

## **SACC Agenda Items Updates April 2014 through present**

### **“P” and the PCAH**

April 2014: PCAH Draft Language changes on grades of “P” and ADTs and GE requirement for “transfer” AA and “CTE for Transfer” degrees. CCCCCO staff reported that, after a thorough review, there is nothing in Education Code or regulation that indicates a restriction on the use of “P” grades for an Associate degree. Therefore, the CCCCCO will remove this statement from the PCAH as part of an errata (which must be vetted through Legal Affairs). Further investigation determined that an errata was not acceptable; rather a CCCCCO memo was issued on May 20, 2014 that informed the field.

### **Eliminate the Word Discipline**

May 2014: Resolution 09.05 (SP13) Eliminate the word “Discipline” in the Taxonomy of Programs was discussed in SACC. Members recommended the language changes to the CCCCCO. The term “discipline” will be replaced with “program.” Legal staff found no issues and changes are to be posted to the website. The Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) manual is being revised to eliminate use of the word “discipline,” using the term “program” as a replacement. The Chancellor’s Office is waiting for the 2010 CIP Code and TOP Crosswalk before publishing the new version. There have been ongoing discussions of transitioning from TOP codes to CIP codes.

August 2014: SACC noted that they will discuss the implications of this transition at future meetings.

### **Adult Education (AB86)**

June 2014: SB 173 passed Assembly Committee. Funding for CDCP courses proposed (and later approved) for 2015-16. CCCCCO will update SACC with new information as needed.

March 2014: Discussed budget trailer bill and concerns continue to exist regarding allocations committee, as well as new concerns regarding the LAO documents, and rolling credit basic skills into block grants.

### **PCAH Revision**

June 2014: SACC recommends taskforce to conduct a PCAH revision. A work group is comprised of CCCCCO staff, CIOs, and faculty.

Possibly provide additional information on progress?

### **GE requirements for AA/AS and CTE degrees with program goal of “transfer”**

June 2014: Members expressed concerns about local (non ADT) degrees identified as “transfer” as the program goal in the Curriculum Inventory. The 5<sup>th</sup> Edition of the PCAH limited colleges to the use of IGETC or CSU pattern. Historically, colleges were permitted to allow students to choose among the local GE pattern, CSU GE, or IGETC for local degrees. SACC discussed several options but came to no conclusions. In January 2015, documents distributed (but not discussed) analyzed the degrees in the system and investigated possible solutions to the GE pattern determination so that colleges could best serve students. ASCCC resolution 09.01 (F2014) supports the option for local determination of using any GE pattern that matches the students’ goals, regardless of the program goal.

### **Noncredit Progress Indicators--elevating the priority of Title 5 changes to add SP (Satisfactory Progress)**

June 2014 and August 2014: SACC reviewed proposed language developed by the Academic Senate for needed modifications to title 5. The language was vetted with members from the original pilot group.

November 2014: SACC recommended that the language be put forward for approval and incorporation in reporting data elements.

### **Collaborative Programs Statement**

June 2014: CCCCCO is developing guidelines for collaborative programs and will bring these to SACC in the fall.

August 2014: SACC recommended that the CCCCCO create a template that colleges might use as parameters to establish programs to serve students. SACC adopted a philosophic principle statement in October 2014 and recommended that a statement on collaborative programs be reintroduced to the next PCAH revision.

### **Relationship of Units to Contact Hours**

August 2014: The CCCCCO described concerns of the assignment of units to contact hours and collecting apportionment. A worksheet was distributed.

October 2014: The CCCCCO posted a checklist for colleges to use when submitting applications for degrees, certificates, and courses. Commonly asked questions from the field are about units and collecting apportionment for homework.

### **ESL Coding for the Data Mart Basic Skills Progress Tracker Tool—Review of Coding Instructions.**

August 2014, September 2014, and October 2014, : Basic Skills courses coded with a CB21 value of “Y” – which should not be possible, but do exist – are in conflict with CB08. The CCCCCO indicates that there have been problems with data verification, and GoverNet is in the process of developing data checks in the Curriculum Inventory to cross check coding. Other coding issues arise with supplemental courses in labs and sequential courses. SACC recommended that the CCCCCO’s Academic Affairs and MIS divisions work with CIOs and ASCCC to identify the coding issues and ensure that recoding doesn’t negatively impact the Scorecard. Cris (email) asked LeBaron to set up a meeting.

September 2014: A review of CB21 rubrics took place.

March 2014: Colleges have coded ESL courses both in basics skills and degree applicable. There are ESL courses coded as degree applicable and coded as being up to two levels below Freshman composition. There is no uniformity in the degree applicability of ESL courses and additional discussions are needed to determine if more specific guidelines are needed. There are two interpretations of the Title 5 language. One could interpret the language that such coding may be inappropriate since one could compare these courses to other basic skills courses. The other interpretation is that ESL courses are much more like foreign language and the determination of degree applicability for ESL course work is subject to the same processes of approval as any other discipline's course that is seeking degree applicability. A separate work group (LeBaron and Craig) will work on this. The ASCCC will be asked to include ESL faculty in the discussion.

### **ADT Issues and Questions**

October 2014: Members recommend COT publish dates in February and September. Ongoing questions regarding ADT legislative mandates and implementation include the following:

- Does a college have to remove its existing degree if it has a transfer degree in the TOP Code and is not able to create an ADT?
- Does the existence of a degree with a CTE goal in a TMC TOP Code create a degree-creation obligation?
- What is the consequence of not creating an ADT as required by SB440?
- What is the process for modification of an existing ADT?
- If a student has completed the CSU Breadth and the local ADT only lists the IGETC pattern is the student prohibited from earning the degree? Doesn't SB 1440 indicate that the student has the option to use either transfer general education pattern?

- Why do all posted templates indicate that they were recently revised, yet no notice was made of what changes were made? Ongoing issues about the communication of template changes, TMC revisions and template modifications.
- What steps will be taken to ensure that templates are not modified or removed when ADT development is in progress? What if the TMC is modified by the discipline faculty? How do we ensure that the intended TMC is reflected in the COT?

March 2014: Members discussed the need for colleges to be able to document when an ADT obligation can be met. There needs to be documentation and proof of reasons why it will not work (anomalous materials, for example).

### **GoverNet Update**

November 2014: System changes have allowed the CCCCO to track data access. The goal of the August closure was for maintenance of the system. Some coding errors have required manual intervention and coding. A SACC-generated task force may be formed to review the system-wide CurricuNET issues.

February 2015: The Senate supported development of a system-wide management system (Resolution 9.09, Fall 2014), and this was shared with the committee.

### **Baccalaureate Degrees**

SACC was presented with information multiple times on the process and activity of the pilot. Conversations about the parameters of the degree need to be held.

### **CTE Task Force/Doing What Matters/Dual Enrollment**

December 2014: Vice Chancellor Van Ton-Quinlivan presented information. A white paper on Curriculum and Instruction issues will be shared with SACC members. Guidelines on dual enrollment need to be developed.

### **Credit/Community Service Combination Classes**

January 2015: CCCCO declared in September 2013 that there were no legal restrictions to offering credit/community services classes at the same time. A guidance document has been reviewed and vetted over multiple meetings since 2013. The CCCCO and the ASCCC believe this document is a priority. SACC members recommend the 2013 document to the CCCCO for adoption.

### **ADT approvals and articulation options:**

February 2014: There are two different scenarios for the use of existing articulation agreements in ADTs. The first scenario is when the template lists both C-ID and articulation as an option for course inclusion. Can the college submit a revised COT indicating the use of course-to-course articulation? Currently, this is a non-substantial change to an existing credit program (so the answer is yes?). The second scenario is when the TMC does not provide the option for using existing articulation agreements. The use of articulation agreements in this case would need to be discussed with the FDRG and accepted by ICFW and ICW.

### **Supervision of Foreign Language Labs**

May 2014, November 2014: Resolution 07.04 (SP14) Immediate Supervision in Foreign Language Labs. Title 5 § 58055 was discussed. SACC affirms that Title 5 changes are not necessary. ASCCC members are working with resolution authors to clarify why a change is necessary and depending on the outcome, resubmit the changes for further consideration by SACC.

### **Local Approval of Stand Alone Courses**

January and February 2015: The CCCCO is reviewing 132 courses using a 22 metric rubric. SACC members reviewed the rubric and expressed concern about the qualitative nature of the evaluation. Senate Resolution Fall 2014 09.03 Reinstating Local Approval of Stand Alone Courses recommends the CCCCO move toward reinstatement. The CCCCO assured members that results from the evaluation will be vetted by SACC at the March 26 2015 meeting.

March 2014: A partial report of 30 courses was presented to SACC. The committee expressed renewed concerns regarding the qualitative components that were measured and asked that those be removed. The committee also wanted to see the degree applicable and non-degree applicable courses.

#### **Credit by Exam/HS Articulation Title 5 55051, High School Articulation**

February 2015: Members discussed Senate Resolution 09.02 (Fall 2013) Modify Title 5 Language to Include Credit by Examination Processes into §55051. SACC recommended that draft language be proposed and consider interplay with other Title 5 language; issue of residency for units that are earned (should that be considered) and issues regarding units in “escrow.” The ASCCC has a resolution from Fall 2007 regarding this issue. The CCCCO would like a task force to work on this. Language MGH sent potential language to CCCCO by email with a request to meet.

March 2014: Language was present to the committee. Recommendations were made for minor language changes. The committee will review this again at an upcoming meeting

#### **Competency vs. Completion vs. Achievement certificates**

February 2015: Members discussed Education Code language and CDCP Certificates approval requirements as well as the difference between the various certificates. Certificates of Competency and Completion, defined in title 5 (section 84760.5), are for noncredit CDCP programs while Certificates of Achievement are used by credit certificate programs.

#### **Cooperative Work Experience.**

May 2014: SACC discovered a misalignment between the sections of Title 5 on work experience and course repeatability. Under Title 5 §55040, only occupational work experience courses are allowed to be repeatable, but general work experience courses are not. Therefore, SACC recently discussed and recommended proposed changes to §55040 (b) (6) that delete the word “occupational” and substitute the word “co-operative” throughout, thereby encompassing both occupational and general work experience. The regulations are with the DOF.

#### **Prison Inmate Education (SB 1391, Hancock)**

January, February 2014: The committee received multiple updates on the legislation implementation. An interagency agreement with the Department of Corrections is under discussion. There is a March 1, 2015 deadline with Department of Corrections for a two million dollar pilot program in which four to six colleges would work with state prisons to provide specific classes (CTE, apprenticeship, etc.) that could also benefit inmates as they transition back to society. The Department of Finance is seeking additional funding (\$5 million) from the Ford Foundation.