and Career Access Pathways partnerships through curriculum review, program review, and analysis of disaggregated student outcomes to support academic quality and equity; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide guidance and professional development to support faculty and local academic senates in fulfilling their roles in College and Career Access Pathways and dual enrollment agreements.

CONTACT | Stephanie Curry, ASCCC Executive Committee, Area A

---

[6] AB 288 (Holden, 2015)
[7] California Education Code - EDC §76004
[8] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2016, March 11). *Dual enrollment and Assembly Bill 288 (CCAP): Legal Opinion 16-02.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/Files/General-Counsel/x_legal-opinion-1602-dual-enrollment-and-ab-288-ccapada.pdf?la=en&hash=9EB06DC8D3150FD95CAF184A4E5B73B04B6E8987
[9] Title 5 §53200

*^104.01.01 SP26 Amend +104.01 S26 Faculty and Local Academic Senate Role in College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Agreements

Amend the 1st Resolved |

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges ~~reaffirm~~ affirm that faculty and local academic senates should play a central role in the development, review, implementation, and renewal of College and Career Access Pathways agreements as part of their authority over academic and professional matters;

CONTACT | Stephanie Curry, ASCCC Executive Committee

+104.02 S26 Strengthening Noncredit Student's Pathways to Credit Bearing Academic Programs

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Vision 2030, Goal #1: Equity in Access cites the benchmark of increasing with equity the number of students attending a California community college by either a) 25% or b) so their enrollments are higher than prior to the pandemic for student populations that experienced enrollment declines during the pandemic (whichever is greater), with emphasis on reaching underserved populations of Californians[10];

Whereas, SB 554 (Roth, 2019) expanded the dual enrollment program in 2020 to include students who attend a noncredit or adult education high school diploma or equivalency program yet a systemized approach, via legislation or guidance from the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, to ensuring that these aspiring transfer students are academically prepared to complete credit bearing coursework, has yet to be developed and implemented[11];

Whereas, The California Adult Education Program Score Card indicates that over 400,000 noncredit students have transitioned to credit bearing programs within the past seven, reported academic years (2018/2019 – 2022/2023) in response to workforce shifts, market demands, and technological advancements that require upskilling and retraining[12]; and

Whereas, California high school enrollment and subsequent graduation rates, which impact enrollment in credit bearing community college courses, has been steadily declining since 2016,[13] yet the number of potential adult learners/noncredit students who do not possess a high school diploma or have completed some college without earning a degree is 4.5 million and 5 million people, respectively[14];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to develop materials to be delivered systemwide that raise awareness about the rigor that Noncredit courses offer and the various pathways that noncredit students utilize to transition to credit bearing programs;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to develop a student support resource toolkit that noncredit/adult or continuing

---

[10] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *Vision 2030: The July 2025 edition.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/vision2030/vision-2030-report.pdf
[11] SB 554 (Roth, 2019)
[12] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (n.d.). *CAEP score card.* https://datavista.cccco.edu/data_views/caep_score_card [datavista.cccco.edu]
[13] Lafortune, J., & Prunty, E. (2023, December). *Factors and future projections for K–12 declining enrollment.* Public Policy Institute of California. https://www.ppic.org/publication/factors-and-future-projections-for-k-12-declining-enrollment/
[14] U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). *California—Educational attainment (Adult education)* [Data table]. https://data.census.gov/table?q=california+adult+education+&t=Educational+Attainment

education divisions/departments can utilize to best support noncredit students who are either preparing to transition to credit academic programs or currently completing credit bearing coursework; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to develop and operationalize publicly available, disaggregated data metrics for noncredit Career Development College Preparation courses, Adult Dual Enrollment programs, and other accelerated learning opportunities for noncredit student that measure matriculation to credit bearing programs, completion of credit bearing certificate and degree programs as well as transfer rates to four-year institutions, amongst other identified student demographics.

CONTACT | Rhonda Williams, Ph.D., Pasadena City College, Area C

*+104.03 S26 Affirming the Integral Role of Journalism Programs in the California Community Colleges

Whereas, Student media provides an unwavering work-based learning opportunity for students in the California Community Colleges, a discipline straddling Liberal Arts and Career Education that is supported directly by the First Amendment;

Whereas, Student journalists are doing critical work in a climate marked by shrinking news landscapes[15], scarce resources[16], attacks on free speech and mounting censorship pressures[17], supported by faculty who develop programs that are tied to industry;

Whereas, The Journalism Association of Community Colleges has noticed an uptick in the threat of journalism program deactivation and journalism class cancellations statewide[18], and the Student Press Law Center reports an uptick in censorship[19], a concern the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges highlighted in a 2001 resolution[20]; and

Whereas, Journalism programs play an integral part in information sharing on their campuses, reporting on district and college governance and empowering local communities, contributing to collective understanding of institutional planning and budget processes;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, affirm that the protections of the First Amendment are central to the educational mission of community colleges, enabling open inquiry, robust information exchange, and work-based learning experiences that cultivate informed participation in a democratic society; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges affirm the value of the role of our system's journalism programs and bring awareness through the development of resources to the field on how student-run publications uphold the First Amendment as an integral part of work-based learning, information sharing, and democracy.

CONTACT | Eleni Gastis, Laney College, Area B

---

[15] Metzger, Z. (2025, October 20). *The State of Local News: The 2025 report.* Local News Initiative, Northwestern University. https://localnewsinitiative.northwestern.edu/projects/state-of-local-news/2025/report/
[16] Yu, Y. S. (2026, January 15). *Gavin Newsom plans no new state funding for local journalism*. CalMatters. https://calmatters.org/politics/2026/01/gavin-newsom-google-journalism-funding-deal/
[17] Osgood, B. (2026, March 11). *Press freedom declines in Americas, with US seeing sharpest drop: Report.* Al Jazeera. https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2026/3/11/press-freedom-declines-in-americas-with-us-seeing-sharpest-drop-report
[18] JACC Statewide Faculty Survey, February 2026
[19] Student Press Law Center. (2026). *To our future: 2026–2028 strategic plan*. https://splc.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/SPLC-Strategic-Plan-2026-2028.pdf
[20] Resolution 13.03 S21 Censorship of College Newspapers

#104.04 S26 Affirming Art History and Studio Arts as Essential Components of STEAM and Student Success in California Community Colleges

Whereas, The California Community Colleges' mission emphasizes providing students with comprehensive educational opportunities that develop critical thinking, creativity, cultural awareness, and interdisciplinary problem-solving skills, and the integration of the arts into science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics (STEAM)[21] has been widely recognized as a key driver of innovation[22] across fields such as digital media, design, architecture, and emerging technologies;

Whereas, Art history and studio arts develop visual literacy, analytical reasoning, historical understanding, and cross-cultural awareness, contributing significantly to general education, transfer pathways, and culturally responsive curriculum that reflects diverse global perspectives;

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Vision for Success, Guided Pathways, equity initiatives, and the Vision 2030 framework[23] guiding documents have been advanced by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, emphasize equitable student success, interdisciplinary learning, culturally responsive teaching, and faculty leadership in transforming teaching and learning for the future; and

Whereas, California's creative economy—encompassing film, digital media, game design, architecture, visual communication, and cultural industries—represents a major workforce sector requiring both technical and creative competencies, and reductions in arts offerings risk limiting students' access to these essential skills and opportunities;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognize and affirm art history and arts disciplines as integral components of science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics education,[24] equitable student success, and the goals outlined in Vision 2030;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates and curriculum committees to support the inclusion, collaboration across science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM) disciplines, expansion, and sustainability of art history and studio arts courses within general education, transfer pathways, and interdisciplinary programs,[25] and to promote interdisciplinary collaboration among arts, humanities, and STEM faculty within Guided Pathways and Vision 2030 initiatives[26] to advance innovation, creativity, and critical thinking;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support efforts to increase equitable access to art history and arts courses through Open Educational Resources, Zero Textbook Cost, and culturally responsive curriculum; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with statewide partners to highlight the role of the arts in California's innovative and creative economies.

CONTACT | Deborah Gustlin, Gavilan College

---

[21] Land, M. H. (2013). *Full STEAM ahead: The benefits of integrating the arts into STEM. Procedia Computer Science, 20*, 547–552. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2013.09.31.

[22] National Endowment for the Arts. (2023). *Arts and the economy: The economic impact of the arts and cultural industries in the United States*. https://www.arts.gov

[23] Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2023). *Vision 2030: A roadmap for California community colleges*. https://asccc.org

[24] Winner, E., Goldstein, T. R., & Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2013). *Art for art's sake? The impact of arts education*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264180789-en

[25] Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2011). *The LEAP vision for learning: Outcomes, practices, impact, and employers' views*. (18). https://www.aacu.org

[26] Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2020). *Guided pathways and the role of faculty in student success*. https://asccc.org

105. STUDENT PREPARATION AND SUCCESS |

+105.01 S26 Protecting the Integrity of Student Course Information

Whereas, Students rely on accurate course information—including Peer Online Course Review (POCR) badges, Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) designations, required technology, proctoring requirements, and other course attributes—when making enrollment decisions to ensure equitable access and informed choice;

Whereas, Existing regulation affirms the importance of accurate course information prior to enrollment, including title 5 section 55005[27] of the California Code of Regulations, which requires disclosure of key distance education elements such as technology needs and proctoring requirements, and Education Code §66406.9[28] (implementing SB 1359, Block, 2015), which requires that Zero Textbook Cost designations be clearly identified at the time of registration;

Whereas, Faculty reassignments or other late administrative changes may result in the loss or alteration of student-facing course attributes—such as removing a Zero Textbook Cost designation or a Peer Online Course Review badge—which can impose unexpected financial costs, diminish accessibility, and compromise the learning conditions under which students enrolled; and

Whereas, Last-minute changes can undermine institutional commitments to transparency and equity, as well as student trust in the accuracy and consistency of course information published through official college systems;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges affirm that course attributes publicly listed for students at the time of registration—including but not limited to Zero Textbook Cost, Peer Online Course Review, and required technology—constitute commitments that should not be altered once enrollment has begun except in extraordinary circumstances with student notification and equitable remedies;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to issue statewide guidance ensuring that colleges protect the integrity of student-facing course attributes and prevent last-minute changes that materially alter student enrollment conditions; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to develop and adopt policies that uphold the integrity of student-facing course information by establishing procedures to ensure that any instructor reassignments or course-level modifications preserve published course attributes or provide equitable alternatives for affected students.

CONTACT | Liz Encarnacion, Chaffey College, Area D

+105.02 S26 Transparency of Estimated Weekly Student Time Commitment in Course Schedules and Registration Systems

Whereas, The Carnegie Unit, used throughout higher education and within the California Community Colleges, defines one unit of credit as a specified number of total student learning hours that include both instructor contact time and independent student work and uses different formulas for lecture, laboratory, and other instructional formats;

Whereas, The Carnegie Unit and title 5 §55002.5[29] (Credit Hour) require that total student learning hours be calculated and documented in the course outline of record, yet the corresponding expected weekly student time

[27] Title 5 §55005
[28] California Education Code - EDC §66406.9
[29] Title 5 §55002.5

commitment is typically not communicated transparently to students through course schedules or registration systems, which instead display course units and meeting times;

Whereas, Colleges offer short-term and accelerated courses to provide flexible scheduling options for students, yet because these courses require the same total student learning hours as full-term courses while occurring over fewer weeks, a moderate increase in units can produce a substantially larger increase in weekly workload when course lengths differ[30]; and

Whereas, Providing transparent information about estimated weekly student time commitments would support informed enrollment decisions, promote equitable access to information about course expectations, and better reflect the workload assumptions embedded in the Carnegie Unit and the course outline of record;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates and districts to explore methods of displaying estimated weekly student time commitments, derived from approved course units and course length, alongside units in course schedules and registration systems; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with system partners, including the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, to develop guidance or promising practices for communicating estimated weekly student workload expectations in course schedules and registration systems while maintaining existing unit-based reporting requirements.

CONTACT | Brandi Bailes, Crafton Hills College, Area D

+105.03 S26 Supporting Systemwide Academic Integrity and Infrastructure for Distance Education in the Age of Agentic Artificial Intelligence

Whereas, Distance education serves a critical and equity-driven role in California Community Colleges, providing access to students who face barriers to in-person attendance due to work obligations, childcare responsibilities, geographic constraints;

Whereas, The rapid advancement and increasing accessibility of agentic artificial intelligence (AI) tools has created significant and growing challenges to academic integrity in distance education, including the circumvention of assessments, a rise in fraudulent enrollments, inconsistent institutional responses to suspected AI misuse, unresolved concerns regarding student data privacy on third-party proctoring and plagiarism-detection platforms, and the inadequacy of existing AI detection tools — challenges that disproportionately burden individual faculty and that no single college can effectively address in isolation;

Whereas, Transfer institutions[31] are increasingly considering requirements for proctored assessments as a condition of accepting distance education coursework for credit, creating urgency for California Community Colleges to establish supported, accessible, and consistent proctoring infrastructure[32] that does not place undue burden on faculty or exclude non-local and rural students from equitable participation; and

---

[30] Under title 5 §55002.5, one lecture unit represents approximately 48 total student learning hours. Eight lecture units in a 16-week term require approximately 24 hours of student work per week. Adding a four-lecture unit course offered in a 12-week term requires approximately 16 additional hours of work per week, increasing the student's weekly academic workload from about 24 hours to 40 hours with the addition of a single short-term course. This represents a 50% increase in units but a 67% increase in the student's weekly academic workload. Adding a four-lecture unit course offered in an 8-week term represents a 50% increase in units *but a 100% increase in the student's weekly academic workload*.

[31] In meetings with other Articulation Officers, an articulation officer at a four-year university stated that university faculty are scrutinizing assessment security, and that it was recommended to mention in course outlines of records how community college faculty ensure assessment integrity.

[32] Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the California Virtual Campus-Online Education Initiative hosted a proctoring network for online classes which has since ceased operations, and at the 2023 Fall Plenary Session, Resolution 13.02 F23 Revival of

Whereas, Universal testing centers at California Community Colleges would not only support the integrity and transferability of distance education courses, programs, and degrees, but would also expand access to on-site tutoring and academic support services for non-local students, thereby advancing both academic quality and student success outcomes systemwide.

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community College's Chancellor's Office and the California State Legislature to provide dedicated, ongoing funding for the establishment and operation of universal testing centers at all California Community Colleges, designed to support equitable access to proctored assessments for distance education students, including non-local and rural students, while preserving the flexibility and student-centered benefits of asynchronous instruction; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community College's Chancellor's Office, the California Virtual Campus, and other system partners to develop systemwide policies, resources, and guidance by Spring 2027 that address academic integrity in distance education in the age of agentic artificial intelligence (AI) — including standards for responding to AI misuse, strategies to prevent fraudulent enrollment, and recommendations for assessment design — in order to protect the value, credibility, and transferability of California Community College courses, programs, and degrees.

CONTACT | Nicholas Petti, Mendocino College, Area B

*^105.03.01 S26 Amend +105.03 S26 Supporting Systemwide Academic Integrity and Infrastructure for Distance Education in the Age of Agentic Artificial Intelligence

Amend the 2nd Resolved |

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community College's Chancellor's Office, the California Virtual Campus, and other system partners to develop ~~systemwide policies,~~ resources~~,~~ and guidance, and explore possible changes to systemwide policies, by Spring 2027 that address academic integrity in distance education in the age of agentic artificial intelligence (AI) — including standards for responding to AI misuse, such as strategies to prevent fraudulent enrollment~~,~~ and recommendations for assessment design — in order to protect the value, credibility, and transferability of California Community College courses, programs, and degrees.

CONTACT | Jeffrey Hernandez, Los Angeles Community College District

*#105.04 S26 Estimating Student Savings and Standardizing OER/ZTC Savings Estimates

Whereas, In response to Resolution 114.04 F25 "Developing a Consistent Method for Calculating Student Cost Savings Resulting from Open Educational Resources Adoption,"[33] the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has consulted with system partners to research and develop a standardized method for calculating student savings resulting from the adoption of open educational resources and course sections achieving zero textbook cost status by other means to be considered by local academic senates at the Spring 2026 Plenary Session;

Whereas, Some institutions and States use a "general estimate" approach to calculate the cost savings from adopting open educational resources, with the Midwest Higher Education Compact noting that many use $100.00 as a general estimate and that the Open Education Network adopted $100.00 because it simplifies

---

the California Virtual Campus-Online Education Initiative (CVC-OEI) Proctoring Network for Online Classes was approved by the body to begin discussions about reviving the proctoring network.

[33] Resolution 114.04 F25 Developing a Consistent Method for Calculating Student Cost Savings Resulting from Open Educational Resources Adoption

calculations and falls near the midpoint of both materials cost estimates and student-reported spending estimates[34];

Whereas, A limited analysis of representative courses in the California community colleges found that half of the Phase I Common Course Numbering Courses (COMM-C1000, ENGL-C1000, and ENGL-C1001) had average costs ranging from $63.77 - $78.87, while the other half (POLS-C1000, PSYC-C1000, STAT-C1000) ranged from $100.75 - $143.50, suggesting that $100 is a reasonable value that does not over-estimate savings as the number of courses with average costs below $100.00 are not far below and most courses are above $100 and often considerably above; and

Whereas, Calculating the cost savings associated with the adoption of open educational resources and the establishment of zero textbook cost sections through library resources and other purchases is essential to advocating for funds, and establishing a recommended standard provides local advocates with a simple mechanism for doing such calculations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend a simple, transparent, systemwide method for estimating student cost savings from the establishment of zero textbook cost course sections using the formula: [student enrollments in qualifying sections] × $100.00 = estimated student cost savings as a standardized measure to reduce reporting burden and enable comparisons; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop guidance for calculating student cost savings resulting from the adoption of open educational resources and the establishment zero textbook cost courses sections, provide data to support the use of a systemwide method for doing so, and note the circumstances in which using a per enrollment estimate for calculating the savings associated with zero textbook cost course sections is not warranted.

CONTACT | Michelle Pilati, Rio Hondo College

106. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES |

#106.01 S26 Supporting Equitable Faculty Leadership and Governance Practices in Local Academic Senate

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) has adopted Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Anti-racism, and Accessibility (IDEAA) principles that recognize the importance of diverse faculty voices in participatory governance, curriculum, and academic leadership;

Whereas, Faculty service in local academic senates, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' committees and leadership positions plays a critical role in shaping curriculum, academic policy, hiring practices, and institutional priorities that directly impact the success of historically marginalized students and faculty;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Faculty Empowerment and Leadership Academy[35] emphasizes mentorship, leadership development, cultural humility, anti-racism, and understanding of faculty purview as outlined in Title 5 Section 53200[36], demonstrating ASCCC's recognition of the importance of developing informed, empowered and diverse faculty leaders; and

Whereas, Transparent and equitable local committee leadership, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges delegate selection processes are necessary to ensure full and equitable access to faculty

[34] Zaback, K. (2022). *Toward convergence: Creating clarity to drive more consistency in understanding the benefits and costs of OER* (ED623683). Midwestern Higher Education Compact. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED623683.pdf
[35] To learn more about the FELA, please visit the ASCCC Faculty Empowerment and Leadership Academy website.
[36] Title 5 §53200

leadership opportunities, and a lack of transparency in appointments can result in informal networks and gatekeeping practices that disproportionately exclude Black faculty, faculty of color, part-time faculty, and other historically marginalized groups from participating in shared governance;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) encourage local academic senates to implement equitable, transparent, and publicly communicated processes for committee and ASCCC delegate selection, including written procedures, open calls for participation, leadership rotation practices, and clear criteria for selection;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to develop leadership pipelines and mentorship opportunities that intentionally recruit, mentor, and support historically underrepresented faculty, including Black faculty, faculty of color, and part-time faculty, for participation in local and statewide academic senate leadership roles;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges develop and provide equity-minded governance training focused on identifying and eliminating gatekeeping practices that hinder equitable participation in shared governance; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) encourage local academic senates to regularly review and update their bylaws regarding committee structures, leadership appointment processes, and leadership representation to ensure alignment with inclusion, diversity, equity, anti-racism, and accessibility, and the goals of the ASCCC Faculty Empowerment and Leadership Academy.

CONTACT | Deborah Anna Brown, Riverside City College

107. ACCREDITATION |

107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data

Whereas, The value of community college degrees and certificates is increasingly being assessed[37] through Return on Investment[38], and how that data is interpreted will shape program review, accreditation narratives, and institutional planning and decision-making across the California Community Colleges areas, which are aligned to the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and title 5 defined Academic and Professional Matters, including the role of faculty in accreditation[39];

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) recently released a position paper titled, "*Leveraging Program-Level Data to Strengthen Student Outcomes: A Framework for ACCJC Institutions (2026)*,[40]" outlining the rationale behind using "Return on Investment" (ROI) to measure the "relationship between educational investment and student earning outcomes" and added a ROI data element to the ACCJC College Accreditation Dashboard;

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges position paper focuses on quantitative earnings data while also highlighting the possibility of creating a "comprehensive picture" through

---

[37] American Association of Community Colleges. (2025). *Resilient by design: The future of America's community colleges*. https://www.aacc.nche.edu/wp-content/uploads/securepdfs/2025/10/Resilient_by_Design_Report10925.pdf

[38] College Futures Foundation. (n.d.). *Golden Opportunities: Measuring return on investment in California higher education for low- and moderate-income learners*. Retrieved February 7, 2026, from https://collegefutures.org/goldenopportunities/

[39] ASCCC 10+1

[40] Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, *Leveraging program-level data to strengthen student outcomes: A framework for ACCJC institutions* (2026), https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Leveraging-Program-Level-Data-to-Strengthen-Student-Outcomes-A-Framework-for-ACCJC-Institutions.pdf?mc_cid=c75d3fb45c&mc_eid=95b81b1851

qualitative data sources such as, "employer advisory board feedback" and "graduate employment surveys[41]"; and

Whereas, "Return on Investment" is not a neutral or purely technical measure, but is shaped by student goals, transfer patterns, regional economies, and the social structures that influence labor markets, and faculty are the experts best positioned to contextualize these factors;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local Academic Senate's active, equity-minded involvement in college and district-level discussions, decisions, and adoption of Return on Investment metrics, including how to measure and interpret student learning/earnings outcomes and address local labor-market realities; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges address the need for clear accreditation and institutional planning guidance and documentation that empower faculty to evaluate and give input on the use of Return on Investment through resources and other communication channels, ensuring the topic remains visible, coherent, and accessible.

CONTACT | Brandi Bailes, Crafton Hills College, ASCCC Data and Research Committee

*#107.01.01 S26 Amend 107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data

Amend the 1st Resolved |

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local academic senates' active, equity-minded ~~involvement in~~ participation in and documentation of senate perspectives in college and district-level discussions, decisions, and adoption of Return on Investment metrics, including how to measure and interpret student ~~learning/earnings~~ learning and earning outcomes and address local labor-market realities; and

CONTACT | Natalie Lopez, Crafton Hills College

*^107.01.02 S26 Amend 107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data

Amend the 2nd Resolved |

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges address the need for clear accreditation and institutional planning guidance and documentation that empower faculty to evaluate and give input on the use of Return on Investment. ~~through resources and other communication channels, ensuring the topic remains visible, coherent, and accessible.~~

CONTACT | Shagun Kaur, De Anza College

108. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT |

*+108.01 S26 Use of Student Data in Artificial Intelligence Tools and AI Detection Technologies

[41] Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, *Leveraging program-level data to strengthen student outcomes: A framework for ACCJC institutions* (2026), https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Leveraging-Program-Level-Data-to-Strengthen-Student-Outcomes-A-Framework-for-ACCJC-Institutions.pdf?mc_cid=c75d3fb45c&mc_eid=95b81b1851

Whereas, California community college faculty increasingly encounter artificial intelligence (AI) tools, including generative AI platforms and AI-based detection software, that claim to analyze student work or student data for instructional, assessment, or academic integrity purposes;

Whereas, The use of student data in artificial intelligence systems raises significant ethical, legal, and privacy concerns, including potential violations of student confidentiality protections under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)[42], state privacy laws, and local district policies;

Whereas, Many artificial intelligence (AI) and AI detection tools rely on opaque algorithms, external data storage, and third-party vendors, creating risks related to data ownership, secondary data use, algorithmic bias, and inaccurate or inequitable outcomes for students;

Whereas, Faculty and local academic senates, under title 5 §53200[43] and the "10+1" academic and professional matters, have responsibility for academic standards, educational integrity, and policies related to student evaluation and equity;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge faculty to exercise caution and professional judgment when considering the use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools or AI detection technologies that require uploading, sharing, or analyzing identifiable or de-identified student data;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge faculty who choose to engage with artificial intelligence tools for instructional or professional purposes to do so with intentionality by removing, anonymizing, or otherwise excluding all identifiable student data prior to using such tools, in order to protect student privacy, uphold ethical standards, and comply with applicable laws and policies.

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to work collegially with administrations to develop policies and guidance addressing ethical, privacy, and equity considerations related to the use of student data in artificial intelligence technologies; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges provide guidance, professional development, and resources to support faculty and local academic senates in making informed, ethical decisions regarding artificial intelligence and student data.

CONTACT | Stephanie Curry, ASCCC Executive Committee, Area A

+108.02 S26 Ensuring Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and Technology Platforms to Protect Student and Institutional Data

Whereas, Faculty and colleges are increasingly using artificial intelligence tools, cloud platforms, third-party digital services, and artificial intelligence-enabled features embedded within commonly used applications in instruction, assessment, research, and administrative work, including Microsoft Office, Google Apps, and Adobe products, often ahead of the development of clear institutional policies and guidance, as noted in recent higher education technology adoption reports[44];

Whereas, Many widely available "free" technology services and generative artificial intelligence tools may collect, retain, or use user-provided content and behavioral data in ways that may not align with institutional privacy obligations or legal requirements such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act[45] and applicable

[42] U.S. Department of Education. (2000). *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)*. https://studentprivacy.ed.gov/ferpa
[43] Title 5 §53200
[44] Robert, J. (2024, February 12). *2024 EDUCAUSE AI Landscape Study*. EDUCAUSE. https://library.educause.edu/resources/2024/2/2024-educause-ai-landscape-study
[45] Student Privacy Policy Office. (n.d.). *Guidance*. U.S. Department of Education. http://studentprivacy.ed.gov/guidance

state privacy laws, as described in publicly available platform privacy disclosures and federal guidance on student data protection[46];

Whereas, Faculty have primary responsibility for curriculum and pedagogy under the purview of the academic senate, and therefore must be supported in making informed decisions about the appropriate use of instructional technologies and emerging artificial intelligence tools; and

Whereas, Colleges and districts can mitigate data privacy risks by providing secure enterprise technology solutions, clear guidance, and professional development that support responsible innovation while protecting students and institutional data;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local academic senates to work collaboratively with their administrations, technology leaders, and governance bodies to promote faculty awareness of data privacy considerations associated with the use of artificial intelligence tools and third-party digital platforms;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the development and dissemination of guidance, professional learning opportunities, and promising practices to help faculty make informed choices about the use of artificial intelligence and technology services in ways that protect student and institutional data; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for colleges and districts to provide secure, accessible, and appropriately supported technology solutions that enable faculty innovation while meeting legal and ethical obligations related to data privacy.

CONTACT | Mark Branom, San José City College, Area B

*^108.02.01 Amend +108.02 S26 Ensuring Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and Technology Platforms to Protect Student and Institutional Data

Amend the 4th Whereas|

Whereas, Colleges, ~~and~~ districts, and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office can mitigate data privacy risks and concerns by developing transparent vetting criteria for Artificial Intelligence tools and providing secure enterprise technology solutions, clear guidance, and professional development that support responsible innovation while protecting students and institutional data;

Amend the 3rd Resolved|

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for colleges, ~~and~~ districts, and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to provide secure, accessible, and appropriately supported technology solutions that enable faculty innovation while meeting legal and ethical obligations related to data privacy.

CONTACT | Angela C. Echeverri, Los Angeles Community College District

+108.03 S26 Ensuring Accessibility and Universal Design for Learning Across Instructional Modalities

[46] Canadian Centre for Cyber Security. (2025, December). *Generative artificial intelligence (AI): ITSAP.00.041*. https://www.cyber.gc.ca/en/guidance/generative-artificial-intelligence-ai-itsap00041

Whereas, The Americans with Disabilities Act[47], Section 504[48], and Section 508[49] of the Rehabilitation Act, and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations[50] require that students with disabilities be provided equitable access to educational programs and instructional materials;

Whereas, In April 2024, the United States Department of Justice[51] issued a final rule under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act establishing technical accessibility requirements for digital content provided by public entities, including public colleges, requiring conformance with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 AA[52] or successor standards by April 2026;

Whereas, Contemporary instruction across California community colleges regularly requires students to access digital instructional materials such as learning management system content, documents, multimedia, web resources, and third-party tools, making accessibility a critical consideration across all instructional modalities[53]; and

Whereas, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles[54] support equitable access to learning by providing multiple means of representation, action and expression, and engagement, benefiting students with disabilities as well as the broader and increasingly diverse student population served by the California Community Colleges;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage colleges and local academic senates to review institutional practices to ensure that digital instructional materials required for student participation align with applicable accessibility standards, including recognized standards such as Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 AA or successor standards across all instructional modalities and conduct a survey of colleges statewide regarding accessibility practices for required digital instructional materials in order to inform future guidance and support; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work to advance systemwide accessibility resources, infrastructure, training, and tools for the California Community Colleges, and encourage local academic senates to collaborate with administrations and campus stakeholders to leverage local and statewide supports, including but not limited to resources such as 3C Media Solutions and the California Community Colleges Accessibility Center, to support faculty in creating accessible digital instructional materials and applying Universal Design for Learning principles in course design and teaching.

CONTACT | Mark Branom, San José City College, Area B

+108.04 S26 Mathematics Pedagogy in the California Community Colleges

[47] U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division. (n.d.). *ADA.gov*. https://www.ada.gov/
[48] U.S. Department of Labor, Civil Rights Center. (n.d.). *Section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973*. https://www.dol.gov/agencies/oasam/centers-offices/civil-rights-center/statutes/section-504-rehabilitation-act-of-1973
[49] Section508.gov. (n.d.). *IT accessibility laws and policies*. https://www.section508.gov/manage/laws-and-policies/
[50] California Code of Regulations Title 5 §§56000-56010
[51] Department of Justice. (2024, April 24). *Nondiscrimination on the basis of disability; Accessibility of web information and services of state and local government entities* (Final rule), **89** *Federal Register* 31320. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/04/24/2024-07758/nondiscrimination-on-the-basis-of-disability-accessibility-of-web-information-and-services-of-state
[52] World Wide Web Consortium (W3C). (2018, June 5). *Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1*. https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/
[53] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (n.d.). *Accessibility*. https://www.cccco.edu/Accessibility
[54] CAST. (n.d.). *UDL guidelines*. https://udlguidelines.cast.org/

Whereas, The technological resources available to both mathematics educators and mathematics students have evolved substantially in even very recent times[55];

Whereas, The current minimum qualifications[56] and in the current draft proposal for revising the minimum qualifications (as of March 13, 2026) for California Community College Mathematics educators do not sufficiently emphasize both thorough mathematical understanding and training in inclusive mathematics pedagogy, as evidenced by the lack of mathematics education training as a required component; and

Whereas, Mathematics is a foundational discipline in the post-COVID 19[57] and post-AB 1705[58] landscape, math educators are tasked more than ever with being able to meet students where they are and work with them to have a successful experience in their mathematics courses;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges explore the creation of a Mathematics taskforce to identify and develop professional learning opportunities for Mathematics faculty with a summary report to be presented to the field by the end of Spring 2028;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges identify professional learning opportunities specifically geared towards Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Anti-Racism, Accessibility-infused Mathematics pedagogy, to support students in Mathematics courses, especially in Calculus and beyond to be shared in an accessible and public forum no later than Spring 2027; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges create an open-access repository of culturally relevant Mathematics classroom practices, which may also support related and adjacent disciplines.

CONTACT | Katia Fuchs, City College of San Francisco, Area B

109. PROGRAM REVIEW |

110. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND BUDGET DEVELOPMENT |

111. ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES |

*111.01 S26 Adopt the 2026–2029 ASCCC Strategic Directions and Goals

Whereas, Strategic planning is a critical component of successful organizations that provides clear direction and stability and ensures that the organization's leadership remains responsive to its members;

---

[55] Balch, D. E., & Blanck, R. (2024, November). *The rise of AI in California Community Colleges*. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC). https://www.asccc.org/content/rise-ai-california-community-colleges; Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly transforming the landscape of higher education, offering unprecedented opportunities for innovation and improvement and teaching and learning methodologies. Nevertheless, integrating AI into education introduces challenges that must be managed to guarantee fair access and uphold academic integrity.

[56] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2024). *19th edition: Minimum qualifications for faculty and administrators in California Community Colleges* (pp. 37). https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/report/19theditionminimumqualifications18a11y.pdf; mathematics minimum qualifications require either a rich preparations in Mathematics and applied fields, or a rich preparation in Mathematics education, but not both.

[57] Nagelhout, R. (2025, December 5). *Some school districts saw more learning loss during the pandemic. Researchers want to know why.* Harvard Graduate School of Education. https://www.gse.harvard.edu/ideas/news/25/12/some-school-districts-saw-more-learning-loss-during-pandemic-researchers-want-know; the impact of pandemic-era remote learning on high school student success metrics varies greatly from school district to school district

[58] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025, March 14). *AB 1705 equitable placement, support and completion progress at your college: City College of San Francisco* [Memorandum]; high school graduates entering California Community Colleges have direct access to STEM Calculus 1, regardless of their high school preparation

Whereas, The 2023–2026 Strategic Plan of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) is set to expire in 2026, and the ASCCC Executive Committee engaged in strategic planning retreat sessions on December 11–12, 2025, followed by further strategic planning during the January 2026 Executive Committee meeting;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community College's (ASCCC) Executive Committee considered the ASCCC mission and vision, adopted resolutions, and current issues impacting academic and professional matters to guide the development of new strategic directions; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community College's (ASCCC) Executive Committee has proposed the 2026–2029 Strategic Directions and Goals for consideration and adoption by the delegates of the ASCCC, to be implemented and actualized annually through an integrated planning process;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) adopt the 2026–2029 ASCCC Strategic Directions and Goals as follows:

2026–2029 ASCCC Strategic Directions and Goals

STRATEGY 1 | Position the ASCCC as a Leading Voice for California Community College Faculty
Goal | Expand ASCCC's influence and effectiveness through coordinated strategy, clear communication, and meaningful partnerships.

STRATEGY 2 | Promote Connection, Inclusion, and Collaborative Engagement
Goal | Foster community through feedback-driven engagement and the advancement of Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Anti-Racism, and Accessibility (IDEAA).

STRATEGY 3 | Advance Organizational Trust, Accountability, and Long-Term Financial Sustainability
Goal | Strengthen transparent operations, responsible stewardship, and strategic resource development.

STRATEGY 4 | Evaluate and Reimagine Organizational Structures, Processes, and Governance
Goal | Strengthen board engagement with faculty by refining structures and clarifying roles and processes.

STRATEGY 5 | Promote Professional Learning That Builds Faculty Leadership
Goal | Strengthen faculty leadership and innovation through intentional, data-informed professional learning that addresses emerging needs and leverages strategic partnerships.

CONTACT | ASCCC Executive Committee

*+111.02 S26 Review of ASCCC Executive Leadership Term Lengths

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges plays a critical leadership role in representing faculty in academic and professional matters pursuant to title 5 and established participatory governance principles[59];

Whereas, The responsibilities of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' executive leadership positions require significant time, coordination, policy analysis, statewide engagement, committee work, and responsiveness to rapidly evolving system-level initiatives, and effective leadership in these roles requires continuity, relationship-building, institutional knowledge development, and sustained strategic planning;

[59] Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2025). *Policy 30.03: Reassigned time and overload assignments.* https://asccc.org/policies

Whereas, A one-year term length for executive leadership positions may limit a leader's ability to fully implement long-term initiatives, assess outcomes, and ensure stability in statewide governance efforts; and

Whereas, Periodic evaluation of governance structures is consistent with principles of continuous improvement, transparency, and organizational effectiveness;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) compile a report that conducts a comprehensive review of the ASCCC executive leadership term lengths for the offices of President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer, assessing whether the current one-year term length is sufficient to effectively fulfill the scope of responsibilities associated with these roles, including consideration of the potential benefits and challenges of extended or staggered terms, using a process that includes broad consultation with current and former Executive Officers, Area Representatives, local academic senate leaders, and faculty delegates to ensure an inclusive and transparent evaluation and that the findings and any recommended amendments resulting from this review be brought forward through established ASCCC governance processes for consideration by the body and subsequently published to the field by Spring 2027.

CONTACT | Sharon Sampson, Grossmont College, Area D

+111.03 S26 Study the Unified Faculty Model in Place in British Columbia in Terms of Academic Freedom and Student Success

Whereas, In the Spring 2025, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges resolved to endorse the United Faculty model, a model created at and exemplified by Vancouver Community College, and other British Columbia area community colleges[60], and "collaborate with local collective bargaining units and advocacy groups to develop campus cultures that seek out all faculty voices and provide equal access to compensated opportunities in curriculum development, participatory governance roles, professional development, and institutional planning for those part-time faculty who wish to engage in such work"[61];

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges "should work with other faculty and administrative organizations to develop structures that will enhance the professionalism of all faculty and protect their academic freedom," and ". . . engage in a serious consideration of the implications and advisability of extending the structures and protections of tenure to regularly rehired part-time faculty who have undergone rigorous evaluation processes"[62];

Whereas, "Part-time faculty not only make up the majority of all faculty in the California community college system, but provide nearly half of all instruction," and "the success of our students, and ultimately our institutions themselves, depend on supporting the needs of part-time faculty just as we must for full time faculty,"[63]; and

Whereas "Given the increased emphasis on student success and completion, it is imperative that part-time faculty are given the tools necessary to aid them in this critical effort," and "the relationship between student

---

[60] Klein, D. (n.d.). *A unified faculty model: The remedy for decades of failed education "reform" in the California Community Colleges* [PDF]. Faculty Association of California Community Colleges. https://www.faccc.org/assets/docs/PolicyPapers/A%20Unified%20Faculty%20Model_FINAL.docx.pdf

[61] Resolution 111.09 S25 Supporting a United Faculty Workplace for California Community Colleges

[62] Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2002). *Part-time faculty: A principled perspective.* https://www.asccc.org/papers/part-time-faculty-principled-perspective

[63] Foster, S. (2018). *Supporting part-time faculty for student success.* Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. https://www.asccc.org/content/supporting-part-time-faculty-student-success

success and part-time faculty resources makes providing such tools clearly an academic and professional matter and is within the purview of local senates"[64];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges conduct a study of the impact of the Unified Faculty Model in place at Vancouver Community College and other British Columbia Community Colleges on protecting academic freedom and on increasing student success on the basis of publicly available data, and publish a report of this study's findings by Spring 2027.

CONTACT | Geoffery Johnson, San Diego Mesa College, Area D

*+111.04 S26 Promising Practices for Mental Health Counseling Faculty in the California Community Colleges

Whereas**,** The mental health counseling faculty role is a new and evolving discipline within the California Community College system, with implications for faculty responsibilities, role clarity, and student support services;

Whereas, For mental health counselors serving in faculty positions, there is currently no statewide definition of the mental health counseling faculty role[65] nor clear guidance on the appropriate scope of responsibilities; and

Whereas**,** The mental health counseling faculty discipline requires master's level professional education and training, along with supervised clinical experience necessary to develop competencies, skills, and knowledge in mental health counseling; and

Whereas**,** Faculty serving in mental health counseling roles must hold licensure or registration with the California Board of Behavioral Sciences or the California Board of Psychology in order to practice within the healing arts of psychotherapy;

Resolved**,** That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in consultation with the California Community Colleges–Mental Health & Wellness Association (CCC-MHWA) and other appropriate interest holders, develop a promising practices guide for mental health counseling faculty in the CCC—addressing, among other relevant topics, the definition of the role, appropriate functional expectations, boundaries between clinical, instructional and student services functions, and considerations for faculty evaluation for individuals serving in mental health counseling faculty positions—by the 2027 Fall Plenary Session.

CONTACT | Lisa Larimer Burtis, Mendocino College, Area B

+111.05 S26 Defending Students and Faculty, Especially People of Color and Immigrants, Against Federal Attacks and Retaliation, and Restricting ASCCC Investments that Support Military Operations

Whereas, The world is witnessing increased aggressive and violent activity against lawful United States (U.S.) residents and citizens by federal agencies, resulting in traumatic family separations, deportations, and tragic unnecessary deaths in U.S. immigrant detention centers, as well as fears of going to work and school for fear of being abducted, detained, and deported, as well as increased U.S. aggression against countries globally, such as the most recent conflict in Iran[66];

---

[64] Foster, S. (2018). *Supporting part-time faculty for student success.* Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. https://www.asccc.org/content/supporting-part-time-faculty-student-success

[65] At the time of the writing of this resolution, a new discipline is being proposed that further defines the role of mental health counseling.

[66] Wikipedia contributors. (2026, March 11). *List of deaths in ICE detention*. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_deaths_in_ICE_detention#2025

Whereas, While there has been widespread condemnation of the unjust murders of Renee Good and Alex Pretti by sanctioned federal agents, including but not limited to Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers, there has not been, for many years, nearly the same level of awareness and condemnation of the similarly unjust abuse and deaths of Brown, Black, Asian, Native Indigenous, Pacific Islander, and other nonwhite individuals, including United States (U.S.) citizens and individuals with legal rights to reside in the U.S., amid continuing escalation of ICE activity, which includes attempts to detain workers and students and threats to target California public schools, including California community colleges (CCC) where a substantial number of students and staff are Brown, Black, Asian, Native Indigenous, and/or Pacific Islander, and many of those who learn and work in the CCC are among the 28% of all Californians (10.9 million in all) who are immigrants[67];

Whereas, The federal government has targeted, threatened, and abducted university students and faculty for simply exercising their academic freedom in speaking out in criticism against actions by United States military and federal agents[68] [69]; and

Whereas, In an urgent moment where the nation's democracy and people's safety must be defended against authoritarian actions in violation of the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights, similar to how Japanese American citizens and legal residents' rights were violated by the 1942 Executive Order 9066, resulting in the California Community Colleges' immigrant and nonwhite students and employees fearing possible Immigrations and Customs Enforcement confrontation, abduction, and deportation simply for trying to go to work and school, and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has already committed to the support for flexible attendance policies for students in such circumstances through the passage of Fall 2025 Resolution 105.02[70] [71];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges condemn any and all attempts to attack the constitutional rights of and attempts to restrict academic freedom of California community college students, faculty, and employees, especially Brown, Black, Asian, Native Hawai'ian/Indigenous, Pacific Islander, and Immigrant students and faculty, who express opinions about federal agencies or the United States military; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, anchor its mission and values in how the organization spends money, especially in its investment portfolio, and thus will not invest in companies that have contributed to the funding of or conducting militaristic operations of United States federal agencies in wars of aggression such as in the latest conflict in Iran.

CONTACT | Karen Chow, ASCCC Executive Committee, Area B

*^111.05.01 S26 Amend +111.05 S26 Defending Student and Faculty, Especially People of Color and Immigrants, Against Federal Attacks and Retaliation, and Restricting ASCCC Investments that Support Military Operations

Amend the 3rd Whereas |

---

[67] Cuellar Mejia, M., & Johnson, H. (2026, January). *Immigrants in California*. Public Policy Institute of California. https://www.ppic.org/publication/immigrants-in-california/

[68] Wikipedia contributors. (2026, March 12). *Mahmoud Khalil (activist)*. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mahmoud_Khalil_(activist)

[69] Romero, L. (2026, January 23). *Judge warns administration against changing immigration status of students who sued over free speech*. ABC News / Good Morning America. https://www.goodmorningamerica.com/news/story/judge-warns-administration-changing-immigration-status-students-sued-129490453

[70] These student and faculty fears were expressed by panelists speaking and by attendees in the chat at the FACCC Public Policy forum held via zoom and recorded on January 31, 2026

[71] Resolution 105.02 F25 Advocating for Flexibility in Attendance and Participation Policies for Students at California Community Colleges

Whereas, The federal government has targeted, threatened, and abducted university students and faculty for simply exercising their academic freedom in speaking out in criticism against actions by ~~the United States military and~~ federal agents; [72] and

Amend the 1st Resolved |

Resolved That the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges condemn any and all attempts to attack the constitutional rights of and attempts to restrict academic freedom of California community college students, faculty, and employees, especially Brown, Black, Asian, Native Hawai'ian/Indigenous, Pacific Islander, and Immigrant students and faculty, who express opinions about federal agencies ~~or the United States military~~ and requests its president send a written statement to all local senate presidents detailing the concerns expressed and positions taken in this resolution, as expeditiously as possible and;

Strike the 2nd Resolved |

~~Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, anchor its mission and values in how the organization spends money, especially in its investment portfolio, and thus will not invest in companies that have contributed to the funding of or conducting militaristic operations of United States federal agencies in wars of aggression such as in the latest conflict in Iran.~~

CONTACT | Karen Chow, ASCCC Executive Committee

*+111.06 S26 Update the ASCCC Paper, "Protecting the Future of Academic Freedom During a Time of Significant Change"

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted the paper, "Protecting the Future of Academic Freedom During a Time of Significant Change",[73] in Fall 2020 and has not been updated since;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges position paper, "Protecting the Future of Academic Freedom During a Time of Significant Change", outlines academic freedom within the contexts of marginalized communities, impact on classroom practices, threats against tenure, the impact on part-time faculty, and statewide legislation -- all topics which have evolved since Fall 2020;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) position paper, "Protecting the Future of Academic Freedom During a Time of Significant Change", makes recommendations that can be further illuminated about how local colleges and academic senates have addressed academic freedom since 2020, and can crosswalk with newer ASCCC resources, such as the 2025 "Academic Freedom Resource Guide"[74]; and

Whereas, Challenges to academic freedom in the past five years regarding the rights and responsibilities of faculty, as well as legislative changes since 2020 in the areas of faculty evaluations, diversity, equity, and inclusion in the course outline of record, and AB 1705 (Irwin, 2022), can help enhance this paper;

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges update the position paper, "Protecting the Future of Academic Freedom During a Time of Significant Change" to include areas of impact on academic

---

[72] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mahmoud_Khalil_(activist); https://www.goodmorningamerica.com/news/story/judge-warns-administration-changing-immigration-status-students-sued-129490453

[73] Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2020). *Protecting the future of academic freedom during a time of significant change* (Position paper). https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Academic_Freedom_F20.pdf

[74] Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2025). *Academic freedom resource guide.* https://www.asccc.org/papers/academic-freedom-resource-guide

freedom with a more nuanced look at tenure, part-time faculty and the most recent threats to academic freedom.

CONTACT | Mitra Sapienza, ASCCC Executive Committee, Area B

#111.07 S26 Condemning Cesar E. Chavez Sexual Abuse and Honoring Survivors and the Farmworkers Movement

Whereas, A multi-year investigation by *The New York Times*[75] uncovered extensive and "profoundly shocking" evidence of sexual abuse, grooming, and misconduct by Cesar E. Chavez, a co-founder of the United Farm Workers (UFW), including harrowing accounts of sexual abuse of children as young as 12 and 13 and incidents of molestation and rape occurring in Chavez's private office and during union marches, and that survival has meant enduring decades of trauma, including panic attacks, depression, and suicide attempts, while their pleas for help were historically ignored or silenced by those seeking to preserve Chavez's public image;

Whereas, Legendary civil rights activist Dolores Huerta, co-founder of the United Farm Workers, revealed that she is a survivor of sexual abuse by Chavez, including manipulation and rape in the 1960s, resulting in two pregnancies, and that she carried this secret because she "wasn't going to let Cesar or anyone less get in the way" of her life's work of building the movement "on behalf of millions of farmworkers and others who were suffering and deserved equal rights"[76];

Whereas, The United Farm Workers Foundation officially cancelled all Cesar Chavez Day activities and described the shocking and indefensible allegations as incompatible with the organization's values,[77] and various state and local officials are taking steps to remove Cesar E. Chavez from public holidays, institutions, streets, and public roads[78]; and

Whereas, State and local leaders in public education are issuing statements calling for a shift in attention away from celebrating Chavez to honoring the Farmworkers Movement and to "ensure that every student in our schools, especially every girl, knows that her body is her own, that inappropriate sexual behavior is never her fault and that she will be believed and supported if she speaks up"[79];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges condemn in the strongest possible terms the deplorable actions of Cesar E. Chavez as described in the testimonials of survivors, which included the grooming and sexual abuse of children and the sexual assault of women within the farmworker labor movement; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly support discussions among community college faculty regarding related curriculum topics that shift away from the celebratory representations of Cesar E. Chavez and to account for the lived experience of survivors of sexual abuse while honoring the work of advocating for the dignity and rights of farmworkers

---

[75] Fernandez, M., & Hurtes, S. (2026, March 18). Cesar Chavez, a civil rights icon, is accused of abusing girls for years. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2026/03/18/us/cesar-chavez-sexual-abuse-allegations-ufw.html

[76] Huerta, D. (2026, March 18). *A statement from Dolores Huerta*. Medium. https://medium.com/@dolores_huerta/march-18-2026-e74c20430555 ; Dolores Huerta's full statement may be accessed through the Dolores Huerta Foundation webpage, "Honoring Courage, Upholding Our Mission." accessed March 25, 2026

[77] UFW Foundation. (2026, March 17). *Statement from the UFW Foundation*. UFW Foundation. https://ufwfoundation.org/statement-from-the-ufw-foundation/

[78] Garcia, K., et al. (2026, March 18). *Calls to remove César Chávez from buildings, parks, and roads*. Los Angeles Times. https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2026-03-18/calls-remove-cesar-chavez-from-buildings-parks-roads

[79] As examples, see the March 20, 2026 statement from State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond "Update Regarding Observance of March 31 State Holiday to Honor the Farmworkers Movement and Latino Civil Rights," accessed March 25, 2026, and the March 18, 2026 Statement from Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools on Allegations Concerning Cesar Chavez, accessed March 25, 2026

CONTACT | Jeffrey Hernandez, Los Angeles Community College District

#111.08 S26 ASCCC Support for International Women's Day as a Holiday

Whereas, International Women's Day is observed annually on March 8 as an official holiday by dozens of countries to celebrate the "social, economic, cultural, and political achievements of women" (International Women's Day, n.d.)[80], and for over 100 years has also worked to "raise awareness of gender inequality through shining a light on persistent issues like the gender pay gap, lack of representation in leadership roles, gender-based violence, and unequal access to education and opportunities" (International Women's Day, n.d.)[81]; and

Whereas, Recognizing the achievements of women and promoting gender equality are evident throughout many aspects of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC), ranging from the work of the Womxn's Caucus to countless contributions in ASCCC leadership, committees and publications[82], and is consistent with the ASCCC's mission and vision which includes advancing inclusion, diversity, and equity[83];

Resolved, That the Academic Senates for California Community Colleges work with external partners and the legislature to advocate for designating International Women's Day as an official state holiday; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senates for California Community Colleges model the expectation of celebrating International Women's Day and explore the feasibility of observing March 8th as a paid holiday for employees of the Academic Senates for California Community Colleges.

CONTACT | Angela C. Echeverri, Los Angeles Community College District

112. HIRING, MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS, EQUIVALENCY, AND EVALUATIONS |

112.01 S26 Disciplines List - Counseling: Mental Health

Whereas, Oral and written testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*, also known as the Disciplines List, supported the following addition of the counseling: mental health discipline:

> Master's in Counseling, Social Work, Marriage and Family Therapy, OR Clinical or Counseling Psychology
>
> AND
>
> A current, valid license issued by the California Board of Psychology or the California Board of Behavioral Sciences
>
> OR
>
> The minimum qualifications as set by the California Board of Psychology or California Board of Behavioral Sciences for licensed psychologists, clinical social workers, professional clinical counselors or marriage and family therapists.
>
> OR the equivalent

[80] International Women's Day. (n.d.). *About International Women's Day (IWD)*. https://www.internationalwomensday.com/About-IWD
[81] International Women's Day. (n.d.). *About International Women's Day (IWD)*. https://www.internationalwomensday.com/About-IWD
[82] For more information, please visit the ASCCC's Womxn's Caucus' website.
[83] Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (n.d.). *Mission and vision*. https://www.asccc.org/about/mission

(NOTES: A Doctorate in Psychology AND license by the California Board of Psychology is equivalent. A registrant or associate under the supervision of an eligible licensed psychotherapist employed by the California Community College system, as recognized by the Board of Psychology or Board of Behavioral Sciences, is an alternative qualification for this discipline.); and

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

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the California Community Colleges Board of Governors adopt the proposed addition to the Disciplines List for Counseling: Mental Health.

CONTACT | Robert L. Stewart, Jr., ASCCC Executive Committee

112.02 S26 Disciplines List - Mathematics

Whereas, Oral and written testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*, also known as the Disciplines List, supported the following revision of the mathematics discipline:

Master's in mathematics or applied mathematics

OR

Bachelor's in either of the above

AND ~~Master's in statistics, physics or mathematics education~~ *Master's in mathematics education with a minimum of 18 semester units of graduate study in mathematics or applied mathematics, or a Master's in statistics or physics*

OR the equivalent; and

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

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the California Community Colleges Board of Governors adopt the proposed revision to the Disciplines List for Mathematics.

CONTACT | Robert L. Stewart, Jr., ASCCC Executive Committee

112.03 S26 Disciplines List - Uncrewed Aircraft Systems (UAS) Technology

Whereas, Oral and written testimony given through the consultation process used for the review of *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*, also known as the Disciplines List, supported the following addition of the uncrewed aircraft systems (UAS) technology discipline:

A Bachelor's degree or higher in any field with two years of professional experience in Uncrewed and Autonomous Systems, Uncrewed Systems, Uncrewed Aircraft Systems, Unmanned Aircraft Systems, Unmanned Aerial Systems, or Drone Technology, and a Remote Pilot (Part 107) Certificate from the Federal Aviation Administration.

Or

An Associate degree in any field with six years of professional experience in Uncrewed and Autonomous Systems, Uncrewed Systems, Uncrewed Aircraft Systems, Unmanned Aircraft Systems, Unmanned Aerial Systems, or Drone Technology, and a Remote Pilot (Part 107) Certificate from the Federal Aviation Administration; and

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

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommend that the California Community Colleges Board of Governors adopt the proposed addition to the Disciplines List for Uncrewed Aircraft Systems (UAS) Technology.

CONTACT | Robert L. Stewart, Jr., ASCCC Executive Committee

*+112.04 S26 Update the ASCCC Tenure Review resources: "Towards A Model Four-Year Tenure Process" and "Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective"

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted "Towards A Model Four-Year Tenure Process"[84] in 1990, and "Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective"[85] in 1998 and neither have been updated since;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in Fall 2023, passed Resolution 03.01[86], encouraging colleges to incorporate inclusion, diversity, equity, accessibility and anti-racism principles into their evaluation processes, including tenure which have developed substantially since 1998; and

Whereas, Challenges to academic freedom in the past five years regarding the rights and responsibilities of faculty, as well as legislative changes since 2020 in the areas of faculty evaluations, can help enhance and update these resources;

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) update tenure evaluation resources, "Towards A Model Four-Year Tenure Process", and "Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective" to include updates that reflect the most recent legislation and incorporate the most recently developed ASCCC resources.

CONTACT | Mitra Sapienza, ASCCC Executive Committee, Area B

113. LEGISLATION AND ADVOCACY |

*+113.01 S26 Support for AB 2301 (Soria, as introduced February 19, 2026) to Establish a Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program

Whereas, California is experiencing a critical healthcare workforce shortage, and students living in rural or underserved regions often lack access to affordable Bachelor of Science in Nursing programs to meet the rising credential requirements of modern hospitals[87];

Whereas, Providing local access to nursing baccalaureate degrees serves the social justice mission of the community colleges by offering upward mobility for working adults and place-bound students without forcing them to enroll in prohibitively expensive private university programs;

---

[84] Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (1990). *Towards A Model Four-Year Tenure Process.* https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/TowardsFourYearTenure_0.pdf

[85] Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (1998). *Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective.* https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/Tenure_0.pdf

[86] Resolution 03.01 F23 Academic Senate Support for Increasing Faculty Diversity and Advancing Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in Evaluation and Tenure Review Processes

[87] Aschenbach, C. (n.d.). *Baccalaureate expansion in the California Community Colleges.* Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. https://www.asccc.org/content/baccalaureate-expansion-california-community-colleges

Whereas, Fulfilling the state's urgent demand for healthcare professionals aligns directly with the California Community Colleges Vision 2030 goal to expand baccalaureate attainment by 30 percent[88] and helps to provide pathways for the 6.8 million California adults who currently lack a degree[89], a gap that cannot be closed by the universities alone since they produce only about 160,000 undergraduate degrees per year for a state population of nearly 40 million[90]; and

Whereas, AB 2301 (Soria, as introduced February 19, 2026) mandates the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to develop a pilot program authorizing up to 10 community college districts to offer a Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree, specifically prioritizing districts in underserved nursing areas and communities with persistent poverty[91], consistent with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' prior support for expansion of baccalaureate degree programs in allied health fields[92];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support AB 2301 (Soria, as introduced February 19, 2026) to create affordable nursing baccalaureate pathways through a targeted pilot program; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges continue to advocate for expansion of applied baccalaureate programs in allied health to close regional equity gaps and meet critical statewide healthcare needs.

CONTACT | Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, College of the Canyons, Area C

*+113.02 S26 Support for AB 2694 (Alvarez, as introduced February 20, 2026) to Modernize Regional Duplication Standards for Baccalaureate Programs

Whereas, California faces a massive statewide demand for degrees that far exceeds current university capacity since the University of California and California State University systems produce only about 160,000 undergraduate degrees annually for a population of nearly 40 million,[93] and addressing the 6.8 million adults between the ages of 25 and 54 who lack a postsecondary degree[94] requires maximizing the geographic reach of the community college system;

Whereas, Current statewide duplication rules[95] inadvertently block community colleges from serving their specific communities, even when universities cannot meet regional labor market demands or when local students are unable to relocate to attend a four-year institution, a geographic barrier further evidenced by research showing that 56 percent of California community college baccalaureate graduates would not have pursued a bachelor's degree at all if it had not been offered at their community college[96];

---

[88] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *Vision 2030: The July 2025 edition.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/vision2030/vision-2030-report.pdf

[89] California Competes. (2021, February 11). *Untapped opportunity: Understanding and advancing prospects for Californians without a college degree.* https://californiacompetes.org/resources/untapped-opportunity-understanding-and-advancing-prospects-for-californians-without-a-college-degree/

[90] Cook, K., & Wigul, C. (2026, February). *California's higher education system.* Public Policy Institute of California. https://www.ppic.org/publication/californias-higher-education-system/

[91] AB 2301 (Soria, as introduced February 19, 2026)

[92] Resolution 06.02 F19 Expansion of Baccalaureate Degree Programs in Allied Health

[93] Cook, K., & Wigul, C. (2026, February). *California's higher education system.* Public Policy Institute of California. https://www.ppic.org/publication/californias-higher-education-system/

[94] California Competes. (2021, February 11). *Untapped opportunity: Understanding and advancing prospects for Californians without a college degree* [PDF]. https://californiacompetes.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Untapped-Opportunity-Report-final.pdf

[95] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *Baccalaureate Degree Program report* (Final Report No. 1). EdSource. https://edsource.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/BDP-Report-1-I-Final-2-1.pdf

[96] Aschenbach, C. (n.d.). *Baccalaureate expansion in the California Community Colleges.* Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. https://www.asccc.org/content/baccalaureate-expansion-california-community-colleges

Whereas, AB 2694 (Alvarez, as introduced February 20, 2026) implements the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' previous call to define duplication with consideration for local unmet workforce needs, regional rather than statewide duplication, and potential impact on place-bound students[97] by shifting the restriction to a "geographic region" standard, allowing community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees if the regional university does not enroll local students in the same pathway or if a documented unmet regional workforce need justifies the program[98]; and

Whereas, Aligning degree approvals with targeted regional needs supports the California Community Colleges Vision 2030 objective to equitably increase community college baccalaureate degree attainment by 30 percent[99];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support AB 2694 (Alvarez, as introduced February 20, 2026) to establish a regional duplication standard for baccalaureate degree approvals; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges champion legislation that prioritizes documented regional workforce demands and local student access over statewide program duplication restrictions.

CONTACT | Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, College of the Canyons, Area C

*+113.03 S26 Support for SB 960 (Cabaldon, as introduced February 3, 2026) to Expand Baccalaureate Degrees in Impacted Regions

Whereas, Place-bound students, working adults, and students living in areas with impacted California State University programs face significant geographic and financial barriers to completing a baccalaureate degree, often leaving them with the choice of either abandoning their educational goals or accruing massive debt at high-cost private institutions[100];

Whereas, The expansion of affordable baccalaureate degree programs in the California Community Colleges is an essential matter of social justice that provides critical pathways for students to achieve upward economic mobility, particularly given that the University of California and California State University systems produce only about 160,000 undergraduate degrees per year[101] for a state population of nearly 40 million, leaving an estimated 6.8 million working-age adults without a postsecondary degree[102];

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Vision 2030 strategic plan sets a clear benchmark to increase the number of students earning a community college baccalaureate degree by 30 percent to meet the state's workforce demands[103], consistent with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' previous call for defining duplication with consideration for local unmet workforce needs, regional rather than statewide duplication, and potential impact on place-bound students[104]; and

---

[97] Resolution 15.05 F22 Propose Definitions for Baccalaureate Degree Duplication and Non-Duplication
[98] AB 2694 (Alvarez, as introduced February 20, 2026)
[99] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *Vision 2030: The July 2025 edition.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/vision2030/vision-2030-report.pdf
[100] Aschenbach, C. (n.d.). *Baccalaureate expansion in the California Community Colleges.* Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. https://www.asccc.org/content/baccalaureate-expansion-california-community-colleges
[101] Cook, K., & Wigul, C. (2026, February). *California's higher education system.* Public Policy Institute of California. https://www.ppic.org/publication/californias-higher-education-system/
[102] California Competes. (2021, February 11). *Untapped opportunity: Understanding and advancing prospects for Californians without a college degree.* https://californiacompetes.org/resources/untapped-opportunity-understanding-and-advancing-prospects-for-californians-without-a-college-degree/
[103] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *Vision 2030: The July 2025 edition.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/vision2030/vision-2030-report.pdf
[104] Resolution 15.05 F22 Propose Definitions for Baccalaureate Degree Duplication and Non-Duplication

Whereas, SB 960 (Cabaldon, as introduced February 3, 2026) offers a direct solution to localized access barriers by amending existing duplication rules[105] to allow a community college district to offer a baccalaureate degree program if the overlapping California State University program has been impacted for three consecutive years[106];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support SB 960 (Cabaldon, as introduced February 3, 2026) to expand community college baccalaureate degree offerings in regions where California State University programs are persistently impacted; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges continue to advocate for the expansion of affordable and accessible community college baccalaureate programs as a vital mechanism for serving place-bound students and closing the statewide degree gap.

CONTACT | Wendy Brill-Wynkoop, College of the Canyons, Area C

*+113.04 S26 Support for Full Implementation of 2025 Gender Equity Report Recommendations

Whereas, In Fall 2023, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges adopted the resolution, "Prioritizing the Prevention of Sexual Harassment and Discrimination at California Community Colleges",[107] to engage in advocacy to ensure that California community colleges commit to ongoing collaboration with external organizations, experts, and advocacy groups to continually enhance their efforts to combat sexual harassment and discrimination on campus;

Whereas, In February of 2024 the California Assembly Committee on Higher Education published a report titled, "A Call to Action"[108], exploring how postsecondary education institutions can address sex discrimination and provide educational justice on college campuses;

Whereas, In December of 2025, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office published a Gender Equity Report[109] to the Legislature pursuant to AB 2048 (Fong, 2024) [110] with recommendations for establishing systemic campus reforms that effectively prevent, detect, and address sexual harassment on community college campuses; and

Whereas, The 2025 Gender Equity Report concluded that the California Community Colleges' Title IX framework was broken as a result of defective design, underfunded implementation, and impractical oversight;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for legislative action to codify and implement all the recommendations of the 2025 Gender Equity Report, including minimum staffing requirements for Title IX offices at all California community colleges, establishment of an External Resolution Authority, adoption of systemwide baseline standards for local policies and procedures, investment in prevention infrastructure, resources, and trainings to help ensure compliance and accountability;

---

[105] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *Baccalaureate Degree Program report* (Final Report No. 1). EdSource. https://edsource.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/BDP-Report-1-I-Final-2-1.pdf
[106] SB 960 (Cabaldon, as introduced February 3, 2026)
[107] Resolution 13.01 F23 Prioritizing the Prevention of Sexual Harassment and Discrimination at California Community College Campuses
[108] California Assembly Committee on Higher Education. (2024). *A call to action: How postsecondary education institutions can address sex discrimination and provide educational justice on campus.* https://ahed.assembly.ca.gov/system/files/2024-02/a-call-to-action-report-2024_0.pdf
[109] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *2025 gender equity report: Pursuant to AB 2048 (M. Fong, 2024).* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/report/2025-Gender-Equity-Report.pdf
[110] AB 2048 (Fong, 2024)

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate for adequate state funding for the full implementation of all the recommendations of the 2025 Gender Equity Report to support meaningful Title IX reform at California community colleges; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to create trainings, workshops, and professional learning opportunities to advance gender equity and implementation of the 2025 Gender Equity Report recommendations.

CONTACT | Angela C. Echeverri, Los Angeles Mission College, Area C

*+113.05 S26 Support for Sustained and Adequate Funding for High-Cost Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs in Higher Education and Reduction of Student Material Costs

Whereas, Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs in the California Community Colleges require specialized laboratories, industry-standard equipment, safety infrastructure, and ongoing faculty professional learning, and often depend on required instructional tools and consumable materials that students must purchase, resulting in higher operating and participation costs than traditional non-CTE courses[111];

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Board of Governors Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy identified postsecondary career and technical education as high-cost and recommended a sustained supplemental funding source to maintain program quality, industry currency, and equitable access beyond what base apportionment can support (Board of Governors Task Force, 2015)[112];

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Vision 2030 framework calls on colleges to expand workforce and career and technical education pathways that advance equity and connect students to living-wage, family-sustaining careers, emphasizing workforce and economic mobility as core higher-education priorities (California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, 2023, 2025)[113] [114] [115]; and

Whereas, California's Master Plan for Career Education (2025) sets statewide higher-education priorities to expand equitable, labor-market-aligned career education while California Legislative Analyst's Office and California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Strong Workforce analyses affirm that Strong Workforce was created to supplement apportionment for high-cost postsecondary career and technical education needs, such as smaller class sizes, expensive equipment, and reducing student financial barriers to required materials (California Master Plan for Career Education, 2025; Legislative Analyst's Office, 2019; California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, 2016, 2024)[116] [117];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Board of Governors, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, and the California State Legislature

---

[111] Legislative Analyst's Office. (2016, February 26). *The 2016–17 budget: Higher education analysis.* https://www.lao.ca.gov/Publications/report/3372

[112] California Community Colleges Board of Governors Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy. (n.d.). *Report of the Task Force on Workforce, Job Creation, and a Strong Economy* (v12). https://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/BOG_TaskForce_Report_v12_web.pdf

[113] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2023). *Vision 2030: A roadmap for California Community Colleges.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/report/Vision-2030-A-Roadmap-for-California-Community-Colleges.pdf

[114] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *Vision 2030: The July 2025 edition.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/vision2030/vision-2030-report.pdf

[115] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *Vision 2030: The July 2025 edition.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/vision2030/vision-2030-report.pdf

[116] California Governor's Office. (2025). *California's Master Plan for Career Education.* https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/2025-CA-Master-Plan-for-Career-Education.pdf

[117] Legislative Analyst's Office. (2019, April 9). *Overview of California Community Colleges Strong Workforce Program* [Handout]. https://lao.ca.gov/handouts/education/2019/Overview-of-CCC-Strong-Workforce-Program040919.pdf

to provide sufficient, sustained, and protected funding including but not limited to Strong Workforce Program allocations and state financial aid structures to support the higher operational costs of career and technical education programs at institutions of higher education and to avoid shifting the additional financial burden onto local general funds or students[118] [119];

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, the California State Legislature, and local colleges to prioritize the use of career and technical education (CTE) and workforce funding streams to reduce or eliminate students' out-of-pocket costs for required instructional materials, tools, uniforms, certifications, and consumable supplies that are necessary for participation and completion in CTE courses and programs, thereby improving equitable access to high-cost workforce pathways; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, the California Community Colleges Board of Governors, and the California State Legislature to align career and technical education, and workforce investments with the priorities of California's Master Plan for Career Education (2025) and Vision 2030, including targeted resources that expand access to stackable credentials and work-based learning and that reduce student financial barriers to entry and completion.

CONTACT | Marvin Da Costa, Los Angeles Trade Technical College, Area C

*+113.06 S26 Providing Dedicated Funding to Support California Community College Faculty to Develop and Integrate Environmental Equity Education Across All Disciplines

Whereas, The "California Community Colleges system has prioritized inclusion, diversity, equity and anti-racism (IDEA) work—including through the CCCCO Call to Action, the DEI Task Force Recommendations, and the Vision for Success goals—to eliminate equity gaps"[120];

Whereas, Environmental equity ensures that marginalized communities, where the majority of the California Community College students live[121], are not forced to endure a disproportionate share of negative environmental consequences[122];

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Board of Governors and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Vision 2030[123] outlines a commitment to "taking care of our planet" and explicitly includes curriculum integration as one of four fields of climate practice by the California Community College system; and

Whereas, The successful Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Open Education Resource Initiative and the Los Angeles Community College District Environmental Equity Education Demonstration Project have

---

[118] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (n.d.). *Strong Workforce Program*. https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Chancellors-Office/Divisions/Workforce-and-Economic-Development/Strong-Workforce-Program

[119] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2024, July 16). *Strong Workforce Program: FY 2024–25 base allocation funding memo (ESLEI-24-40).* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/memo/eslei-24-40-swp-fy-2024-25-base-allocation-funding-memo-a11y.pdf

[120] Resolution 03.02 S21 Establishing Local Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Anti-racism (IDEA) Liaison

[121] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (n.d.). *Student enrollment and demographics.* https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Chancellors-Office/Divisions/Research-Analytics-Data/data-snapshot/student-demographics; The CCCCO Student Enrollment and Demographics website documents how the majority of students in the California community colleges are from marginalized communities.

[122] U.S. Global Change Research Program. (2023). *Fifth National Climate Assessment* (cloned version hosted on Climate.us). https://nca5.climate.us/; The Fifth National Climate Assessment examined the disproportionate impacts endured by marginalized communities.

[123] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *Vision 2030: The July 2025 edition.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/vision2030/vision-2030-report.pdf

established a precedent demonstrating the necessity of dedicated financial commitment to support faculty in curriculum/resource development and integration for student success;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the California State Legislature to advocate for dedicated ongoing funding to support environmental equity education, including faculty environmental equity education professional learning and faculty-led endeavors to develop curriculum and integrate environmental equity education across all disciplines.

CONTACT | Beth Abels, Los Angeles Pierce College, Area C

114. CONSULTATION WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE |

*114.01 S26 Electronic Versions of the Program and Course Approval Handbook and Minimum Qualifications Handbook

Whereas, The Program and Course Approval Handbook and the Minimum Qualifications Handbook are identified in California Code of Regulations Title 5 (§55000.5[124] and §53407[125], respectively) as documents produced by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office that provide operational guidance for implementing Title 5 regulations; and

Whereas, The Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH) and the Minimum Qualifications (MQ) Handbook have historically been delayed by waiting for accessible print versions[126], yet the majority of California Community College practitioners likely access online versions of the PCAH and MQ Handbook;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to expedite releasing the Program and Course Approval Handbook and the Minimum Qualifications Handbook by providing access to a web-based version after approval in the interest of more efficiently communicating updates to colleges and districts.

CONTACT | Eric Wada, ASCCC Executive Committee

*+114.02 S26 Promising Practices for Comprehensive Student Education Planning

Whereas, The California Community Colleges Board of Governors recently approved proposed revisions to title 5 §§55524[127], 55530[128], and 55531[129], requiring all students*[130] to receive a comprehensive education plan before the end of their first academic year[131]; and

Whereas, The 2025-2028 Student Equity Plan requests districts/colleges to provide data and a narrative detailing how they track student education plans in the first year, especially for disproportionately impacted students[132];

---

[124] Title 5 §55000.5
[125] Title 5 §53407
[126] For example, the 18th edition of the MQ Handbook took almost one year to be released.
[127] Title 5 §55524
[128] Title 5 §55530
[129] Title 5 §55531
[130] *All non-exempt students are required to receive a comprehensive student education plan.
[131] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2025). *Final regulatory text: Student education plans.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/regulatory-action/finalregtextstudentedplans20250729a11y.pdf
[132] California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2024). *2025–28 Student Equity Plan: Planning resources and development template.* https://www.cccco.edu/-/media/CCCCO-Website/docs/plan/2025-28-student-equity-plan-template-a11y.pdf

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to support completion of Comprehensive Education Planning by presenting state-wide data from Student Equity Plans, surveys, and/or other resources to compile promising practices and report out to the field by Spring 2027.

CONTACT | Trulie Thompson, Moorpark College, Area C

*+114.03 S26 Adopt Procedures for Progress Renewal to Increase Student Equity and Success

Whereas, Title 5 §55031 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) requires districts/colleges to place students on Academic or Progress Notice if they fall below a 2.0 grade point average or successful course completion standards[133], and CCR title 5 §55046 allows for Academic Renewal Without Course Repetition but does not include language related to Progress Renewal[134];

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Resolution 105.04[135] "Designing a Pathway for Students to Achieve Satisfactory Academic and/or Progress Status and Achieve Credential Completion" (adopted Fall 2025), identified that students placed on Academic or Progress Notice presents a significant barrier for students of all races/ethnicities to meet transfer eligibility requirements and these precarious positions also heighten the improbability of their returning to college; and

Whereas, Education Code Section 70902, subdivision (b)(3)[136] directs governing boards to "establish academic standards, probation and dismissal and readmission policies, and graduation requirements" not inconsistent with the California Community Colleges Board of Governors minimum standards, such that the structure of title 5 section 55046 endorses a similar" disregard but do not erase" approach for academic renewal[137], thereby legally allowing for Progress Renewal procedures which Santa Monica College[138] and Santa Rosa Junior College[139] have already adopted and had in place for many years;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to include title 5 language on Progress Renewal; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support local academic senates to adopt Progress Renewal policies while title 5 changes are in progress.

CONTACT | Trulie Thompson, Moorpark College, Area C

#114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request

Whereas, Resolution 06.03 S22 "Upholding the California Community College Mission–Oppose AB 1705 (Irwin, 2022) as of April 9, 2022 Unless Amended"[140] opposed AB1705 (Irwin, 2022) unless amendments were enacted that ensured "Placement and enrollment of students in a transfer-level English or mathematics course should

---

[133] Title 5 §55031
[134] Title 5 §55046
[135] Resolution 105.04 F25 Designing a Pathway for Students to Achieve Satisfactory Academic and/or Progress Status and Achieve Credit Completion
[136] California Education Code - EDC §70902
[137] Title 5 §55046
[138] Santa Monica College. (2024). *AR 4245: Progress renewal* [Administrative regulation]. https://admin.smc.edu/administration/governance/board-of-trustees/documents/AR-4245-Progress-Renewal-4-2024.pdf
[139] Santa Rosa Junior College. (n.d.). *Academic standards for probation, dismissal, and readmission* [Board policy]. https://go.boarddocs.com/ca/santarosa/Board.nsf/goto?open&id=A84PGP640C10
[140] Resolution 06.03 S22 Upholding the California Community College Mission–Oppose AB 1705 (Irwin, 2022) as of April 9, 2022 Unless Amended

not prevent students from enrolling in a pre-transfer level English or mathematics course when a student determines a course fulfills their academic needs…";

Whereas, Resolution 06.04 S22 "Students' Right to Choose to Take a Pre-Transfer Level English or Mathematics Course"[141] "support(s) the right of any student to choose to take pre-transfer level English or mathematic courses for the purpose of academic preparation, meeting non-transfer degree/certificate requirements, reskilling, or life-long education";

Whereas, Resolution 07.04 F23 "AB 1705 Meaningful Metrics for Equitable Outcomes"[142] stated in their second whereas, "The current throughput model[143] uses all students enrolled in a prerequisite class in the calculation of the gateway course's success rate, regardless of whether those students passed the prerequisite or enrolled in the gateway course and thereby ignoring any confounding variables, with throughput only counting relative growth in pass rates, neglecting to account for disproportionate fail rates, particularly among students of color[144]"; and

Whereas, California community colleges are open-access institutions dedicated to addressing community needs and supporting local educational advancement and are, at their core, committed to equity, which requires flexibility in offering pathways to meet students where they are, and Education Code 78213 (e)(2)[145] states that students may enroll in pre-transfer level courses provided they are told that this "does not improve their chances of completing subsequent coursework that satisfies a requirement for their intended certificate or associate degree, or a requirement for transfer within their intended major";

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and other interest holders to provide more comprehensive data including prerequisite completion and pre-census drops as related not only to success but also to the students who dropped, need additional support, and or have yet to pass a transfer level course;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and other interest holders to redefine the throughput model to better reflect the diverse needs of community college students; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to inform districts that they can offer, and students may enroll in optional pre-transfer level English and mathematics courses for California community college students to access educational pathways that meet their needs across the state.

CONTACT | John Stover, Santa Rosa Junior College

*+114.04.01 S26 Amend #114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request

Amend the 2nd Resolved |

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate to the California Community College Chancellor's Office and ~~other interested stakeholders~~ interest holders to ~~redefine the throughput~~

---

[141] Resolution 06.04 S22 Students' Right to Choose to Take a Pre-Transfer Level English or Mathematics Course
[142] Resolution 07.04 F23 AB 1705 Meaningful Metrics for Equitable Outcomes
[143] See slide 3: https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/MultipleMeasures/Presentations/ValidatingPlacementSystems.pdf
[144] See pp. 8-9; RP Group, & California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office. (2023). *Maximizing calculus completion for students seeking the Business Administration degree* (Multiple Measures Assessment Project Report). https://44593827.hs-sites.com/hubfs/Projects/Multiple%20Measures%20Assessment%20Project/AB705%20Workshops/Maximizing_Calculus_Completion_For_Business_Admin_Degree_May_2023.pdf
[145] California Education Code - EDC §78213(e)(2)

~~model~~ consider other data beyond the throughput model to better serve the diverse needs of community college students~~; and~~.

CONTACT | John Stover, Santa Rosa Junior College

*^114.04.02 S26 Amend #114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request

Strike the 3rd Resolved |

~~Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges advocate to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to inform districts that they can offer, and students may enroll in optional pre-transfer level English and mathematics courses for California community college students to access educational pathways that meet their needs across the state.~~

CONTACT | John Stover, Santa Rosa Junior College

Resolutions	Page	Voting Results
*^101.01.01 S26 Amend #101.01 S26 Clarification, Recognition, and Inclusion of Specific Course Designators Within the Four Autonomous Core Disciplines	12	consent
#101.01 S26 Clarification, Recognition, and Inclusion of Specific Course Designators Within the Four Autonomous Core Disciplines	12	
#102.01 S26 From EdTech to TechEd: Building a Future-Ready Technology Education Framework in Title 5	13	
*^104.01.01 SP26 Amend +104.01 S26 Faculty and Local Academic Senate Role in College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Agreements	15	consent
*+104.01 S26 Faculty and Local Academic Senate Role in College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Agreements	14	consent
+105.01 S26 Protecting the Integrity of Student Course Information	18	
#106.01 S26 Supporting Equitable Faculty Leadership and Governance Practices in Local Academic Senate	21	
*#107.01.01 S26 Amend 107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data	23	consent
*^107.01.02 S26 Amend 107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data	23	consent
107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data	22	
*+108.01 S26 Use of Student Data in Artificial Intelligence Tools and AI Detection Technologies	23	consent
*111.01 S26 Adopt the 2026–2029 ASCCC Strategic Directions and Goals	27	consent
112.01 S26 Disciplines List - Counseling: Mental Health	34	
*+113.01 S26 Support for AB 2301 (Soria, as introduced February 19, 2026) to Establish a Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program	36	consent

*114.01 S26 Electronic Versions of the Program and Course Approval Handbook and Minimum Qualifications Handbook	42	consent
+104.02 S26 Strengthening Noncredit Student's Pathways to Credit Bearing Academic Programs	15	
+105.02 S26 Transparency of Estimated Weekly Student Time Commitment in Course Schedules and Registration Systems	18	
*^108.02.01 Amend +108.02 S26 Ensuring Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and Technology Platforms to Protect Student and Institutional Data	25	consent
+108.02 S26 Ensuring Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and Technology Platforms to Protect Student and Institutional Data	24	
*+111.02 S26 Review of ASCCC Executive Leadership Term Lengths	28	consent
112.02 S26 Disciplines List - Mathematics	35	
*+113.02 S26 Support for AB 2694 (Alvarez, as introduced February 20, 2026) to Modernize Regional Duplication Standards for Baccalaureate Programs	37	consent
*+114.02 S26 Promising Practices for Comprehensive Student Education Planning	42	consent
*+104.03 S26 Affirming the Integral Role of Journalism Programs in the California Community Colleges	16	consent
*^105.03.01 S26 Amend +105.03 S26 Supporting Systemwide Academic Integrity and Infrastructure for Distance Education in the Age of Agentic Artificial Intelligence	20	consent
+105.03 S26 Supporting Systemwide Academic Integrity and Infrastructure for Distance Education in the Age of Agentic Artificial Intelligence	19	
+108.03 S26 Ensuring Accessibility and Universal Design for Learning Across Instructional Modalities	25	
+111.03 S26 Study the Unified Faculty Model in Place in British Columbia in Terms of Academic Freedom and Student Success	29	

112.03 S26 Disciplines List - Uncrewed Aircraft Systems (UAS) Technology	35	
*+113.03 S26 Support for SB 960 (Cabaldon, as introduced February 3, 2026) to Expand Baccalaureate Degrees in Impacted Regions	38	consent
*+114.03 S26 Adopt Procedures for Progress Renewal to Increase Student Equity and Success	43	consent
#104.04 S26 Affirming Art History and Studio Arts as Essential Components of STEAM and Student Success in California Community Colleges	17	
*#105.04 S26 Estimating Student Savings and Standardizing OER/ZTC Savings Estimates	20	consent
+108.04 S26 Mathematics Pedagogy in the California Community Colleges	26	
*+111.04 S26 Promising Practices for Mental Health Counseling Faculty in the California Community Colleges	30	consent
*+112.04 S26 Update the ASCCC Tenure Review resources: “Towards A Model Four-Year Tenure Process” and “Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective”	36	consent
*+113.04 S26 Support for Full Implementation of 2025 Gender Equity Report Recommendations	39	consent
*+114.04.01 S26 Amend #114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request	44	consent
*^114.04.02 S26 Amend #114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request	45	consent
#114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request	43	
*^111.05.01 S26 Amend +111.05 S26 Defending Student and Faculty, Especially People of Color and Immigrants, Against Federal Attacks and Retaliation, and Restricting ASCCC Investments that Support Military Operations	31	consent
+111.05 S26 Defending Students and Faculty, Especially People of Color and Immigrants, Against Federal Attacks and Retaliation, and Restricting ASCCC Investments that Support Military Operations	30	

*+113.05 S26 Support for Sustained and Adequate Funding for High-Cost Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs in Higher Education and Reduction of Student Material Costs	40	consent
*+111.06 S26 Update the ASCCC Paper, “Protecting the Future of Academic Freedom During a Time of Significant Change”	32	consent
*+113.06 S26 Providing Dedicated Funding to Support California Community College Faculty to Develop and Integrate Environmental Equity Education Across All Disciplines	41	consent
#111.07 S26 Condemning Cesar E. Chavez Sexual Abuse and Honoring Survivors and the Farmworkers Movement	33	
#111.08 S26 ASCCC Support for International Women’s Day as a Holiday	34	

Resolutions Questions and Comments Period

Comments or Questions Received between March 13, 2026 and April 09, 2026

Resolution 104.01 S26 Faculty and Local Academic Senate Role in College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Agreements (Stephanie Curry)

COMMENT | Consider striking the first resolved statement because "reaffirm."

QUESTION | Does this build upon a previous resolution about faculty in dual enrollment having a central role?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | Gets more specific in the CCAP. Separates dual enrollment and CCAP.
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

Resolution 104.02 S26 Strengthening Noncredit Student's Pathways to Credit Bearing Academic Programs (Rhonda Williams, Ph.D.)

QUESTION | Does this refer to transfer students?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | It is for traditional transfer students. Final resolve for regimented data that is trackable and shareable because noncredit students do transition to credit and eventually transfer.
(Response from Rhonda Williams, Ph.D., author)

Resolution 105.01 S26 Protecting the Integrity of Student Course Information (Liz Encarnacion)

QUESTION | Isn't this already the case statewide and a violation of title 5?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | The instructors who take over the courses that have the ZTC and POCR markers will have to maintain the same level of instruction, because the ZTC and POCR are not in the title 5 recommendation.
(Response from Liz Encarnacion, author)

QUESTION | Would we get into an issue of academic freedom if a new instructor is assigned?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | *Because the district has the right to assignment. The instructors still have the right to choose the material, but they have to follow the ZTC designation. POCR alignment has nothing to do with academic freedom.*
(Response from Liz Encarnacion, author)

Resolution 105.03 S26 Supporting Systemwide Academic Integrity and Infrastructure for Distance Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence (Nicholas Petti)

QUESTION | How do you propose to fund the universal testing centers? What happens to the testing centers if the funding stops?
(Submitted by Deborah Gustlin, Gavin College)

ANSWER | Since we are urging the legislature to create testing centers, it would be up to them to provide funding and provide a sustainable plan.
(Response from Nicholas Petti, author)

Resolution 106.01 S26 Supporting Equitable Faculty Leadership and Governance Practices in Local Academic Senate (Ty Simpson)

QUESTION | What would it look like in action to do mentoring for underrepresented faculty?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | Ideally, we would have someone in that subgroup, or at least someone with an understanding of it. However, this is a conversation that would need to happen with the respective caucus'.
(Response from Ty Simpson, author)

QUESTION | How do you identify individuals?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | Directly ask the individual who they identify as.
(Response from Ty Simpson, author)

QUESTION | What would this look like for a rural campus, whose structures are different?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | Let me get back to you on this one.
(Response from Ty Simpson, author)

QUESTION | How can we encourage this, considering resources and time constraints?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | Depends on the college.
(Response from Ty Simpson, author)

COMMENT | Consider including examples of resources.
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

Resolution 107.01.01 S26 Amend 107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data (Natalie Lopez)

QUESTION | Where and to whom is the documentation being sent?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | The documentation is not being sent anywhere. It's retained for the purposes of record, as much of the documentation done by the Academic Senate.
(Response from Brandi Bailes, Crafton Hills College)

QUESTION | Why do you feel this is necessary, considering items are documented in the Academic Senates?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | The resolution calls for conversations and engagement around the topic. The amendment only asks that those be documented. If the assumption is that the Academic Senate will already document it, why would the assumption not also be the Academic Senate already engage in topic?
(Response from Brandi Bailes, Crafton Hills College)

Resolution 108.01 S26 Use of Student Data in Artificial Intelligence Tools and AI Detection Technologies (Stephanie Curry)

QUESTION | What would constitute "de-identified student data"?
(Submitted by Aree Metz, Woodland Community College)

ANSWER | De-identified data is information from which personal identifiers – such as, names, addresses, and

social security numbers – have been removed or masked to prevent the identification of an individual.
(Response from Stephanie Curry, ASCCC Executive Committee)

QUESTION | Is this about using AI grading exams?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

COMMENT on QUESTION | Yes, and if you are using an AI tool to help grade, you are risking data privacy, aka FERPA. Also, there are concerns from the student perspective (i.e., being required to use AI for an assignment).
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | It could be, it is very general and for every type of AI use.
(Response from Stephanie Curry, ASCCC Executive Committee)

Resolution 108.02 S26 Ensuring Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and Technology Platforms to Protect Student and Institutional Data (Mark Branom)

COMMENT | This is not anti-AI, but to use it judiciously, correctly, and ethically.
(Comment by Mark Branom, author)

Resolution 108.03 S26 Ensuring Accessibility and Universal Design for Learning Across Instructional Modalities (Mark Branom)

COMMENT | The deadline for colleges to update their digital materials to meet WCAG 2.1 AA requirements is April 24th.
(Comment by Mark Branom, author)

QUESTION | Why do we need this if we are already required to do this?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | The vast majority are not doing this.
(Response from Mark Branom during 2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

QUESTION | Is this resolution asking for anything beyond what the laws are asking?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | The Final resolved statement asks colleges to review practices.
(Response from Mark Branom during 2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

QUESTION | Who is the purview for compliance? Is there a designated person who is responsible for compliance? The resolution reads as the faculty needing to demonstrate compliance.
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | Every faculty member is responsible for their own class. But the school and district are also required to do it. The faculty should be doing it in collaboration with the school.
(Response from Mark Branom during 2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

QUESTION | Adding the idea of asking for resources can help. I am concerned about asking the local senate to help with it (this is more of a school-wide thing than a senate thing).

ANSWER | The second resolved resources request.
(Response from Mark Branom during 2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

Resolution 108.04 S26 Mathematics Pedagogy in the California Community Colleges (Katia Fuchs)

COMMENT | I reached out to our math faculty. They expressed concern that the second Whereas seemed to imply that minimum qualifications are insufficient.

They offered a suggested revision: "The current minimum qualifications for California community college mathematics faculty emphasize disciplinary expertise but do not require formal participation in evidence-based participation in evidence-based or inclusive mathematics pedagogy."

QUESTION | Where is the evidence for the second Whereas?
(Submitted by Scott Sandler, Gavilan College)

ANSWER | Looking at the minimum qualification to teach mathematics, there are 4 possible routes: Master's degree in mathematics, master's degree in mathematics education, or master's degree in physics or statistics with a bachelor's degree in mathematics. Only if you have a degree in mathematics education, would you have the coursework related to mathematics pedagogy. If you have a "pure" math, physics, or statistics degree, you would have only taken the classes related to the subject matter, but no coursework related to how to serve or teach students. Of the 4 available tracks, only one involves coursework in mathematics education training.

(Response from Katia Fuchs during 2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

Resolution 111.03 S26 Study the Unified Faculty Model in Place in British Columbia in Terms of Academic Freedom and Student Success (Geoffery Johnson)

QUESTION | Looking at the 4th Whereas, what tools are you referring to in the statement?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | Working conditions, academic freedom, and due process rights.
(Response from Geoffery Johnson during 2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

Resolution 111.05 S26 Defending Students and Faculty, Especially People of Color and Immigrants, Against Federal Attacks and Retaliation, and Restricting ASCCC Investments that Support Military Operations (Karen Chow)

QUESTION | Whether or not this resolution falls under the purview of the ASCCC?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | Yes, it relates to academic freedom.
(Resolutions Committee)

Resolution 111.08 S26 ASCCC Support for International Women's Day as a Holiday (Angela Echeverri)

QUESTION | Whether or not this resolution falls under the purview of the ASCCC?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | ASCCC has previously supported a Resolution to support another potential public holiday, F24 Resolution 113.02 Designating an Official Native American Holiday for the California Community College System. And the second resolved directs the organization.
(Resolutions Committee)

Resolution 112.01 S26 Disciplines List - Counseling: Mental Health (Robert L. Stewart, Jr.)

QUESTION | Why was it pulled from consent?

(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | Required licensing to follow board requirements
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

Resolution 113.05 Support for Sustained and Adequate Funding for High-Cost Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs in Higher Education and Reduction of Student Material Costs (Marvin da Costa)

QUESTION | Concerns about equity, how to sustain funding, and what to do if funding drops out? Suggest in the second resolved to add: "recommend approval of Strong Workforce Program fund to help cover student out-of-pocket costs."
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | They are not the "purse holder," and they don't want to narrow down the funding source and be too specific. It is up to the people with the "purse" to designate.
(Response from Marvin da Costa during 2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

COMMENT | The amount of funding has dropped significantly this year (for instance, the strong workforce funding). We may want to talk to the chancellor's office about the legislative side to help with the funding.
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

QUESTION | Is this something we can talk to the executive committee after the resolution is accepted?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | This is something that the committee assigned has to interpret, and may consult with the author.
(Resolutions Committee)

Resolution 114.02 S26 Promising Practices for Comprehensive Student Education Planning (Trulie Thompson)

QUESTION | Is there a solution for different counselors using different Ed Plan systems (e.g., an EOPS program counselor may use a different program for Ed Plan)? How do we coordinate across different services?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | In their college, there is only one active Ed Plan, but this is something to look into.
(Response from Trulie Thompson during 2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

QUESTION | Consider adding a reference to the paper on counselor roles?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | We prefer to have it separated, and this resolution is more looking at gathering data and best practices.
(Response from Trulie Thompson during 2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

QUESTION | For the second, whereas, is this focusing on the disproportionately impacted students?
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

ANSWER | The student equity plan calls for identifying students who are disproportionately impacted, so the colleges have the data locally. This is just a matter of getting access to the data.
(2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)
(Response from Trulie Thompson during 2026 Spring Plenary Study Session)

Resolution 114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request (John Stover)

QUESTION | I am wondering if this third resolved is jumping the gun. What is the point of collecting the data if we are prepared to offer pre-transfer classes before collection of that data? I worry that this makes the first resolved feel disingenuous. This reads like a resolution with its mind made up.
(Submitted by Scott Sandler, Gavilan College)

ANSWER | Planning to propose to strike the third resolved statement based on the consultation from the math faculty.
(Response from John Stover, Santa Rosa College)

Resolutions	Page	Voting Results
*^101.01.01 S26 Amend #101.01 S26 Clarification, Recognition, and Inclusion of Specific Course Designators Within the Four Autonomous Core Disciplines	12	consent
#101.01 S26 Clarification, Recognition, and Inclusion of Specific Course Designators Within the Four Autonomous Core Disciplines	12	Acclamation
#102.01 S26 From EdTech to TechEd: Building a Future-Ready Technology Education Framework in Title 5	13	**Con** - spirit agree, back track extensive research, need resolution for the research before passing something like this. Who would be teaching Ai competency. Things are going to title 5 too quickly. Title 5 is hard to change. If we turn this over to CCCO, faculty lose their voice. **Pro** - student readiness and Ai and tech - looking to avoid outside usage without guidance from faculty. equitable approach for all students to have access to technology. already look at english and math competency. it takes 2-3 year to change title 5 so that it can be processed along side the growing understanding. **Parliamentary** - split resolve, remove 2nd resolve and group 1,3,4 vote. - MOTION PASSED ,TO SPLIT. **VOTE - YEA FOR 1,3,4 (80%- YEA), NAY FOR 2 (75% NAY) PERFECTED - YEA - PASSED (75%)**
*^104.01.01 SP26 Amend +104.01 S26 Faculty and Local Academic Senate Role in College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Agreements	15	consent
*+104.01 S26 Faculty and Local Academic Senate Role in College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Agreements	14	consent
+105.01 S26 Protecting the Integrity of Student Course Information	18	**PRO** - understand the concern that instructors concerns - they still have the right to change what within that. Insures access and equity. Does not restrict academic freedom. Bait and switch - OER **CON** - PT concern - negative implication that have to take up other instructors choice at the last minute. Last minute is not clearly defined. Year ahead scheduling. difficulty teaching someone elses material. Institution support the cost if there is a change rather than put it on the faculty. **Parliamentary** - SPLIT 2nd RESOLVE - Nay FAILED **VOTE - NAY - FAILED (75%)**
#106.01 S26 Supporting Equitable Faculty Leadership and Governance Practices in Local Academic Senate	21	**Parliamentary** - Motion for Acclamation. FAILS MOTION - SPLIT 2ND RESOLVE, FAILED NO 2ND, MOVE TO ADD LGBT - cannot ammend from floor. **CON** - does not include all groups PRO - does not exclude others, just identifies the most "agregously misrepresented" **VOTE - YEA - PASSED**
*#107.01.01 S26 Amend 107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data	23	consent
*^107.01.02 S26 Amend 107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data	23	consent
107.01 S26 Academic Senate and Faculty Inclusion on Return on Investment (ROI) Data	22	**PRO**- ROI data is here, we don't like it but this encourages us to be involved. **VOTE - YEA - PASSED (86%)**
*+108.01 S26 Use of Student Data in Artificial Intelligence Tools and AI Detection Technologies	23	consent
*111.01 S26 Adopt the 2026–2029 ASCCC Strategic Directions and Goals	27	consent
112.01 S26 Disciplines List - Counseling: Mental Health	34	**PRO** - equitable mental health access - creation of discipline allows it. Support for providing basic needs. **VOTE - YEA - PASSED (95%)**
*+113.01 S26 Support for AB 2301 (Soria, as introduced February 19, 2026) to Establish a Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program	36	consent
*114.01 S26 Electronic Versions of the Program and Course Approval Handbook and Minimum Qualifications Handbook	42	consent
+104.02 S26 Strengthening Noncredit Student's Pathways to Credit Bearing Academic Programs	15	**PARLIAMENTARY** - Motion for Acclamation. FAILS MOTION **PRO** - asking for recognition of non traditional pathways, need resources, equity issue, data tracking. these students are our future. **CON** - Support of non credit but shame on us - taught for 33 years - not moving the needle. funds have been dumped into this and we need to look at it. **VOTE - YEA PASSED (98%)**
+105.02 S26 Transparency of Estimated Weekly Student Time Commitment in Course Schedules and Registration Systems	18	**PARLIAMENTARY -** Motion for Acclamation. FAILS MOTION **CON -** sends message of intensity - discourage enrollment **VOTE - NAY FAILED(52-62 54%)**
*^108.02.01 Amend +108.02 S26 Ensuring Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and Technology Platforms to Protect Student and Institutional Data	25	consent
+108.02 S26 Ensuring Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence and Technology Platforms to Protect Student and Institutional Data	24	**VOTE - YEA PASSED 95%**
*+111.02 S26 Review of ASCCC Executive Leadership Term Lengths	28	consent
112.02 S26 Disciplines List - Mathematics	35	**PRO** - missing essential math, seen examples math ed doesn't cover the material needed. support rigor of quals. **CON** - needs local decision, significantly change - reducing the pool. Targets Math ed, not inclusive - impact women and people of color. Decreasing representation, disproportionately. These are min quals - don't have to hire them. **VOTE - NAY FAILED 65%**

*+113.02 S26 Support for AB 2694 (Alvarez, as introduced February 20, 2026) to Modernize Regional Duplication Standards for Baccalaureate Programs	37	consent
*+114.02 S26 Promising Practices for Comprehensive Student Education Planning	42	consent
*+104.03 S26 Affirming the Integral Role of Journalism Programs in the California Community Colleges	16	consent
*^105.03.01 S26 Amend +105.03 S26 Supporting Systemwide Academic Integrity and Infrastructure for Distance Education in the Age of Agentic Artificial Intelligence	20	consent
+105.03 S26 Supporting Systemwide Academic Integrity and Infrastructure for Distance Education in the Age of Agentic Artificial Intelligence	19	**VOTE - YEA PASSED 94%**
+108.03 S26 Ensuring Accessibility and Universal Design for Learning Across Instructional Modalities	25	**VOTE - YEA PASSED 97%**
+111.03 S26 Study the Unified Faculty Model in Place in British Columbia in Terms of Academic Freedom and Student Success	29	**PRO** - Ed Code 87665 - no academic freedom for contigent faculty, Vancouver model has permanent status for contigent faculty - giving academic freedom. **CON** - working conditions **VOTE - NAY PASSED 62%**
112.03 S26 Disciplines List - Uncrewed Aircraft Systems (UAS) Technology	35	**VOTE - YEA PASSED (99%)**
*+113.03 S26 Support for SB 960 (Cabaldon, as introduced February 3, 2026) to Expand Baccalaureate Degrees in Impacted Regions	38	consent
*+114.03 S26 Adopt Procedures for Progress Renewal to Increase Student Equity and Success	43	consent
#104.04 S26 Affirming Art History and Studio Arts as Essential Components of STEAM and Student Success in California Community Colleges	17	**Parliamentary** - Motion for Acclamation. FAILS MOTION - **CON** - feels it is not necessary - interesting that it only calls out studio arts and art history **VOTE - YEA PASSED (64%)**
*#105.04 S26 Estimating Student Savings and Standardizing OER/ZTC Savings Estimates	20	consent
+108.04 S26 Mathematics Pedagogy in the California Community Colleges	26	**PRO** - Mim quals is a floor but not meant to carry us through our career - PD is important. Asking for tools. Nothing is being mandated. **PARLIAMENTARY** - QUESTION ABOUT DATES - 3rd resolve - spring 2027 report out **CON** - legislation - seeking alternative instead, success matrix - address single course success not subsequent, solution to student preparedness shouldnt be about professional training, and additional PD has negative impact on math faculty. Androgogy (adult) not pedegogy. No mention of who the taskforce is. **VOTE - YEA PASSED (92%)**
*+111.04 S26 Promising Practices for Mental Health Counseling Faculty in the California Community Colleges	30	consent
*+112.04 S26 Update the ASCCC Tenure Review resources: "Towards A Model Four-Year Tenure Process" and "Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Faculty Perspective"	36	consent
*+113.04 S26 Support for Full Implementation of 2025 Gender Equity Report Recommendations	39	consent
*+114.04.01 S26 Amend #114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request	44	consent
*^114.04.02 S26 Amend #114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request	45	consent
#114.04 S26 AB 1705 Pre-Transfer Data and Access Request	43	
*^111.05.01 S26 Amend +111.05 S26 Defending Student and Faculty, Especially People of Color and Immigrants, Against Federal Attacks and Retaliation, and Restricting ASCCC Investments that Support Military Operations	31	consent
+111.05 S26 Defending Students and Faculty, Especially People of Color and Immigrants, Against Federal Attacks and Retaliation, and Restricting ASCCC Investments that Support Military Operations	30	
*+113.05 S26 Support for Sustained and Adequate Funding for High-Cost Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs in Higher Education and Reduction of Student Material Costs	40	consent
*+111.06 S26 Update the ASCCC Paper, "Protecting the Future of Academic Freedom During a Time of Significant Change"	32	consent
*+113.06 S26 Providing Dedicated Funding to Support California Community College Faculty to Develop and Integrate Environmental Equity Education Across All Disciplines	41	consent
#111.07 S26 Condemning Cesar E. Chavez Sexual Abuse and Honoring Survivors and the Farmworkers Movement	33	Acclamation
#111.08 S26 ASCCC Support for International Women's Day as a Holiday	34	Acclamation

NC DEC Senate Updates 4/20/2026

I. **ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for RSI**
   a. **Approved and adopted by ACCJC for accreditation DE RSI reviews in 2025). See page 3 of the ACCJC Rubric now being utilized for ACCJC RSI reviews**
   b. **ACCJC eliminated asynchronous instruction as a form of direct instruction for Substantive Interaction - Item A**
   c. **Now direct instruction is defined and interpreted as referring to synchronous engagement**

II. **RCCD AP 2105 Revisions - Aim to Align with ACCJC Rubric and New Substantive Interaction Standard**
   a. **See pg. 4 for modification. Or see "Item 1i. for Instructor Contact" below**
   b. **Deleted language noted in red below**
   c. **Drafted by MVC DEC; Approved by NC DEC in March 12, 2026 meeting**
   d. **Approved by NAS in 4/6/2026 meeting; to be taken to April 27, 2026 DAS meeting for approval.**

Instructor Contact:

1. Any portion of a course conducted through distance education includes regular and substantive interaction between the instructor(s) and students, (and among students as described in the course outline of record), either synchronously or asynchronously, through group or individual meetings, orientation and review sessions, supplemental seminar or study sessions, field trips, library workshops, telephone contact, voicemail, email, or other activities. Substantive interaction is engaging students in teaching, learning, and assessment, consistent with the content under discussion, and also includes at least two of the following:

i. Providing direct instruction via synchronous or asynchronous methods;

III. **RCCD RSI Guidelines Revisions - Aim to Align the Existing RCCD RSI Guidelines With ACCJC Rubric and New Substantive Interaction Standard and AP 2105 Revision.**
   a. **Drafted by MVC DEC; Approved by NC DEC in March 12, 2026**

b. **Please see pg. 2 for the revisions. Or the modifications outlined below**
c. **Deleted language noted in red**
d. **This will be a future NAS and / or DAS Agenda Item this spring**

Substantive interaction is engaging students in teaching, learning, and assessment, consistent
with the content under discussion, and also includes *at least two* of the following:

i. Providing direct instruction via synchronous or asynchronous methods

- Synchronous Direct instruction is distance education classes with meeting(s) during scheduled days and times. Students will attend class online during the published course times. Additionally,
  students will log in to Canvas and complete work regularly throughout the week. Canvas and other technologies will be required to complete coursework.

  - Evidence of class meetings (ConferZoom, Recording, announcements with basic information about time, date, topic, link, etc.,).

- Asynchronous instruction is distance education classes with no scheduled meeting days.
  Students will log in to Canvas and complete work regularly throughout the week. Canvas and other technologies will be required to complete coursework.

  - Instructional videos (synchronous meeting recordings, self-made and/or curated instructional videos) with basic contextualization from the instructor about what to do with the materials.

IV. DE Certification Equivalency – DAS (March 2026) Request to local DECs to Consider @ONE Expansion

a. **NC DEC 4/9/26: Reviewed @ONE facilitated courses already taken by RCCD faculty but not included on DAS 2025-2025 approved DE Certification Equivalency list of options.**
b. **NC DEC voted to approve an exception for three of the four courses, not an expansion of the approved RCCD list.**
    - **If also approved in a future DAS meeting, this would allow faculty who took the three @ONE courses in good faith to now have them approved for DE Certification.**
    - **NC DEC did not recommend adding these to the already DEC and Senate approved list of @ONE DE Certification options.**

c. **This feedback is intended to be shared with DAS in their April 2026 meeting**
d. **The list of the four @ONE courses that were considered are found below.**
    - **Teaching with OER and Open Pedagogy for Equity (4 weeks)**
    - **Engagement Strategies for Live Online Teaching & Learning (4 weeks)**
    - **Introduction to Asynchronous Online Teaching & Learning (4 weeks)**
    - **Online College Counseling (4 weeks)**
        - **NOTE: NC DEC (4/9/26) - did not recommend this (OCC) course be included in the exception for RCCD DE Certification due to concerns that was not well aligned with the competencies for RCCD DE Certification.**
e. **All facilitated @ONE courses are options for future DE Re-Certification.**

V. **Peer-to-Peer Facilitator Role: A .2 Position to Manage the RCCD Peer-to-Peer DE Certification Process**
a. **Was a DAS March Agenda Item**
b. **DAS requested the JD for this position be reviewed by local DECs**
c. **NC DEC (4/9/2026) reviewed the P-2-P Job Description and duties**
    - **The consensus from the DEC members was that there were many duties that were not included in the JD,**
        - **A significant amount of "hidden" work – such as replying to the faculty at all stages of the process, as well as the many faculty who have questions about the rubric, process, timelines, backlogs, final certification status etc.**
        - **There was also discussion of the need for a lead to consistently organize P-2-P PD trainings for faculty to prepare for the P-2-P review.**
        - **MVC and RCC are holding DE P-2-P Certification days, where faculty meet with reviewers to have in-person reviews conducted.**
            - **MVC's DEP-2-P workgroup (lead and members) have secured SPRs to support this work and compensate the participants for these in-person offerings.**
            - **Ideally, the P-2-P facilitator role would ensure equity in terms of PD opportunities among all three**

colleges and would advocate for and coordinate equitable access to resources such as SPR opportunities.

- **DEC members also expressed concern that a .2 course release was not sufficient to manage this RCCD certification pathway across all three colleges.**
    - **The discrepancy between the workload and the compensation is particularly likely to be the case in years where there are many new FT & PT faculty hired and in re-certification years.**
        - **The Re-Certification Requirement: 6 hours of DE-focused training/professional development every 3 years.**

- **There were also discussions of the benefits of having local leads vs. one RCCD lead.**
    - **Local facilitators provide the benefits of having leads closer to the faculty they support.**
    - **Local leads also aid in coordination of P-2-P professional development training, support, resource requests, and coordination with local DECs and local Senates at each college vs. All three or. Not fulfilling these bridging roles.**

VI. **First Ever NC DEC & CMAC Collaboration – CMAC Supports NC DEC Chair's Request to Fund 11 Participants to June 2026 Online Teaching Conference. See details and the description below.**

Hello all Norco College faculty,

You are invited to apply to attend the upcoming **Online Teaching Conference** (June 23rd - 25th), held at the Hilton Hotel in Anaheim, CA. This opportunity is open to all faculty, including both full-time and Associate faculty. **OTC 2026 – Designing the Future of Online Learning: Human Element, Ethics, Innovation and AI**

The Course Materials Affordability Committee is offering to pay for ten faculty to attend this conference (up to $1,480 in funding each).

The first ten applicants will be accepted.
Attendance will be paid for using ZTC grant funds. Each faculty member will be responsible for following Norco College's Concur travel/expense report procedures, including obtaining a travel card to access the funds. If you have questions about the Concur process, please reach out to CMAC's Chair – Adam Martin (adam.martin@norcocollege.edu).

Below is the list of faculty participating in upcoming Online Teaching Conference:

1. Laura Adams
2. Tamara Cummings
3. Roberto Perez
4. Mona Shadia
5. Nancy Quinones
6. Adriana Moreno
7. Zina Chacon
8. Stacy Miklavcic
9. Daniel Turrubiartes
10. Shirley Ayangbah
11. Beverly Natividad

VII. NC DEC requests that NAS agendize and consider the unanimously approved NC DEC - November 2026 voting agenda items 2.2 – 2.5.

a. **These requests are intended to help the college adapt to meet several urgent needs and dramatically improve our DE planning and college's alignment with ACCJC Accreditation Standard 2.6 – Review Criteria.**
b. **The goal of the requests are to establish, maintain, and document compliance with new RSI accreditation requirements, new DOJ accessibility Title II laws, and the college's obligations under the CVC Master Agreement for Teaching Colleges - regarding establishing a robust**

POCR process that will POCR certify 20% of OL classes or sections within 2 years.

c. **NC DEC strongly and unanimously supported (in our 11/2025 meeting) the creation of DE Coordinator positions and approved detailed job descriptions for two positions.**
d. **NC DEC also unanimously voted to send a letter of support for DE Coordinators to the NC Executive Cabinet (11/2025)**
e. **A request for a NAS voting item to consider NAS formally supporting the NC DEC request for DE Coordinator positions was submitted for the 4/6/2026 NAS meeting.**
    - **NC DEC's request for this item was not included in the 4/6 or 4/20 NAS meetings.**
f. **These documents have been shared with MVC and RCC DECs for feedback.**
    - **MVC has submitted a DE Program Resource Request to fund a MVC RSI Coordinator position for their college.**
    - **They are similarly seeking funding to support the restarting of their POCR process.**
g. **The proposed NC DE Coordinator Roles involve the establishment of clear leadership, mandates, coordination, planning and implementation required to sustainably meet Norco College's evolving distance education needs.**
    - **# 1) RSI and Accessibility DE Coordinator**
        - **Aids the college's ability to establish and ensure the consistency of the necessary planning, policies, audits, reliable access to professions development, and practices needed to achieve our ACCJC Standard 2.6 accreditation and Title II WCAG level 2.1 AA DOJ legal requirements.**
        - **Improve the quality and regularity of communication with NC faculty, NC DEC and NAS awareness of RSI and Accessibility gaps, data, progress, and PD.**
        - **Documents compliance with our college's ongoing work to meet the ACCJC Standard 2.6 accreditation requirements.**
        - **Supports faculty and the college's ability to meet the new ADA Title II requirements, which is applicable to all web-content – across all modalities.**

    - **This includes all Canvas content and other digital content used for instruction.**
    - **A designated DE Coordinator position aid in the institutionalization and demonstration of our college's ongoing commitment and work to meet the RSI & other elements of the ACCJC Standard 2.6 compliance requirements, as well as the Department of Justice's new Web Content Accessibility Guidelines - WCAG 2.1 AA legal requirement.**
    - **Norco College and RCCD face a DOJ Title II compliance deadline of April 2026.**
    - **To date – to the best of NC DEC's knowledge - neither the college or district has an existing accessibility plan, DE Strategic Plan, or an upcoming plan to designate bodies or individuals who are charged with conducting this vital work.**
    - **Much of this work is well beyond the DE Chair's .2 reassign time and the capacity of DEC (and even our DE RSI and Accessibility sub-committees' ability) to accomplish.**
    - **NC DEC request for support is based in the agreement that our current DE practices are no longer sustainable – particularly as these new compliance and legal obligations are now permanent needs of the college, the faculty and district.**
- **This DE Coordinator also helps support and track progress towards the NC SPGM Student Success Goal – to eliminate equity gaps across all teaching modalities.**
- **Intentional support for DE Coordinator positions also improves the alignment of our strategic planning processes as well.**
    - **Increasing the benefits of DE participation, information sharing, and alignment of strategic planning among our various bodies, stakeholders, and cycles.**
    - **Ies. EMP, SPGM, SEP, District DE, District SPGM.**

- **In sum, this NC DEC request for a DE RSI & Accessibility Coordinator involves the designation of clear leadership to advance and maintain faculty and student success in DE courses.**
    - **This includes consistently informing, training, and supporting faculty.**
    - **Establishing and publicizing DE benchmarks for RSI and Accessibility**
    - **Gathering and utilizing data to help track progress.**
    - **Coordinating with stakeholders at the college, district DE, and other colleges as appropriate.**
    - **Managing the processes, practices, and support (as needed) to meet and sustain compliance with the ACCJC accreditation and DOJ federal legal requirements.**

- **# 2) DE Coordinator - A local NC POCR Lead**
    - **This position is designed to lead in the creation, coordination and ultimately running of a local NC POCR process.**
    - **Approval demonstrates the college's work to institutionalize support to consistently coordinate with the CVC Exchange, other POCR leads, and formally establish a local POCR team of reviewers.**
    - **Approval advances our 3 + years of considerable NC DEC work to prepare to establish a local POCR process, team, and support our ability to achieve Norco's CVC – OEI Master Agreement obligations (pg. 4, item 2.b).**
    - **NAS approval is an important first step to advance our college's ability to support and launch a sustainable and robust local NC POCR process.**
    - **A NAS designated POCR lead would also help open an already approved RCCD pathway for DE Certification.**
    - **It also advances our ability to establish a stream-lined "quality review" process for intra-RCCD faculty, who teach at multiple colleges.**

- **It also advances our ability to begin "quality review" approvals for those faculty who already have local POCR badges from other colleges.**
    - **Although faculty may have a course already certified at MVC, RCC, or other colleges as "QR" - we need a local NC POCR review to approve and allow their NC courses to be listed as "Quality Reviewed" on the CVC Exchange.**
    - **"QR" courses are listed highest on the CVC Exchange is this drives enrollment, gaining new enrollments from throughout the CCC system, increasing our college's funding, and alignment with our "Access" goals.**
- **Support for this position advances the ability of faculty, disciplines, departments, and the college to maximize efficiency in NC OL courses**
- **Numerous studies demonstrate that POCR significantly advances student equity outcomes, particularly for the populations identified in the NC Student Equity Plan. Thus, support for this position demonstrates a commitment to an established pathway to improve student success outcomes, and aid student completion.**
- **Designating a POCR Lead also helps our college to align with the highest (gold standard) in OL teaching in the CCC system.**
    - **It fosters alignment with the CVC-OEI Course Design Rubric.**
    - **Quality review badging also demonstrates that our "QR" courses are 100% alignment with the CVC – OEI Course Design Rubric and DOJ accessibility requirements.**
- **In sum, a vote for a POCR Lead provides the clear mandate and leadership required to launch and run a local NC POCR process provides, that provides a host of benefits. It provides new opportunities for faculty, disciplines, and the college to prioritize the highest quality distance education professional development, supporting our student success**

and equity goals. It also significantly advances our progress on meeting and sustaining our efficiency, enrollment, and accessibility goals.

- **NC DEC has voted to approve the NC POCR process, based on the MVC POCR pilot model**
    - **This process is managed by a POCR lead; who works with a team of POCR reviewers and POCR mentors, and the POCR applicant – who receives a stipend for obtaining a "Quality Reviewed" POCR badge and / or DE equivalency.**
    - **This position also is the liaison with the CVC Exchange, POCR mentors, other leads, manages the NC local POCR team, and coordinates their participation in the CVC POCR norming sessions every semester.**
- **Review of Progress to Date - NC DEC, in spring 2025, requested NAS approval to design a local NC POCR process to meet our CVC Master Agreement obligations – which was supported by NAS.**
- **NC DEC's subsequent fall 2025 request to launch our initial 3-course POCR pilot process (required by the CVC for NC to gain the status of a locally certified POCR college) was tabled.**
    - **The NAS and DAS priorities for the 2025-2026 is the creation and establishment of the new Peer-to-Peer DE Certification process and the June 2026 DE Certification deadline to continue to teach OL and hybrid classes.**
- **NC DEC would like to launch our 3-course pilot process next year and having NAS support for the POCR lead position is an important first step.**

h. # 3) Request that NAS Support the DEC Item to Re-Evaluate the DE Chair's Role and Re-Assign Time

- **The NC DEC also strongly and unanimously supports the re-evaluation of the DE Chair's duties and re-assign time considering the fact it has not been re-evaluated since 2020.**
- **The DE Chair role no longer realistically reflects the expanded roles and time commitments of this position.**
- **Since 2020, the number of faculty and students served in our DE spaces have both dramatically increased.**
    - **Before 2020, the college primarily offered face-to-face courses.**
    - **Since 2021 – the students have consistently primarily been enrolling in Distance Education courses.**
- **A host of new responsibilities have arisen since 2020, such as those resulting from the NC SPGM organizational changes (ie. Academic Council, APC and the creation of other new Councils).**
    - **The DE Chair is now expected to serve on Academic Council although this is not listed in the DE Chair's duties, and is not included in the .2 re-assign time.**
    - **Similarly, the DE Chair is now expected to represent DE when issues arise (ie. Equivalency, Certification etc.) in APC meetings as well.**
- **A host of new responsibilities and time obligations have also arisen with new District DE bodies and meetings (ie. DESP and Region 9).**
- **There has also been an ongoing need for additional district wide DE collaborations (such as involvement in the Peer-to-Peer Workgroup / DE Certification meetings).**
- **Additional areas that require significant time and attention from the DE Chairs include: Equivalency, Replacement for DE CAMP, POCR, RSI and Equity audits, evidence, compliance work, PD training, etc).**
- **The current DEC Chair at Norco College is currently fulfilling the roles of DE Coordinator / liaison with FPDC / District DE / TLC / CMAC regarding DE PD / RCCD Grants / and has also served as the NC POCR Lead for the last 2 years.**
- **This work goes well beyond a .2 for the DE Chair and NC DEC, and other DE Chairs agree that the scope of this work is no longer a .2.**

        - **A small sample of this work includes - successfully advocating for – and managing the process for one-time FPDC funds. This work supported a cohort of NC faculty to participate in the 60-hour POCR reviewer training needed to serve as a POCR reviewer.**
        - **Attending the POCR norming sessions required of local POCR teams.**
        - **Serving on a summer 2025 grants workgroup, applying for a Title V HIS grant – to support the joint efforts of NC and MVC (which applied collectively) – to launch robust, aligned and sustainable local POCR processes at Norco College and MVC, based on the established MVC POCR process.**
    - **A great deal of additional work advocating for the inclusion of the disaggregation of DE student success outcomes to be included in our strategic planning processes (ie. SPGM and SEP) and for alignment of strategic planning efforts and cycles.**
    - **Working with RCCD and NC Offices of Institutional Effectiveness to request that they gather disaggregated data on student success across all modalities. And to create DE PowerBi dashboards**
    - **Working with District DE and NC stakeholders to increase the transparency (regarding the people and processes) involved with DE tool renewals and discontinuation, as well as the timely notification of faculty of non-renewal.**
        - **The District DE tool budget is facing an approximately $200,000 potential deficit if all tools currently utilized are renewed, so these are significant issues for faculty and students.**
        - **This is particularly the case for Turnitin and MediaSite, which are the highest cost external apps paid for by District DE's limited tool budget.**
    - **With DE Chair re-assign time already significantly being exceeded – it would benefit the college to recognize, support, codify, and regularize this work.**

i. **NC DEC (4/9/26) also approved moving forward with a regularized / annual RSI institutional review process.**
    - **In summer 2025, this effort was initially led by the DE Chair.**

- **Without support of a DE RSI Coordinator tasked with this work, the considerable work of organizing, gaining necessary approvals, leading the team, and sharing the results of this work will likely continue to fall heavily on the NC DE Chair.**
- **Again, the scope of this work is beyond the .2 for this position.**

j. **At RCC and MVC, they have experienced extremely high rates of turnover in their DE Chair positions.**
   - **Each has had 4 and 3 (and soon to be a 4th) DE Chairs each over the last year or so.**
   - **Such high turn-over rates for these important positions makes DE coordination across the colleges (and within them) even more difficult.**
   - **This also provides strong additional evidence that the scope of the DE Chair position, and work involved, is well beyond the .2 allocated.**

k. **In sum, alignment with Standard 2.6 requires colleges to have ongoing institutionalized processes to guide improvements and that they use these results to guide improvements.**
   - **NC DEC's proposals - to establish DE Coordinators and review the duties and compensation for the DE Chair position to ensure that they are accurate and aligned – are intended to support the strengthening of high-quality DE, as well as the achievement and maintenance of alignment with Standard 2.6.**
   - **These approved NC DEC proposals also align with and seek to advance numerous EMP and SPGM and SEP goals, as well as providing additional financial and other returns on these investments.**

Reference - ACCJC Standard 2.6 and Review Criteria

ACCJC Accreditation alignment requires ongoing institutional level processes to guide improvements and ensure ongoing alignment with federal requirements for DE

- **"The institution regularly evaluates the delivery modes and teaching methodologies to supporting student learning and achievement for all students, and uses results to guide improvements *(Emphasis Added)***

- **"Institutions have practices in place to ensure ongoing alignment with federal requirements for distance education"** ***(Emphasis Added)***

ACCJC Standard 2.6 and Review Criteria Are Outlined Below

2.6. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that meet student and curricular needs and promote student learning and achievement for all students.

Review Criteria:

- The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of its delivery modes and teaching methodologies to supporting student learning and achievement for all students, and uses results to guide improvements.
- Institutions have practices in place to ensure ongoing alignment with federal requirements for distance education and correspondence education, and direct assessment, as defined in ACCJC's Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education and Policy on Competency Based Education (if applicable).

Possible Sources of Evidence Could Include:

- Program reviews that disaggregate student learning assessment data and student achievement data by mode of delivery
- Examples of improvements to delivery modes and/or teaching methodologies there were made in order to address gaps in student learning and achievement
- Institutional reports on changing needs of students and resulting plans for developing or improving delivery modes and teaching methodologies
- Local guidelines that establish expectations for effectiveness and quality in distance education and/or correspondence education (if applicable)

Source - **ACCJC Accreditation Standard 2.6 – Review Criteria**

District DE: RCCD Certification #s as of 4/16/2026

	RCCD	MVC	RCC	Norco
Total Active Faculty	2004	495	1040	469
Remaining Faculty required to certify by 6/2026	**892**	**211**	**455**	**226**
Certified Faculty	619	163	294	162
Not Required to be Certified by 6/2026	493	121	291	81

Certification Breakdown	RCCD	MVC	RCC	Norco
Certified Faculty	619	163	294	162
Equiv (@ONE & external trainings)	323	80	133	110
P2PR	33	9	17	7
POCR (paused pending funding)	16	12	4	0
Camp (closed 4/30/25)	247	62	140	45
Non-Renewal Choice (not in cert total)	10	3	5	2

DEC Chairs have raised four issues of concern regarding the DAS approved Peer-to-Peer process:

1. Backlog of faculty seeking P-2-P review.
    a. What is the status of this backlog?
    b. In addition to the lack of a sufficient number of available P-2-P reviewers - is the requirement that the reviewer be from a different college than the applicant also contributing to this backlog?
    c. Are the P-2-P in-person review day opportunities and PD being offered and supported in an equitable manner?
2. Several of the FT faculty are over their FTEs, limiting or preventing their ability to serve as P-2-P reviewers.
3. What is the length of time that these reviewers are doing the Peer-to-Peer reviews and being compensated through SPRs? The contract states that unless the SPRs are paid out of "grant, categorical, or one-time funding," the SPRs cannot go beyond two consecutive semesters. If the plan is to extend these SPRs beyond 2 consecutive semesters and are paid out of the general fund, they will have to go to the Association for "possible contractual status."
4. The length of time and communication regarding their status in terms of the time to be assigned a reviewer, as well as the notification of DE certification approval.

Current P2PR Reviewers with their faculty status and hiring dates:

Hired Fall 2025:

- Laura Adams: FT
- Kanya Godde-Chrisco: FT
- Alexis Gray: FT
- Debbi Renfrow: FT
- Sabrina Roberts: PT
- Carlotta Robinson: PT
- Susan Seifried: PT
- Soohyun Son: PT
- Melissa Wilson: FT

Hired Winter 2026:

- Gina Curasi: PT

- Brielle Erike: PT
- Camille Perry: PT

Hired Spring 2026:

- Alyssa Drake: FT
- Richard Garcia: PT
- Dakota Mattson: PT
- Ryan Peckingpaugh: PT