

# **Disciplines List Review Process**

---

**2003-2004 Standards and Practices Committee**

Mark Snowwhite, Chair, Crafton Hills College

Dave Clarke, College of the Siskiyous

Karolyn Hanna, Santa Barbara City College

Beverly Reilly, Rio Hondo College

Sophie Rheinheimer, Las Positas College

Julie Adams, Executive Director, ASCCC

---

# Contents

- BACKGROUND . . . . . 1
- PURPOSE OF PAPER . . . . . 3
- REASONS AND CONDITIONS FOR CHANGES TO THE DISCIPLINES LIST. . . . . 4
  - REASONS CONSIDERED ACCEPTABLE FOR SUBMITTING PROPOSALS . . . . . 4
    - Proposals to update language to reflect new terminology
    - Proposals to create a new discipline
    - Proposals to make an existing discipline’s minimum qualifications MORE restrictive
    - Proposals to make a currently existing discipline’s minimum qualifications LESS restrictive
    - Request for a change that requires change in regulations
  - REASONS CONSIDERED UNACCEPTABLE FOR SUBMITTING PROPOSALS . . . . . 6
- DISCIPLINE REVIEW PROCESS . . . . . 7
- TIMELINE . . . . . 9
- RESOURCES FOR LOCAL SENATES. . . . . 10
- APPENDICES . . . . . 11
  - APPENDIX A: SAMPLE PROPOSALS . . . . . 11
  - APPENDIX B: REVISION TO DISCIPLINES LIST FORM. . . . . 13



# Background

The system of minimum qualifications to teach or perform other faculty services in the California community colleges began in 1988 with the signing into law of the Community College Reform Bill (AB 1725). This legislation replaced the state's community college faculty credential with minimum qualifications and required the Board of Governors, relying primarily on the advice of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, to develop a framework of minimum qualifications that allows districts to institute hiring practices that meet their local needs.<sup>1</sup> Implementation of this mandate became the responsibility of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, which this legislation directed "to prescribe... a working definition of the term *discipline* and prepare and maintain a list of disciplines that are *reasonably related* to one another..." (Education Code §87357 (b)). In consultation with other system constituents, the Academic Senate recommended, and the Board of Governors adopted, a process for establishing the list of disciplines and related disciplines (referred to as the Disciplines List) to be used to determine minimum qualifications for California's publicly supported community college faculty. The Board adopted the original Disciplines List in July 1989.

The Education Code further requires that these minimum qualifications undergo periodic review so that they can be changed to reflect current standards. For this reason the Education Code requires that the Board of Governors

establish a process to review at least every three years the continued appropriateness of minimum qualifications, and the adequacy of the means by which they are

administered. The process shall provide for the appointment of a representative group of community college faculty, administrators, students, and trustees to conduct or otherwise assist in the review, including particularly, representatives of the academic senates, collective bargaining organizations, and statewide faculty associations. In addition, the group shall broadly be representative of academic and vocational programs in the curriculum from both urban and rural districts, and representatives of ethnic minority communities. (Education Code, §87357 (a) (2))

In accordance with this mandate, the Academic Senate conducts a review of the Disciplines List every three years to recommend additions and changes that keep it current. As required by the section of the Education Code quoted above, this review invites input from all major community college constituent groups and other stakeholders in the California Community College system.

The review of this entire process is examined through the consultation process and involves representatives from the Chief Executive Officers (CEOs), Chief Instructional Officers (CIOs), Chief Student Services Officers (CSSOs), Chief Business Officers (CBOs), and other constituent organizations. The first disciplines review was conducted in Spring 1990 and amended the original Disciplines List, approved the prior year. Since that time, reviews have been conducted, on a three-year cycle, in 1993, 1996, 1999 and 2002.

The Disciplines List actually consists of two lists of disciplines: "Disciplines Requiring a Master's Degree" and "Disciplines in Which a Master's

---

<sup>1</sup> Board of Governors July 1989

Degree is not Generally Expected or Available.” The disciplines on the master’s list require a master’s degree in that discipline (or in some cases, a specified professional license) or a master’s in a related discipline along with a bachelor’s in that discipline or related disciplines. The disciplines on the non-master’s list require *any* bachelor’s degree and two years of appropriate work experience or *any* associate degree and six years of appropriate work experience (Education Code §87357 (b) and Title 5 §43407). These lists are intended to assure the professionalism of faculty and guide day-to-day decisions regarding employment.

Title 5 Regulations specify additional minimum qualifications for certain subgroups of community college faculty. These include the following:

- ▶ Noncredit faculty (§53412)
- ▶ Apprenticeship instructors (§53413)
- ▶ Those in disabled students programs and services (§53414)
- ▶ Learning assistance or learning skills coordinators or instructors, and tutor coordinators (§53415)
- ▶ Work experience instructors or coordinators (§53416)
- ▶ EOPS directors (§56262)
- ▶ EOPS counselors (§56264)

AB1725 intended that the Disciplines List allow some local flexibility. Thus districts may establish qualifications greater than the minimums so long as those qualifications would provide the basis for better teaching or other service. In addition, districts may hire applicants who do not possess the minimum qualifications as precisely defined in the Disciplines List if they possess qualifications that are deemed equivalent. Districts are therefore required to develop standards and processes for determining

equivalency to the minimum qualifications, based on policy and procedures recommended by their local academic senates (see Equivalency to the Minimum Qualifications, Spring 1999 and Qualifications for Faculty Service in California Community Colleges: Minimum Qualifications, Placement of Courses Within Disciplines, and Faculty Service Areas, Spring 2004). Colleges also have the prerogative to place courses within disciplines—on recommendation of their curriculum committees—thus allowing faculty with the minimum qualifications in a discipline to teach the specific courses within that discipline.

# Purpose of Paper

The purpose of this document is to provide faculty members with a guide to the disciplines review process. The following sections of this paper will discuss reasons or conditions for recommending changes and/or additions to the Disciplines List and outline the review process. The paper will conclude with resources for local senates and other constituent groups to use as they consider proposing changes to the Disciplines List.

# Reasons and Conditions for Changes to the Disciplines List

There are four general reasons faculty may propose a change to the Disciplines List:

- ▶ To update language to reflect new terminology.
- ▶ To create a new discipline—either by splitting a currently existing discipline or by creating an entirely new one.
- ▶ To make the minimum qualifications for an existing discipline more restrictive.
- ▶ To make the minimum qualifications for an existing discipline less restrictive.

The following examples explain these reasons and conditions that may establish the need for change. It is intended that these comments will provide the reader with direction for preparing a proposal to change the minimum qualifications for a discipline. Local faculty reviewing locally proposed modifications would use these same rationales.

## REASONS CONSIDERED ACCEPTABLE FOR SUBMITTING PROPOSALS

### PROPOSALS TO UPDATE LANGUAGE TO REFLECT NEW TERMINOLOGY

**Condition:** A degree is no longer awarded under the exact name used in the disciplines list. For example, for many universities, what previously was called *Speech* is now called *Speech Communication*.

**Comment:** *These are pretty straightforward proposals. As a matter of bookkeeping, there would likely be little debate and delegates at a plenary session of the Academic Senate would approve forwarding the recommendation to the Board of Governors.*

### PROPOSALS TO CREATE A NEW DISCIPLINE

**Condition:** A completely new field has developed that truly is not covered in any existing discipline. For example, *multimedia* (non-master's list) was added in 1999 when it became established as a discipline.

**Comment:** *The proposal would need to demonstrate that the proposed discipline requires its own status and does not belong under an existing discipline. For disciplines on the master's list, a master's degree in that discipline would need to be available from at least one public university in the state.*

**Condition:** An area within an existing discipline has evolved such that it should have its own status as a separate discipline. For example, in the 2002 review the argument was made and accepted that *Sign Language/English interpreting* should be separated from *Sign Language*. They now are separate disciplines (on the non-master's list).

**Comment:** *The proposal will need to demonstrate that the newly proposed discipline is indeed distinct from the discipline in which it is presently included.*

**Condition:** Two disciplines were originally considered so closely related that their minimum qualifications are identical. There is a contention that each should have its own status as a stand-alone discipline because the educational preparation for one may not in fact satisfy the requirements for the other. For example, physics and astronomy are listed as combined on the master's list: *Physics/Astronomy*. In the 2002 review, an argument was put forth that although those with a master's in astronomy must complete

enough coursework in physics to have minimum qualifications in both disciplines, those with a Master's in Physics may not have had any coursework in astronomy and therefore may not have adequate preparation to teach astronomy. Thus a proposal to separate astronomy from physics makes sense.

**Comment:** *The proposal will need to demonstrate that the two disciplines do indeed require different minimum qualifications.*

#### PROPOSALS TO MAKE AN EXISTING DISCIPLINE'S MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS MORE RESTRICTIVE

**Condition:** To reconsider the appropriateness of a discipline's current minimum qualifications, specifically to make them MORE restrictive. For example, it has been argued that one who possesses a Master's in Creative Writing (usually an Master's in Fine Arts) should not be considered minimally qualified to teach all English courses.

**Comment:** *Support for this type of proposal needs to be substantial and well documented. Essentially, this type of proposal argues that the original minimum qualifications are inadequate and that they need to be adjusted. Such action will result in decreasing the number of faculty considered qualified to teach in that discipline. The proposal should focus on making the actual case, rather than assuming that more restrictive minimum qualifications will necessarily improve the quality of teaching within the discipline.*

#### PROPOSALS TO MAKE A CURRENTLY EXISTING DISCIPLINE'S MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS LESS RESTRICTIVE

**Condition:** To reconsider the appropriateness of a discipline's current minimum qualifications, specifically to make them LESS restrictive.

**Comment:** *As with the proposal to make minimum qualifications more restrictive, the proposal should argue that the original minimum qualifications were too stringent and that they*

*need to be adjusted. Such action will result in increasing the number of faculty considered qualified in that discipline. This proposal should focus on requirements needed to ensure that faculty are qualified to teach in the discipline (or provide services) and not on other expected effects such as increasing the hiring pool. Note that many of the reasons for changing the Disciplines List that have been previously rejected were requests to relax the standards. See the section on page 5 for examples of proposals determined to be unacceptable.*

**Condition:** To institutionalize a qualification that is commonly used as an equivalency for a particular discipline.

**Comment:** *We need to be careful with this one. "Because everyone is already doing it" is not a good reason. The proposal should take the position that expansion of the minimum qualifications for that discipline is appropriate because such qualification really does confer the expertise required to teach within the entire discipline.*

**Condition:** A license, credential, or other certification not already covered by Title 5 has become universally recognized as equivalent to an already named degree.

**Comment:** *In the past, many proposals that have been received have **not** been advanced because they are already covered in Title 5. Check there first. For example, Section 53410.1 specifies that a bachelor's degree plus certain professional licenses (i.e., Certified Public Accountant (CPA); Marriage, Family, and Child Counselor; Professional Engineer; Registered Dietician) may be accepted as equal to a master's degree. Title 5 §53417 establishes requirements for licensure or credentials when that license or credential is required for program or course approval. If a license or other credential is not specified in this section of Title 5, then it may be an appropriate matter for the Senate to consider.*

## REQUEST FOR A CHANGE THAT REQUIRES CHANGE IN REGULATIONS

**Condition:** A proposal is developed that is not covered by Title 5 Regulations but would require a change in the Title 5 language governing minimum qualifications for disciplines.

**Comment:** *In the past, requiring a change in Title 5 has been considered grounds for not advancing a proposal. However, the fact that a proposal might go beyond a change in the Disciplines List and require other changes in Title 5, or even the Education Code, should not automatically disqualify it from consideration. The Academic Senate may recommend to the Board of Governors changes in minimum qualifications that require other such changes in regulation or even in law. It would be the prerogative of the Board of Governors to accept or reject such a recommendation. At a minimum, the Standards and Practices Committee or the Senate Executive Committee may be able to direct the problem to a body better able to resolve it.*

## REASONS CONSIDERED UNACCEPTABLE FOR SUBMITTING PROPOSALS

**Condition:** A district is having trouble finding qualified candidates within a discipline area and expanding the minimum qualifications would remedy that problem.

**Comment:** *This is a district-specific problem and should not be addressed by changing the minimum qualifications for the entire system. To do so could potentially compromise the quality of instruction and other services, as well as the professionalism of our faculty. Alternatives for addressing this problem, at the district level, include offering specific courses as fee-based “community service” or non-credit courses.*

**Condition:** A district is having trouble finding enough load for certain faculty members, and expanding the disciplines that person’s degree

qualifies him or her to teach will enable the district to fill their loads.

**Comment:** *This also is a district-specific problem and should not be addressed by changing the minimum qualifications for the entire system.*

**Condition:** A district would like to hire faculty specifically to teach precollegiate basic skills courses in mathematics or English and suggests that basic skills be recognized as a sub-discipline to facilitate that effort.

**Comment:** *The Academic Senate has rejected Basic Skills as a separate discipline on numerous occasions. A proposed change that has been rejected may not be resubmitted unless it is supported by a substantially different rationale.*

**Condition:** A new discipline is proposed on the basis of there being a TOP code for it.

**Comments:** *TOP codes are developed by the Chancellor’s Office as a tracking and bookkeeping mechanism. They are not related to the defined minimum qualifications on the Disciplines List.*

The Academic Senate views the mandate to review the “appropriateness of minimum qualifications, and adequacy of the means by which they are administered” (Education Code §87357 (a) (2)), as a professional responsibility to be taken very seriously. Proposals to change minimum qualifications are carefully evaluated, disseminated statewide, and discussed with faculty and consultative groups in open hearings as well as at plenary sessions before decisions are made to endorse recommended changes and forward them to the Board of Governors. The Board of Governors has demonstrated its confidence in the integrity of this process, as evidenced by the fact that in the past fifteen years, (1989-2003) it has never rejected a recommendation from the Academic Senate to change minimum qualifications. The next section outlines the steps of the discipline review process.

# Discipline Review Process

Following are the steps required to take a Disciplines List Proposal from the proposal stage through acceptance by the Board of Governors.

## STEP 1: DISTRIBUTION OF RFPs TO THE FIELD

In the spring preceding the scheduled review, the Senate Office sends Requests for Proposals (RFPs) to local senate presidents, college presidents, chief instructional officers, curriculum chairs, personnel officers, and discipline professional organizations informing them of the opportunity to propose a change to the Disciplines List. The material contains information on the process and a timeline for submission.

## STEP 2: SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals may be submitted to the Senate Office by either a local senate or professional organizations:

- ▶ **Through Local Senates:** Any faculty member may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List. It is recommended that local senates hold hearings regarding the proposals among its faculty. The local senate must approve and forward the recommendation to the state Senate Office. The local senate president must sign the Disciplines List Change Proposal Form (see Appendix B) acknowledging that the local academic senate supports the proposal.
- ▶ **Through a recognized discipline or professional organization:** Any member of an organization that represents a discipline or profession may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List. The organization

should hold hearings regarding proposals among its members. The governing body of the organization must approve the recommendation. The organization's president must sign the Disciplines List Change Proposal Form.

## STEP 3: INITIAL REVIEW

The Standards and Practices Committee performs an initial review of proposals using the following criteria:

- ▶ Is the information on the proposal complete and accurate?
- ▶ Does the proposal exceed the scope of the Disciplines List review process?
- ▶ Has this proposal previously been considered and rejected by the plenary session?
- ▶ If so, is there new rationale, such that it may be considered a new proposal?
- ▶ Is there an indication that the proposal is being submitted to deal with a district-specific problem?

If this initial review reveals a problem with the proposal, the Committee Chair will contact the maker of the proposal in an effort to resolve the problem. Amendments to proposals **are** allowed at this stage of the process. If such problems are resolved to the satisfaction of the Committee, the proposal will be considered viable and advanced to the next step. The maker may withdraw proposals.

If a proposal is not advanced to the next step, the Committee Chair will formally notify the maker of the proposal of its status, the reasons for that

status, and the options available. Appeals are not recognized for a proposal rejected at this point in the process. The maker is free to resubmit the proposal in the next cycle, but would be well advised to correct the problems responsible for rejection at this level. The maker may not introduce the proposal at the plenary session as a resolution because only those proposals that have gone through the hearing process may be considered at session.

#### **STEP 4: PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS FOR DISSEMINATION**

All viable proposals are compiled into a single document, which is distributed to the field. At this point and extending through the remainder of the process, the proposal is locked. No changes may be made to the proposal, even by amendment during plenary session, and proposals may not be withdrawn.

#### **STEP 5: COLLECTION OF INPUT**

The Standards & Practices Committee then collects input on the proposals in two ways:

- ▶ Two hearings are held by mid-February, one in the North and one in the South. All testimony is collected.
- ▶ Any interested party may submit written comments to the Committee, via the state Senate Office.

#### **STEP 6: SUBMISSION TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

The Standards and Practices Committee presents the proposals and associated testimony to the Senate Executive Committee. The Committee also presents its recommendations (to advance to plenary or to reject) along with the rationale for those recommendations and any other comments that may assist the Executive Committee in its deliberations.

The Senate Executive Committee considers each proposal and either forwards the proposal for consideration by the body at the spring plenary session or rejects it.

If the Executive Committee rejects a proposal, anyone may still bring the proposal forward to plenary session by introducing a resolution “to reconsider” the proposed change at any of the Area meetings or at the plenary session.

#### **STEP 7: VOTING ON RECOMMENDED CHANGES**

The delegates to the spring plenary session, after due consideration, vote whether to adopt each proposal.

#### **STEP 8: SUBMISSION TO BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

Each proposal adopted by the Senate is forwarded to the Board of Governors as a recommendation. The Board of Governors considers the recommendations of the Senate and formally acts on them. To date, the Board of Governors has accepted all recommendations of the Senate.

#### **STEP 9: DISSEMINATION OF CHANGES**

The amended Disciplines List is published by the Chancellor’s Office, as the document titled *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges* and is posted on the Academic Senate’s website.

The entire Disciplines List Review Process takes approximately twenty-four months from the time it is initiated until recommendations are adopted by the Academic Senate, approved by the Board of Governors and an amended list of minimum qualifications is published by the Chancellor’s Office. The most recent review was completed by the Academic Senate in Spring 2002, approved by the Board of Governors in November 2002, and published as the 5th edition of *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*, in March 2003.

# Timeline

February/ March	First notice goes out to local academic senate presidents (including form with cover sheet indicating the criteria for submission of change)
April	Announced at Area Meetings
September	Second notice sent out to senate presidents, CIOs, CEOs, Curriculum Committee Chairs, discipline organizations, personnel officers. The proposed Disciplines List revisions are sent to senate presidents for discussion at Area Meetings.
October	A breakout will be held at the Fall Plenary Session to discuss the proposed revisions to the Disciplines List and to write resolutions as necessary.
October	All proposed Disciplines List revisions are due no later than 5:00 p.m. on Friday two weeks after the fall plenary session. Amendments and substitute motions can be written. <b>Please note that no revisions to the Disciplines List will be accepted after deadline including modifications to proposals already submitted.</b>
November	Proposed Disciplines List revisions will be mailed to senate presidents, CIOs, CEOs, Curriculum Committee Chairs, discipline organizations, and personnel officers no later than two weeks after the Fall Plenary Session.
December/ January	Consultation with CIOs, CEOs, and COFO (bargaining units). Informal consultation with personnel officers.
January/ February	Two hearings in the North and South on the proposed Disciplines List changes. Hearings can result in modifications of the proposed Disciplines List revisions, but no new proposals can be made for any discipline due to the consultation process.
March	The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate approves final versions of resolutions transmitting Disciplines List revisions for submission to Spring Plenary Session
April	Spring Session delegates vote on resolutions.
July	First reading by the Board of Governors on changes recommended by the delegates at the Spring Plenary Session.
September	Final action by Board of Governors.
TBD	Revised Document published by the System Office.

In accordance with Education Code requirements, the Academic Senate has completed reviews of the Disciplines List and endorsed changes at Spring Plenary Sessions in 1991, 1993, 1996, 1999, and 2002. The next scheduled review will be initiated in Spring 2004 and concluded in Spring 2005.

# Resources for Local Senates

Qualifications for Faculty Service in the California Community Colleges: *Minimum Qualifications, Placement of Courses Within Disciplines, and Faculty Service Areas* (Spring 2004).

*Equivalency to the Minimum Qualifications* (Spring 1999).

# Appendices

## Appendix A: Sample Proposals

### SAMPLES OF ADOPTED PROPOSALS:

The proposals below were adopted at past plenary sessions.

#### PROPOSED REVISION DISCIPLINE: CHEMISTRY

##### **Current Minimum Qualification for Chemistry:**

Master's in chemistry OR Bachelor's in chemistry AND Master's in biochemistry, chemical engineering, chemical physics, physics, molecular biology, or geochemistry OR The equivalent.

##### **Proposed Change:**

Master's in chemistry OR Bachelor's in chemistry *or biochemistry* AND Master's in biochemistry, chemical engineering, chemical physics, physics, molecular biology, or geochemistry OR The equivalent.

##### **Summary:**

The proposal states that a Bachelor's degree in biochemistry is now more common than in the past and that the course requirements for the biochemistry degree are not significantly different than those of the chemistry degree.

#### PROPOSED REVISION DISCIPLINE: PHYSICAL EDUCATION

##### **Current Minimum Qualification for Physical Education:**

Master's in physical education, or education with an emphasis in physical education, kinesiology, physiology of exercise, or adaptive physical education OR Bachelor's in any of the above AND Master's in any life science, dance, physiology, health education, recreation administration, or physical therapy OR The equivalent.

##### **Proposed Change:**

Master's in physical education, or education with an emphasis in physical education, kinesiology, physiology of exercise, or adaptive physical education, or exercise science OR Bachelor's in any of the above AND Master's in any life science, dance, physiology, health education, recreation administration, or physical therapy OR The equivalent.

##### **Summary:**

The proposal seeks to add exercise science to the minimum qualifications. This particular degree is offered at a number of colleges and universities.

#### PROPOSED REVISION DISCIPLINE: AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE AND AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE/ENGLISH INTERPRETING (DISCIPLINE TITLE CHANGE)

##### **Current Minimum Qualification for Sign Language:**

Bachelor's degree AND two years of experience, OR any associate degree AND six years of experience.

##### **Proposed Change:**

Proposal seeks to split Sign Language into two separate disciplines:

American Sign Language and American Sign Language/English Interpreting.

##### **Summary:**

The proposal states that a separation needs to be made between the hiring of American Sign Language instructors and American Sign Language/English Interpreting instructors. The two disciplines have different training, curricular goals and pedagogical methodologies.

## EXAMPLES OF PROPOSALS NOT ADOPTED

PROPOSED REVISION DISCIPLINE: BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE

**Current Minimum Qualification for Biological Science:**

Master's in any biological science OR Bachelor's in any biological science AND Master's in biochemistry, biophysics, or marine science OR The equivalent

**Proposed Change:**

Master's in any biological science, or zoology OR Bachelor's in any biological science AND Master's in biochemistry, biophysics, or marine science OR the equivalent

**Summary:**

The proposal recommends the addition of the zoology degree to the minimum qualifications.

**Reason for rejection:**

Zoology is a biological science, and thus it would be redundant to list all the subjects or specializations that are part of biology. (For example: Botany, cell molecular biology, physiology, microbiology, etc are all branches of biology.) In addition, zoology is too narrow a focus. Zoology is a constituent of biology. Thus, a degree in zoology is not sufficient as broad preparation of biology.

PROPOSED REVISION DISCIPLINE: FAMILY CHILD CARE (NEW DISCIPLINE)

**Current Minimum Qualification for Family Child Care:**

N/A (New Discipline)

**Proposed Change:**

Bachelor's degree AND two years of experience, OR any associate degree AND six years of experience.

**Summary:**

This proposal suggests the addition of a new discipline, family childcare. The proposal argues that it is more appropriate to have family childcare as a specific discipline as opposed to its being taught under the current early childhood education.

**Reason for rejection:**

The rationale was not sufficiently substantiated.

PROPOSED REVISION DISCIPLINE: EMERGENCY MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES

**Current Minimum Qualification for Emergency Medical Technologies:**

Bachelor's degree AND two years of experience, OR any associate degree AND six years of experience.

**Proposed Change:**

Bachelor's degree AND two years of experience, OR any associate degree AND six years of experience AND certification in one of the following: MD, RN, PA (physician's assistant), EMT-P, EMT II.

**Summary:**

The proposal recommends that the qualifications for EMT be changed to include certification. The argument is that this change will allow the discipline to better comply with state regulations.

**Reason for rejection:**

This proposal was rejected because certification was already covered in Title 5 §53417, which requires a faculty member to possess a certificate or license when one is necessary for program or course approval, or "whenever current occupational certification is essential for effective instruction, as determined through local hiring procedures" (See p. 5, above).

## Appendix B: Revision to Disciplines List Form

PLEASE TYPE (Note: Only typed forms will be accepted)

DISCIPLINES TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

PROPOSED REVISION:

If a current minimum qualification exists, please include with strikeouts and italics below (or attach). If the proposed revision is the addition of another degree, identify the UC or CSU campus where the degree is offered: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

REASON FOR CHANGE: (Check one)

- changes within the profession/discipline
- continually using the equivalency process to hire under a specific discipline
- clarify or eliminate confusion and ambiguity
- ensure the maximum degree of flexibility for the discipline
- new degrees are available
- other

BRIEF EXPLANATION:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Contact person: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Senate President: \_\_\_\_\_

College: \_\_\_\_\_

Submitted to local Senate by: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Approved by Local Senate: \_\_\_\_\_

OR

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

President: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Approved by Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

RETURN FORM TO:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

428 J Street, Suite 430, Sacramento, CA 95814

Fax 916-323-9867

Email: [asccc@ix.netcom.com](mailto:asccc@ix.netcom.com)





