

SENATE AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING
ACADEMIC SENATE OF GROSSMONT COLLEGE
MARCH 17, 1997
ROOM 370, 11:10a.m. - 12:20 p.m.

I. PRELIMINARY ITEMS

- A. Call to Order
- B. Approval of Agenda
- C. Approval of Minutes March 3, 1997

II. ACTION ITEMS

- A. Resolution to accept the Objectives of Strategic Plan Version 6.1 (Attachment A. 3-17-97)
- B. Resolution to support the inclusion of sexual orientation within the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District's non-discrimination policy. (Proposal is on Page 4 and 5 of (Attachment B. 3-17-97)
- C. Resolution to congratulate and welcome as tenured faculty Thomas Bell, Juliana Cardenas, Michael Golden, Kats Gustafson, Craig Milgrim, Nelson Paler, Beth Smith and Cary Willard

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. General Education Committee Report - Joyce Sake. (Attachment C. 3-3-97)
- B. Resolution to adopt the the 1986 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges position on academic freedom and tenure and the AAUP Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. (Attachment D. 3-17-97)
- C. Resolution to adopt the COFO Faculty Equity Statement (Attachment E. 3-17-97)
- D. Resolution to broaden the list of courses eligible for Auditing purposes within the Grossmont College Audit Policy and Procedures. (Attachment F 3-17-97)

- E. Draft of GCCCD Legislative Program 1997-98 (Attachment F. 3-17-97)
- F. Senate Officers Committee Nominations : Nominations for the 97-99 term of Senate Vice President and two Senators at large will close on Monday April 21. The election will be held the week of April 28, with the results announced at the May 5 Senate meeting.

IV. OTHER MATTERS

- A. President's Report
Use of Foundation Donation.
Report on Cuyamaca's secession from the district.
Report on resolution regarding Vote of No Confidence.
- B. United Faculty Update

Next regular meeting Monday April 7, 1997
Proposed Agenda Items are due by 2pm, April 2, 1997

**GROSSMONT COLLEGE
STRATEGIC PLAN
VISION, MISSION STATEMENT, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
Preliminary Draft #6.1**

February 24, 1997

VISION STATEMENT

"STUDENT SUCCESS THROUGH EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE."

MISSION STATEMENT

"GROSSMONT COLLEGE WILL PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY EDUCATION AND SUPPORT SERVICES TO PREPARE STUDENTS FOR SUCCESS AT BACCALAUREATE INSTITUTIONS, TO DEVELOP THEIR WORKPLACE SKILLS, AND TO ENRICH THEIR SOCIAL AND CULTURAL AWARENESS SO THAT THEY MIGHT LIVE MORE PRODUCTIVE AND RESPONSIBLE LIVES."

PREAMBLE

As a forerunner in the community college movement, Grossmont College has built a reputation for excellence over the past 35 years, "one student at a time."

This Strategic Plan challenges the College to continuously assess its effectiveness in meeting the needs of its students and the local community and positions the institution to continue its reputation for service, commitment, and excellence. A central theme of this plan is that fact that Grossmont College is an institution of higher education with prescribed standards and expectations. We accept responsibility for our role in the learning process, and, at the same time, we expect students to commit themselves to their responsibilities as learners.

The following goals and objectives outline the direction for Grossmont College for the next three-to five-year period. This plan is the result of a lengthy and comprehensive process of campus-wide consultation, participation, review, and revision. Earlier drafts of the plan were discussed at several campus-wide meetings so that college personnel would have opportunity to comment and, at the same time, feel they had a part in preparation of the final document.

The challenge before us as an institution is to sustain our reputation for excellence by identifying, creating, and seizing every opportunity to enhance student success. We believe the Strategic Plan will assist the College in accomplishing this important goal.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
Preliminary Draft #6.1

February 24, 1997

GOAL 1: GROSSMONT COLLEGE WILL SUPPORT AND MAINTAIN EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE.

- Objective 1a: Grossmont College will provide high-quality instruction and services which develops college-level academic skills in reading, writing, math, communication, and problem solving.
- Objective 1b: All courses will have clearly-stated learning outcomes and appropriate measures will be established to assess student acquisition of the learning outcomes.
- Objective 1c: The college will provide instructional and student services that encourage students to define and achieve their educational goals in a timely manner.
- Objective 1d: The college will increase the number of students transferring to four-year institutions.
- Objective 1e: The college will increase the number of students completing career and training programs and the number of those students who achieve employment related to their training.
- Objective 1f: The college will support efforts to strengthen the academic curriculum at middle, high schools and adult schools.
- Objective 1g: Instructional departments and student services programs will strengthen ties with their counterparts in the region's postsecondary institutions.

GOAL 2: **GROSSMONT COLLEGE WILL ACTIVELY SEEK, SUSTAIN AND VALUE A HIGH-QUALITY, DIVERSE STAFF DEDICATED TO ACCOMPLISHING THE GOALS OF THE COLLEGE.**

Objective 2a: Grossmont College will seek, recruit, appoint, and maintain high-quality, diverse faculty who have deep knowledge and love for their fields of study, enthusiasm for teaching and counseling, and the ability to communicate clearly.

Objective 2b: Grossmont College will seek, recruit, appoint, and maintain high quality, diverse classified staff who are dedicated to facilitating a strong link between academic excellence and student success.

Proposed 2c: Grossmont College will seek, recruit, appoint, and maintain high quality, diverse administrators who are committed to educational excellence and student success and whose decisions will promote collegiality, engender mutual trust and cooperation, foster an openness to ideas and embrace cooperation and clear communication.

Objective 2d: By Fall 2001, the college will meet the district's goals and timetable for the college as outlined in an updated District Staff Diversity Plan.

Objective 2e: An on-going staff development plan will be developed and implemented that includes teaching/learning strategies, curriculum presentations, other related professional presentations or training, and an evaluation component to assess the effectiveness of the plan.

GOAL 3: GROSSMONT COLLEGE WILL PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS AND APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGIES, SUPPORT SERVICES AND STAFF TO ACHIEVE EDUCATIONAL GOALS.

Objective 3a: The college's comprehensive Technologies Plan will be updated and assessed annually.

Objective 3b: By Fall 2000, the college staff and students will have appropriate technologies and innovative instructional methodologies including multimedia.

Objective 3c: By Fall 2000, campus offices, instructor offices, instructional laboratories and classrooms will have appropriate technologies as defined by the college's comprehensive Technology Plan.

Objective 3d: By Fall 2000, the college will have adequate and appropriate staffing for instructional laboratories and supplemental instruction.

Objective 3e: By Fall 2000, the annual renewal rate of the Division of Learning Resources/Learning Resource Center's collection will have reached at least 60% of AB 1725 (Program Based Funding) standards for library materials.

GOAL 4: GROSSMONT COLLEGE WILL ESTABLISH, VALUE AND PROMOTE A CLIMATE THAT ENHANCES DIVERSITY, COLLABORATION, EFFECTIVENESS, AND STUDENT SUCCESS.

Objective 4a: By Fall 1998, college-wide activities and publications will address diversity concerns identified in the initial and ongoing campus climate studies.

Objective 4b: Grossmont College will increase enrollment of diverse students, reflecting the demographics of its service area.

Objective 4c: Grossmont College will strengthen support services for the International Student Program commensurate with enrollment.

Objective 4d: By Fall 1999, the college will have an organizational structure that is student centered, user friendly and efficient.

Objective 4e: By Fall 1999, the college will have a common vision of student success that promotes collaboration and trust among staff, faculty and students.

Objective 4f: The college will continue to work with the District Office and Cuyamaca College to develop strategies that improve working relationships.

Objective 4g: Grossmont College will annually increase student retention, without a reduction in academic standards.

GOAL 5: GROSSMONT COLLEGE WILL BE A VISIBLE, ENGAGED AND RESPONSIVE LEADER WITHIN THE WIDER COMMUNITY.

Objective 5a: The college will continue to increase collaboration and partnerships with private and public community-based organizations and with governmental agencies within our service area.

Objective 5b: By Fall 1998, the college will better serve all underrepresented populations within its service area.

Objective 5c: By Fall 2000, the college will have developed and implemented a system for integrating academic learning with community service.

Objective 5d: By Fall 1998, Grossmont College will establish an Issue Management Team to identify local, national and global issues that may impact the college planning process.

GOAL 6: GROSSMONT COLLEGE WILL IDENTIFY AND MEET INTERNAL STANDARDS OF ACCOUNTABILITY AND WILL PROMOTE EXTERNAL STANDARDS OF ACCOUNTABILITY.

Objective 6a: The college will publish and distribute an annual report to the public.

Objective 6b: By Fall 1998, every department, program, and service area will develop specific measures of effectiveness (staffing, equipment, funding, student outcomes, etc.) that are reviewed bi-annually.

Objective 6c: By Fall 2000, 80% of college programs will have undergone program review and 100% will have been scheduled to undergo program review, using 1996-97 as the initial review year.

Objective 6d: By Fall 1998, the college will be given responsibility for utilizing its total budgets, making transfers between budget areas in appropriate and innovative ways in order to stay within the total division and program budget while achieving agreed-upon goals.

Objective 6e: By Fall 1997, an ongoing institutional effectiveness research agenda will be developed, reviewed and revised annually.

Objective 6f: By Spring 1998, an integrated Educational and Facilities Master Plan will be completed and updated annually.

Objective 6g: The college will implement a refined General Education packet and a yearly evaluation mechanism to assess its effectiveness.

Objective 6h: By Fall 1999, the college will implement all prerequisites, corequisites, and recommended advisories.

GOAL 7: **GROSSMONT COLLEGE WILL INCREASE FUNDING, MAXIMIZE RESOURCES AND ENHANCE STAFF UNDERSTANDING OF AND INVOLVEMENT IN ALL BUDGETING PROCESSES.**

Objective 7a: The college will annually develop specific recommendations to adjust the district allocation formula so that a greater percentage of the district income be directed to college level instruction, services, infrastructure, etc.

Objective 7b: The college will implement a budgeting system based on planning processes to ensure an efficient use of resources.

Objective 7c: By Fall 1997, the college will develop specific recommendations to improve district purchasing and budgeting procedures, including more decisions and actions made at lower levels.

Objective 7d: By Fall 2000, the Grossmont College Foundation will contribute \$25,000 annually to the college.

Objective 7e: The college will annually increase its grant and other external funding income.

Objective 7f: The college will annually increase revenue from contract education services to the business community.

GOAL 8: **GROSSMONT COLLEGE WILL PROVIDE AND MAINTAIN AN ENVIRONMENT, INCLUDING INFRASTRUCTURE, THAT IS SAFE, FUNCTIONAL, ATTRACTIVE, ACCESSIBLE, AND ECOLOGICALLY SOUND.**

Objective 8a: By Fall 2000, the college will provide a safe, fully accessible, and aesthetically pleasing campus.

Objective 8b: The college will use physical resources in ways that reduce negative impact on the environment.

Sponsored by:
L.G.B.S.U.
(Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Student Union)
ICC Chartered Club

**THE INCLUSION OF SEXUAL
ORIENTATION WITHIN THE
GROSSMONT-CUYAMACA
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT'S
NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY**

Authored by: Timothy P. Holmberg

I. Issue/Concern:

Currently the Grossmont Cuyamaca Community College District (GCCCD) utilizes a non-discrimination policy that does not contain any provisions for sexual orientation as a basis for protection (the overall policy is divided into four separate policy statements (#'s 103, 320, 411, and 532) which were last amended in 1989).

II. Background:

As our nation approaches the twenty-first century we continue to embrace the principles of equal opportunity and equal protection under the law contained in our Constitution and its Amendments. It has become standard practice to communicate the protections that an agency provides through a non-discrimination policy so that there can be no confusion within the agency, and between the agency and those with whom it contracts. Nowhere is this more true than in our nation's public institutions which have come to set the equal-protection standards by which other organizations are judged. As our nation moves to incorporate the full extent of its diversity into the policies by which it operates, we increasingly find that sexual orientation is becoming a standard category protected from discrimination. In fact, although it is not yet required by law, many colleges and universities have already begun to provide basic protections on the basis of sexual orientation.

Of the numerous public and private colleges in the state of California a distinct majority offer protection from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (see enclosure 1). Additionally, efforts that are under way will mandate such protections in public schools state-wide (see enclosure 2). Our District's non-discrimination statement, which appears at the front of the current class schedule and elsewhere, delineates every distinguishable category for protection except that of sexual orientation, thereby leaving any protections that the GCCCD Board of Trustees may want to provide to this group as being *implied* rather than *expressed* (see enclosure 3).

Why should this be of concern to the GCCCD Board of Trustees?

An ever-widening pool of research is clearly illustrating that gay and lesbian students are facing tremendous difficulties in the course of pursuing their education, many of which are the result of neglect or outright hostility on the part of educational institutions and the administrations which oversee them. The campus environment fostered by a lack of direction and an overall vagueness of policy with regards to sexual orientation indirectly (and sometimes unintentionally) precipitates an often intimidating, and exclusionary climate within the institution. Without clear direction from the GCCCD Board of Trustees, individuals on our campus are left free to act out their biases and prejudices in often damaging ways (see enclosure 4). Instructors may not feel obligated to address discriminatory remarks directed at gay and lesbian students in the classroom or elsewhere, and students will sense an absence of support on the part of faculty and administrators. An atmosphere such as this will serve to further isolate gay and lesbian

students while emboldening the prejudices of intolerant ones. This type of environment is particularly harmful to college-age gay and lesbian students because it occurs at precisely the time when the majority of these students are undergoing their "coming out" or self-identification process, and, depending on the severity of the environment, can result in an increased risk of alienation, depression, and even suicide (see enclosures 5 & 6). In fact "it is estimated that up to 30% of all reported youth suicides each year are committed by lesbian and gay youth" (Harry 115-116).

According to the Kinsey survey, which is arguably the most comprehensive study on sexuality to date, ten percent of the population reported predominantly homosexual behavior and/or feelings (estimates have ranged higher and lower but the generally accepted number is around ten percent)(Kinsey et al). Utilizing the figures of the Kinsey survey, Grossmont College with an enrollment of over 15,000, may have some 1,500 students who would be considered gay or lesbian, excluding bisexual individuals or staff and faculty, who would fall into these categories. As these individuals embark on their "coming out" process some of them will seek support through the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Student Union (L.G.B.S.U.), or via supportive faculty, staff, or nurses at Grossmont College, but many more will be too afraid to come to club meetings or seek out the support they so desperately need.

In an informal research project conducted by Dr. Leilani Holmes of the Grossmont College Sociology Department one of the key concerns expressed by gay and lesbian interviewees, and perhaps a significant contributing factor to students' unwillingness to seek out campus-based support, was a concern for their own safety on campus (see enclosure 7):

"The Grossmont College campus does not seem to be a place where gay, lesbian or bisexual people feel free expressing their identity. Both groups [surveyed] agreed that it was not a good idea to freely express their sexuality at Grossmont . . . 'You have to be fearful - you can never let your [guard] down all the way and feel completely free'"(Holmes 40)

The fears expressed by students transcend a simple fear of other students, and go to the administration itself. Several students within the L.G.B.S.U. have expressed an open distrust of the administration when asked to refer harassment complaints to them. By not communicating a commitment to protecting gay and lesbian students via the District's non-discrimination policy the District fails to provide equal access to, and equal treatment by the GCCCD and all of its subsidiaries. The abuse that is suffered by students on our campus often goes unreported, and while this situation cannot be attributed entirely to the administration, the remarks of some administrators indicate disturbing realities that lend increased justification to students' fears. In recent communications with top administrators, an unwillingness to address this issue has been indicated (see enclosure 8).

The federal court system is increasingly holding school districts responsible for anti-gay abuse suffered by students in public schools, the most recent case involving Jamie Nabozny, a high school student in Wisconsin, who successfully litigated a case against his former high school that resulted in a settlement of over \$900,000.00. The Seventh US Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that "the Equal Protection Clause does, however, require the state to treat each person with equal regard, as having equal worth, regardless of his or her status . . . We are unable to garner any rational basis for permitting one student to assault another based on the victim's sexual orientation." (Buckel 11). This case is one of many which are demonstrating that school districts that do not take a proactive stance in preventing anti-gay abuse on their campuses will pay a high price. Apart from increasing legal ramifications, there are other motivations for the District to incorporate sexual orientation into its non-discrimination policy.

In the words of Dr. Sanchez, "Higher education is predicated on several factors, not the least of which is a free flow of information and ideas on all subjects" (Holmberg 15). In order for this to occur, all groups on both campuses must be afforded the same protections and both administrations in cooperation with the District must actively work to ensure that the environment they create is one in which individuals regardless of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, disability, medical condition, age, status as a Vietnam-era veteran, marital status, economic status, and sexual orientation will feel free to communicate their concerns, and will have the explicit assurance of the District that those concerns will be dealt with openly, fairly, and appropriately.

Proposal:

It is recommended that in order to achieve the aforementioned goals the GCCCD Board of Trustees take the following actions:

1. GCCCD's non-discrimination policy #'s ^{amending} 103, 320, 411, and 532 (last amended in 1989) be further amended to include sexual orientation.
2. The GCCCD, in cooperation with the Gay and Lesbian Community Center, develop a training program for staff, faculty, and administration aimed at providing vital background information which will enable these groups to more effectively meet the needs of gay, lesbian, and bisexual students, and facilitate improved understanding and communication between the GCCCD (and subsidiaries) and gay and lesbian students.
3. The GCCCD make a concerted effort to expand the amount of resource materials available in the LRC on gay and lesbian studies.
4. The GCCCD direct the entities responsible for curriculum development to review current and future curricula for purpose of eliminating negative references to gays and lesbians, and include applicable references and information on the gay community and same-sex relationships.

5. The GCCCD undertake ongoing efforts to combat prejudice and intolerance toward gays and lesbians as well as other minorities.

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District has shown in the past a commitment to providing an environment free of discrimination in which students can feel free to achieve their goals. The above proposals are in keeping with highest traditions of the GCCCD and will serve to demonstrate the District's continuing dedication to the principles of equal opportunity and equal protection under the law.

Works Cited:

Buckel, David. "Stopping Anti-Gay Abuse of Students in Public Schools". Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc. Legal memo :11.

Harry, Joseph, Ph.D., Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Youth Suicide v II, Rockville, Md.: US Dept. of Health & Human Services, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, 1989. Also published as Risk Factors for Youth Suicide 115-123.

Holmberg, Timothy P. "Grossmont College President Speaks Out About Gay and Lesbian Issues". Gay and Lesbian Times 13 Feb. 1997 Is. #477.: 15-16.

Holmes, Leilani, Dr. "Untitled" (informal research project). As yet unpublished. 1996, 39-41.

Kinsey, Alfred, C., "Sexual Behavior in the Human Male", Ed. W.B. Suanders, Pomeroy, W.B., & Martin, C. E., Philadelphia 1948.

GROSSMONT COLLEGE

Proposed Revision of Associate Degree General Education Requirements

This is a proposal to revise the general education requirements for students who are equipping themselves with an Associate Degree. THIS IS NOT a revision of the general education requirements for those advancing to a four-year institution for further study. Those requirements will remain the same (as they are printed in the College catalog on pp. 26-30).

The aim of the proposed set of requirements is to provide Associate Degree students with a common core of knowledge and skills determined by the faculty of this College to be necessary for effectiveness in the world of work and life in general. To this end the G.E. Committee started with several faculty forums at which they asked "What is a general education?" and "What should our students know and be able to do when they complete their Associate Degree studies with us?" Since these questions were last considered by the General Education Committee over fifteen years ago, resulting in our current requirements, members of the Committee thought it was time to ask them again in the interests of making sure our general education requirements reflect current realities and future trends.

Why change the current G.E. requirements?

1. To respond to the myriad social changes, work force changes, and the increasingly more varied educational aims of students attending our College as we move into the 21st Century. Preparing students for the next millennium requires a standards-based curriculum that focuses on skills and knowledge necessary to meet the challenges of the changing world around them.
2. To establish a set of categories which introduces students to specific bodies of knowledge and skills, while conforming to the requirements of Title 5. Some of the current categories are so broadly defined that students who take different courses in a category may complete those course with little knowledge in common.
3. To address skill development across the general education curriculum. The current curriculum focuses almost exclusively on knowledge acquisition (with the exception, of course, of writing and speaking skills). Employers have become increasingly more vocal about the skills they say are lacking in the graduates they hire. Not surprisingly, the employers' list matches almost exactly the list that evolved through discussions with our faculty.

What has been the Committee's process?

The following steps have been taken to date:

- May 1993: Initial meeting to discuss general education requirements with Grossmont and Cuyamaca faculty participating.
- January 1995: Next-steps meeting with Cuyamaca's Curriculum Committee (which is a combined Curriculum and G.E. Committee) and Grossmont's G.E. Committee.
- August 1995: Forum during Professional Development Week asking What do we want our graduates to know and be able to do when they complete their Associate Degree?
- Fall 1995: G.E. Committee frames initial proposal.
- January 1996: Forums during Professional Development Week to present initial proposal.
- Spring 1996: Initial proposal presented to Academic Senate, Deans and Directors and, through campus mail, to Chairs/Coordinators. G.E. Committee members seek invitations to department meetings and/or Division Councils to field questions and concerns. G.E. Committee continued to develop final proposal taking faculty input into consideration. Joint Grossmont G.E./Cuyamaca Curriculum Committees meeting held to share progress.
- Fall 1996: G.E. Committee shapes current proposal. Joint meeting with two College committees held to share progress.

What is the Committee proposing?

- 1. The current categories be revised.**
- 2. Skills be infused across the G.E. curriculum.**
- 3. Current G.E. courses be resubmitted for review to determine relevance to new category structure/definitions and to assess the infusion of skills.**

1. Proposed categories and requirements follow:

Computer Literacy (1 course)

This requirement is designed to introduce students to the computer and commonly-used application software. Emphasis will be placed on those fundamental skills and knowledge needed for school, home and small business usage. Students may complete this requirement by establishing that they already are familiar with this subject matter or by taking one of the courses listed in the category.

Natural Sciences (1 lab course)

Courses in this category are those which examine the physical universe, its life forms, and its natural phenomena. They are designed to help students develop an appreciation and understanding of the scientific method and the relationships between science and other human activities.

Quantitative Reasoning (1 course)

Courses in this category are those which introduce students to concepts and skills which enable the student to analyze and solve problems.

Social and Behavioral Sciences (1 course)

Courses in this category are those which focus on people as members of society. Courses in this category should be designed to develop an awareness of the methods of inquiry used by the social and behavioral sciences and be designed to stimulate critical thinking about the ways people act and have acted in response to their societies and should promote appreciation of how societies and social subgroups operate.

Humanities (1 course)

Courses in the humanities are those which offer different perspectives from which to study the cultural activities and traditions of human beings, the complexity of the human experience. They help reveal how individuals and societies through the ages have tried to make moral, spiritual, and intellectual sense of human existence. These courses should help students, in other words, try to answer the question: "What does it mean to be human?". The humanities explore questions of meaning and value, asking not only what is and has been significant for human thought and action, but also why it has been so.

Arts (1 course)

Courses in the arts provide students with a sense of the arts in civilization, of creativity in the artistic process, of the vocabularies of artistic communication, and of the critical elements necessary to making informed choices about the products of the arts.

English Composition (1 course)

Courses in this category cover the principles and applications of language toward logical thought, clear and precise expression, and critical evaluation of written communication.

Oral Communication (1 course)

Courses in this category are designed to expand the ability of students to communicate effectively interpersonally and/or before groups. Audience analysis, logical thought, clear, precise, and engaging expression, and critical evaluation skills are emphasized.

Health Maintenance (2 one-unit courses)

Courses in this category cover the basic principles of maintaining a healthy life style, including exercise and nutrition. Students must take one course from section one and one course from section two.

Section One: Body Fitness

Section Two: Activities

2. Proposed skills to be infused across the G.E. curriculum follow:

The following skills/understandings will appear to a greater or lesser extent in the content and delivery of each G.E. course. These applications, by their presence in all G.E. courses, will reinforce learning and prepare the student for further study (including lifelong learning), for the workplace, and for life.

Required in each general education course:

Reading

Critical Thinking

Writing

Awareness/Appreciation of Diversity

Ethical Standards: Personal, Academic, Workplace

Speaking/Listening

Two of the following must also be integrated into each general education course:

Quantitative Reasoning
Group/Teambuilding
Healthy Living
Computer Literacy
* Information Competence.

The Committee is currently working on definition sheets for each of the above and will solicit input from members of the campus community with expertise in each of these areas.

What is the timeline for accomplishing this transition?

Spring 1997:	Approvals secured.
97/98 Acad. Yr:	Course proposals submitted for approval.
Fall 1998:	New General Education requirements implemented.

February 1997

1986 Spring, Resolution 062 -Hiring/Tenure

... "Be it further resolved that the Joint Legislative Committee consider the following reasons for continually protecting and sustaining tenure for faculty members in all segments of higher education in California:

1. Tenure is essential to the protection and preservation of academic freedom --the freedom to teach and the freedom to learn--and is thereby indispensable to the success of higher education in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.
2. Tenure enables teachers to dare to say what they think, to dare to talk with each other as a community of scholars and to dare to bring into discussion views that may differ from those that currently prevail and tenure thereby vitally contributes to the advancement of truth.
3. Tenure is essential for academic due process in colleges and universities, and thereby for effective and equitable procedures for faculty discipline and termination.
4. Low status, low salaries, and long hours do not attract quality teachers; but tenure, which promotes academic freedom and employment security, is a major means of attracting men and women of ability into the teaching profession, and thereby also contributing to faculty recruitment.
5. Tenure protects teachers against fear of reprisal, intimidation, and enforced conformity, and therefore is instrumental to free exchange of ideas, innovation, and openness to creative change.
6. In the absence of tenure, the temptation and likelihood exists, especially in terms of financial crisis, of terminating teachers regardless of their experience and ability, merely because they are the highest paid, thereby reducing faculty quality and teaching excellence.
7. Instituting "rolling" contracts as an alternative to tenure obviously undermines tenure; this, in turn, leaves academic freedom, due process, and employment security less protected, and thereby diminishes achievement of the Commission's stated goals and higher education's contribution to the public good.

reaffirmed by Academic Senate
of Calif. Community Colleges
April, 1996
(Resolution 19.4 596)

1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure With 1970 Interpretive Comments

In 1940, following a series of joint conferences begun in 1934, representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) agreed upon a restatement of principles set forth in the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This restatement is known to the profession as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

The 1940 Statement is printed below, followed by Interpretive Comments as developed by representatives of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1969. The governing bodies of the two associations, meeting respectively in November 1989 and January 1990, adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.

The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to ensure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher¹ or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.^{[1]²}

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

- (a) Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
- (b) Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.^[2] Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.^[3]

¹The word "teacher" as used in this document is understood to include the investigator who is attached to an academic institution without teaching duties.

²Bold-face numbers in brackets refer to Interpretive Comments which follow.

- (c) College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.[4]

ACADEMIC TENURE

After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice:

1. The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.
2. Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank,[5] the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution, it may be agreed in writing that the new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years.[6] Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.[7]
3. During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.[8]
4. Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges and should have the opportunity to be heard in his or her own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon the case. The teacher should be permitted to be accompanied by an advisor of his or her own choosing who may act as counsel. There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from the teacher's own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution.[9]
5. Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably *bona fide*.

1940 INTERPRETATIONS

At the conference of representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges on November 7-8, 1940, the following interpretations of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* were agreed upon:

1. That its operation should not be retroactive.

2. That all tenure claims of teachers appointed prior to the endorsement should be determined in accordance with the principles set forth in the 1925 *Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.
3. If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph (a)(4) of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

1970 INTERPRETIVE COMMENTS

Following extensive discussions on the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with leading educational associations and with individual faculty members and administrators, a joint committee of the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges met during 1969 to reevaluate this key policy statement. On the basis of the comments received, and the discussions that ensued, the joint committee felt the preferable approach was to formulate interpretations of the Statement in terms of the experience gained in implementing and applying the Statement for over thirty years and of adapting it to current needs.

The committee submitted to the two associations for their consideration the following "Interpretive Comments." These interpretations were adopted by the Council of the American Association of University Professors in April 1970 and endorsed by the Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting as Association policy.

In the thirty years since their promulgation, the principles of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* have undergone a substantial amount of refinement. This has evolved through a variety of processes, including customary acceptance, understandings mutually arrived at between institutions and professors or their representatives, investigations and reports by the American Association of University Professors, and formulations of statements by that association either alone or in conjunction with the Association of American Colleges. These comments represent the attempt of the two associations, as the original sponsors of the 1940 *Statement*, to formulate the most important of these refinements. Their incorporation here as Interpretive Comments is based upon the premise that the 1940 *Statement* is not a static code but a fundamental document designed to set a framework of norms to guide adaptations to changing times and circumstances.

Also, there have been relevant developments in the law itself reflecting a growing insistence by the courts on due process within the academic community which parallels the essential concepts of the 1940 *Statement*; particularly relevant is the identification by the Supreme Court of academic freedom as a right protected by the First Amendment. As the Supreme Court said in *Keyishian v. Board of Regents* 385 U.S. 589 (1967), "Our Nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned. That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom."

The numbers refer to the designated portion of the 1940 *Statement* on which interpretive comment is made.

1. The Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors have long recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. Both associations either separately or jointly have consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in their utterances as citizens, in the exercise of their responsibilities to the institution and to students, and in their conduct when resigning from their institution or when undertaking government-sponsored research. Of particular relevance is the *Statement on Professional Ethics*, adopted in 1966 as Associ-

ation policy. (A revision, adopted in 1987, was published in *Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP* 73 [July-August 1987]: 49.)

2. The intent of this statement is not to discourage what is "controversial." Controversy is at the heart of the free academic inquiry which the entire statement is designed to foster. The passage serves to underscore the need for teachers to avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to their subject.

3. Most church-related institutions no longer need or desire the departure from the principle of academic freedom implied in the 1940 *Statement*, and we do not now endorse such a departure.

4. This paragraph is the subject of an interpretation adopted by the sponsors of the 1940 *Statement* immediately following its endorsement which reads as follows:

If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph (a)(4) of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

Paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom in the 1940 *Statement* should also be interpreted in keeping with the 1964 "Committee A Statement on Extramural Utterances" (*AAUP Bulletin* 51 [1965]: 29), which states *inter alia*: "The controlling principle is that a faculty member's expression of opinion as a citizen cannot constitute grounds for dismissal unless it clearly demonstrates the faculty member's unfitness for his or her position. Extramural utterances rarely bear upon the faculty member's fitness for the position. Moreover, a final decision should take into account the faculty member's entire record as a teacher and scholar."

Paragraph V of the *Statement on Professional Ethics* also deals with the nature of the "special obligations" of the teacher. The paragraph reads as follows:

As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of other obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

Both the protection of academic freedom and the requirements of academic responsibility apply not only to the full-time probationary and the tenured teacher, but also to all others, such as part-time faculty and teaching assistants, who exercise teaching responsibilities.

5. The concept of "rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank" is intended to include any person who teaches a full-time load regardless of the teacher's specific title.*

6. In calling for an agreement "in writing" on the amount of credit given for a faculty member's prior service at other institutions, the *Statement* furthers the general policy of full understanding by the professor of the terms and conditions of the appointment. It does not necessarily follow that a professor's tenure rights have been violated because of the absence of a written agreement on this matter. Nonetheless, especially because of the variation in permissible institutional practices, a written understanding concerning these matters at the time of appointment is particularly appropriate and advantageous to both the individual and the institution.**

* For a discussion of this question, see the "Report of the Special Committee on Academic Personnel Ineligible for Tenure," *AAUP Bulletin* 52 (1966): 280-82.

** For a more detailed statement on this question, see "On Crediting Prior Service Elsewhere as Part of the Probationary Period," *AAUP Bulletin* 64 (1978): 274-75.

7. The effect of this subparagraph is that a decision on tenure, favorable or unfavorable, must be made at least twelve months prior to the completion of the probationary period. If the decision is negative, the appointment for the following year becomes a terminal one. If the decision is affirmative, the provisions in the 1940 *Statement* with respect to the termination of service of teachers or investigators after the expiration of a probationary period should apply from the date when the favorable decision is made.

The general principle of notice contained in this paragraph is developed with greater specificity in the *Standards for Notice of Nonreappointment*, endorsed by the Fiftieth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors (1964). These standards are:

Notice of nonreappointment, or of intention not to recommend reappointment to the governing board, should be given in writing in accordance with the following standards:

- (1) Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
- (2) Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
- (3) At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.

Other obligations, both of institutions and of individuals, are described in the *Statement on Recruitment and Resignation of Faculty Members*, as endorsed by the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors in 1961.

8. The freedom of probationary teachers is enhanced by the establishment of a regular procedure for the periodic evaluation and assessment of the teacher's academic performance during probationary status. Provision should be made for regularized procedures for the consideration of complaints by probationary teachers that their academic freedom has been violated. One suggested procedure to serve these purposes is contained in the *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, prepared by the American Association of University Professors.

9. A further specification of the academic due process to which the teacher is entitled under this paragraph is contained in the *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, jointly approved by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1958. This interpretive document deals with the issue of suspension, about which the 1940 *Statement* is silent.

The 1958 *Statement* provides: "Suspension of the faculty member during the proceedings is justified only if immediate harm to the faculty member or others is threatened by the faculty member's continuance. Unless legal considerations forbid, any such suspension should be with pay." A suspension which is not followed by either reinstatement or the opportunity for a hearing is in effect a summary dismissal in violation of academic due process.

The concept of "moral turpitude" identifies the exceptional case in which the professor may be denied a year's teaching or pay in whole or in part. The statement applies to that kind of behavior which goes beyond simply warranting discharge and is so utterly blameworthy as to make it inappropriate to require the offering of a year's teaching or pay. The standard is not that the moral sensibilities of persons in the particular community have been affronted. The standard is behavior that would evoke condemnation by the academic community generally.

ENDORSERS

Association of American Colleges and Universities	1941
American Association of University Professors	1941
American Library Association (adapted for librarians)	1946
Association of American Law Schools	1946
American Political Science Association	1947
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education	1950

American Association for Higher Education	1950
Eastern Psychological Association	1950
Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology	1953
American Psychological Association	1961
American Historical Association	1961
Modern Language Association of America	1962
American Economic Association	1962
American Agricultural Economics Association	1962
Midwest Sociological Society	1963
Organization of American Historians	1963
American Philological Association	1963
American Council of Learned Societies	1963
Speech Communication Association	1963
American Sociological Association	1963
Southern Historical Association	1963
American Studies Association	1963
Association of American Geographers	1963
Southern Economic Association	1963
Classical Association of the Middle West and South	1964
Southwestern Social Science Association	1964
Archaeological Institute of America	1964
Southern Management Association	1964
American Theatre Association	1964
South Central Modern Language Association	1964
Southwestern Philosophical Society	1964
Council of Independent Colleges	1965
Mathematical Association of America	1965
Arizona-Nevada Academy of Science	1965
American Risk and Insurance Association	1965
Academy of Management	1965
American Catholic Historical Association	1966
American Catholic Philosophical Association	1966
Association for Education in Journalism	1966
Western History Association	1966
Mountain-Plains Philosophical Conference	1966
Society of American Archivists	1966
Southeastern Psychological Association	1966
Southern Speech Communication Association	1966
American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies	1967
American Mathematical Society	1967
College Theology Society	1967
Council on Social Work Education	1967
American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy	1967
American Academy of Religion	1967
Association for the Sociology of Religion	1967
American Society of Journalism School Administrators	1967
John Dewey Society	1967
South Atlantic Modern Language Association	1967
American Finance Association	1967
Association for Social Economics	1967
United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa	1968
American Society of Christian Ethics	1968
American Association of Teachers of French	1968

Eastern Finance Association	1968
American Association for Chinese Studies	1968
American Society of Plant Physiologists	1968
University Film and Video Association	1968
American Dialect Society	1968
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association	1968
Association of Social and Behavioral Scientists	1968
College English Association	1968
National College Physical Education Association for Men	1969
American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association	1969
History of Education Society	1969
Council for Philosophical Studies	1969
American Musicological Society	1969
American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese	1969
Texas Junior College Teachers Association	1970
College Art Association of America	1970
Society of Professors of Education	1970
American Anthropological Association	1970
Association of Theological Schools	1970
American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism	1971
American Business Law Association	1971
American Council for the Arts	1972
New York State Mathematics Association of Two-Year Colleges	1972
College Language Association	1973
Pennsylvania Historical Association	1973
Massachusetts Regional Community College Faculty Association	1973
American Philosophical Association***	1974
American Classical League	1974
American Comparative Literature Association	1974
Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association	1974
Society of Architectural Historians	1975
American Statistical Association	1975
American Folklore Society	1975
Association for Asian Studies	1975
Linguistic Society of America	1975
African Studies Association	1975
American Institute of Biological Sciences	1975
North American Conference on British Studies	1975
Sixteenth-Century Studies Conference	1975
Texas Association of College Teachers	1976
Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies	1976
Association for Jewish Studies	1976
Western Speech Communication Association	1976
Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education	1977
Metaphysical Society of America	1977
American Chemical Society	1977
Texas Library Association	1977
American Society for Legal History	1977
Iowa Higher Education Association	1977
American Physical Therapy Association	1979

***Endorsed by the Association's Western Division in 1952, Eastern Division in 1953, and Pacific Division in 1962.

North Central Sociological Association	1980
Dante Society of America	1980
Association for Communication Administration	1981
American Association of Physics Teachers	1982
Middle East Studies Association	1982
National Education Association	1985
American Institute of Chemists	1985
American Association of Teachers of German	1985
American Association of Teachers of Italian	1985
American Association for Applied Linguistics	1986
American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages	1986
American Association for Cancer Education	1986
American Society of Church History	1986
Oral History Association	1987
Society for French Historical Studies	1987
History of Science Society	1987
American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists	1988
American Association for Clinical Chemistry	1988
Council for Chemical Research	1988
Association for the Study of Higher Education	1988
American Psychological Society	1989
University and College Labor Education Association	1989
Society for Neuroscience	1989
Renaissance Society of America	1989
Society of Biblical Literature	1989
National Science Teachers Association	1989
Medieval Academy of America	1990
American Society of Agronomy	1990
Crop Science Society of America	1990
Soil Science Society of America	1990
Society of Protozoologists	1990
Society for Ethnomusicology	1990
American Association of Physicists in Medicine	1990
Animal Behavior Society	1990
Illinois Community College Faculty Association	1990
American Society for Theatre Research	1990
National Council of Teachers of English	1991
Latin American Studies Association	1992
Society for Cinema Studies	1992
American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies	1992
Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences	1992
American Society for Aesthetics	1992
Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies	1994
American Council of Teachers of Russian	1994
Council of Teachers of Southeast Asian Languages	1994
American Association of Teachers of Arabic	1994
Association of Teachers of Japanese	1994

3-17-97

COFO Faculty Equity Statement (Draft 6 - January 17, 1996)

We, the members of the Council of Faculty Organizations (COFO), recognize that the part-time and full-time faculty members of the California Community College System share common professional interests. The core of this common interest is our responsibility to provide educational opportunities of the highest quality to our students. To accomplish that purpose full- and part-time faculty must communicate effectively with each other, share institutional responsibilities and rewards, and create an academic community that is based on mutual respect. Part-time faculty must be recognized as competent, responsible and productive members of a distinguished and honorable profession. At the present time these conditions do not uniformly exist in the community colleges of California.

Providing students an excellent education and instituting fair working conditions for part-time faculty are complementary objectives. To this end, COFO supports the right of part-time faculty to participate in organizations and activities that shape the direction of the individual community college. All faculty should participate in departmental functions, assume organizational responsibilities, and contribute to the general well-being of the institution.

Full- and part-time faculty are required to meet the same minimum qualifications for employment and should be hired and evaluated using comparable processes. Students should have reasonable access to all faculty members—both full- and part-time. Since full- and part-time faculty have the same responsibilities to students, part-time faculty members should have the same support services, office space, choice of educational materials, and opportunities for professional development as their full-time colleagues.

Part-time faculty should be accorded fair compensation, professional respect and due process. It is the role of the Legislature, first and foremost, to protect part-time faculty from discriminatory treatment. Further, it is the recognized role and responsibility of individual bargaining agents to make contractual gains that will benefit part-time faculty which in turn will improve the educational quality of the institutions that employ them. However, we, the representatives to COFO, urge support of the following rights for part-time faculty: pro-rata pay, contractual consideration for full-time positions, health benefits, seniority or rehire rights, paid office hours, legitimate STRS pension opportunities and true professional status relating to teaching and learning issues.

We view the need for improving these conditions as self-evident, and we are confident that better communication and mutual respect between full- and part-time faculty, as well as frank discussions of these labor and educational issues, will lead to changes that will benefit community colleges and full-time faculty as well as the part-time faculty who are directly affected.

GROSSMONT COLLEGE
AUDIT POLICY and PROCEDURES

It is the policy of the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District Board to permit audit of courses as follows:

1. Audit enrollment will not be permitted until students have completed the allowable number of repeats in practice or performance courses. Courses are determined through agreement between the department and the appropriate administrator. Priority class enrollments are given to students desiring to take the course for credit. No student will be permitted to enroll for audit purposes until Monday of the second week of instruction.
2. A non-refundable audit fee of \$15 per unit plus any required student or instructional materials fee (e.g., health fee of \$10, Art material fees, etc.) shall be payable at the time of enrollment as an auditor.
3. Students enrolled in classes to receive credit for 10 or more semester credit units shall not be charged a fee to audit three or fewer semester units per semester. If the student drops below the 10-units level, the \$15 per unit audit fee will be assessed.
4. Audit enrollment will be based on "seats available" and will not be used to count toward minimum enrollment requirements. If a class closes after an auditor has been admitted, the auditor may be asked to leave to make room for the credit students. Instructor discretion is strongly recommended. Audit enrollments which allow faculty to be eligible for large class bonus will not be counted.
5. No student auditing a course shall be permitted to change his or her enrollment in that course to receive credit for that course.
6. Permission to audit a class is done at the discretion of the instructor and with the instructor's signed permission.
7. No credit will be received for auditing a course. The College will not maintain any attendance or academic records for MIS reporting.

Courses permitted for Auditing purposes:

ART	128	Ceramics III
DANC	080A, 080D	Modern Dance I, IV
DANC	084A, 084D	Jazz Dance I, IV
DANC	088A, 088D	Ballet I, IV
MUS	149	Classical Guitar Ensemble
MUS	239	Grossmont Master Chorale
MUS	251	Grossmont Symphony Orchestra
MUS	257	Jazz Ensemble
MUS	273	Summer Pops Chorale
PE	005	Adaptive Aerobic Fitness
PE	006	Total Body Fitness
PE	009	Aerobic Dance Exercise
PE	023C	Advanced Weight Training
PE	024	Olympic, Power, Circuit & Conditioning Training for Athletes
PE	040	Water Aerobics
PE	043C	Swimming
PE	044	Lap Swimming for Health and Fitness
PE	060C	Advanced Badminton
PE	070C	Advanced Racquetball
PE	076C	Tennis
PE	120	Advanced Bowling
PE	125C	Advanced Golf
PE	140C	Advanced Snow Skiing
PE	155C	Advanced Basketball
PE	170C	Advanced Soccer
PE	175C	Advanced Volleyball
PE	185C	Advanced Fencing

Procedures for students to audit a class:

1. Obtain course audit application from Admissions and Records Office.
2. Student completes application.
3. Instructor signs application.
4. Student submits application to Admissions and Records Office for eligibility verification and calculation of fees.
5. Student takes form to cashier to pay fees.
6. Student returns form to Admissions and Records Office to be processed.

GROSSMONT COLLEGE

COURSE AUDIT APPLICATION

SEMESTER Spring Summer Fall Year _____

Date: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State _____ Zip _____

Telephone: _____

SS # _____

Number of units enrolled for college credit _____.

Number of units enrolled for audit _____.

Section Number	Subject	Units	Instructor's Signature

I certify I have completed the allowable number of repeats in the above practice or performance courses. I understand I cannot change this enrollment to receive college credit.

 Student Signature

Admissions Office Use Only

Currently Enrolled _____ Units _____ Verified By _____ Date _____

Audit Units _____ Audit Fees _____ Other Fees _____

Cashier Office Use Only

Fees Paid _____ Verified By _____

Draft 2/18/97

Draft Draft Draft

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM 1997-98

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District legislative program provides guidance for the development of, and response to, state and federal legislation. The program continues core positions adopted since 1993 and suggests additional positions based on new and emerging community college issues.

new The improvement in funding for community college education coupled with an increased legislative emphasis on economic development and accountability demand creativity and openness to new approaches. At the same time it must be understood that a sound academic grounding will underlie not only transfer and associate degree programs but workforce training and retraining. Substantive communications skills, written, verbal or technological, will be needed to survive in an increasingly complex world.

The District's policy statements address five key areas in need of legislative attention:

Access
Financing
Workforce and Economic Development
Welfare Reform
Administrative Issues

STATE ISSUES

ACCESS

As long as community colleges are affordable to students from all segments of society, they are the gateway to equity. State budget proposals must ensure affordability and access.

Background

While the University of California and the California State University systems are to serve the top 12 1/2 percent and 33 1/3 percent, respectively, California's community colleges serve the top 100%, the most diverse of all postsecondary students. They are older, have lower family incomes, are predominantly part-time, and more likely to be independent of their parents for financial support than CSU or UC students. Community colleges have fewer students from middle income families and more women, minorities and disabled students than any other segment of higher education. The lowest income students often access community colleges through training programs.

delete?

[Faculty and staff interact with students in a wide variety of learning environments — from internet to one-on-one, from large and small classes in lecture and laboratory settings to telecourses and more.

Full-time, dependent community college students with the very lowest incomes (less than \$12,000) cover 54 percent of their education costs from their own savings and earnings. Districtwide, 2,710 students received federal Pell grants in 1995-96 with grant awards totalling almost \$4 million. Increased requests are already evident. Approximately 74% of those who actually apply for financial aid in our District do not receive aid due to the lack of available funds. Over 1,500 students were eligible for the Federal Work Study program in 1995-96, but were not awarded Work Study due to lack of funds.

In addition to the lack of sufficient financial aid, the shift in recent years from grants to loans is regrettable. ~~The proportion of grants to loans used to be approximately 75%/25%, but has been gradually reversing so that today most financial aid is in loans (75%) while only 25% of the aid is in grants.~~ The result is to encourage the acquisition of substantial debt by low income students. ~~The proposed policy positions support a more balanced approach to loans and grants.~~

Policy Positions with respect to access:

1. Oppose significant increase of enrollment fees which would severely, and negatively, impact student enrollment.
2. Strengthen transfer and articulation processes and seek more effective transfer guarantees to UC and CSU.
3. Support an increase in grants, not loans, particularly for first year students.
4. Support legislation which would link financial aid caps to the Consumer Price Index and reflect an increase in the number of students.
5. Oppose overly restrictive provisions for waiving student fees.
6. Support local administration of financial aid, including direct lending.
7. Support removal of physical barriers to community college campuses.
8. Support educational programs and services that assist under-represented populations, including those on welfare.

new 8. support increased funding and expanded eligibility for CAL Grants for community college students.

FINANCING

Funding for community colleges decreased in the early 1990s while the needs of students and the community at large were increasing. This resulted in reduced access, fewer programs and deteriorating facilities. Improved state funding must balance the accumulation of deferred needs, expanding demands for programs and services and fiscal stabilization.

Background

The low-cost higher education for all eligible citizens that was envisioned in the "Master Plan" is no longer a fact of life. Anticipation of Tidal Wave II, the high enrollment demand which will put community colleges at service to over two million students by 2005, (an increase of 350,000) will impact all aspects of the campus community, particularly facilities, four-year students and articulation. Yet the California Community Colleges are anticipated to continue to be the primary access route to higher education for most Californians, a route that includes transfer, career education and basic skills.

Community colleges provide quality post-secondary education at low cost. Consider the following State funding per full-time student (or full-time student equivalent):

University of California	\$14,362
Calif. State University	9,665
Calif. Community College	3,759
Kindergarten-12	4,228

Or compare with other taxpayer investments:

One year in State Prison	20,721
One year at Community College	3,759

There is a need for a stable, predictable funding base consistent with the mission of California's community colleges. Progress toward this goal can occur if there is adherence to the Proposition 98 funding split as established in its implementing statute (89 percent for K-12; 11 percent for community colleges) and property tax backfilling in case of shortfalls.

The Property Tax Issue

From 1991-1995, community colleges failed to receive budgeted State funding of over \$200M due to shortfalls in property tax revenue based largely on overly optimistic projections by the State Department of Finance. Post shortfall budgets and legislation have restored \$117.4M.

Cities, counties and other special purpose governments receive their property taxes directly and allocate them. K-12 education is subject to State estimates the same as community colleges. If the State has under-estimated property tax revenue, it "backfills" K-12 so there is no shortfall. There is no provision for "backfilling" community college property tax shortfalls.

To cope with the lack of reliability, despite budget approvals, college districts place funds in contingency reserves that would otherwise be available for programs and services.

Community college districts need either a guarantee of property tax revenue as is done for K-12 districts or an adjustment in the State's tax revenue projection methodology.

Capital Outlay Funding

State funds continue to be the major source of financing for community college capital facilities. Historically, the State obtains these funds through bond measures placed on the statewide ballot by the legislature in even numbered years. Bond funds are traditionally allocated to all three higher education segments in equal one-third portions, although community colleges serve more students and have more campuses. Over \$140M remains needed for Americans with Disability Act (ADA) projects just to meet federal basic compliance requirements.

Student Outcomes

Legislative interest in accountability in all segments of higher education has led to a contract with UC and CSU connecting funding to measurements. Interest in changing from process funding to outcomes funding must recognize the time it takes for outcomes to be reflected. Wage measurements of less than three years, for example, are not appropriate for a real look at long term impact.

Equalization

Community college regulations require equalization funding to help insure a similar level of programs and services to students throughout the state. Grossmont-Cuyamaca and Southwestern ~~community college districts have the lowest funding of any California~~ community college.

districts in the state. and Antelope Valley are

Policy positions with respect to budget and fiscal issues

1. Advocate for restoration and retention of the statutory division of Proposition 98 funds (10.98 percent for community colleges).
2. Support reimbursement for waiver of student health fees for low income students.
3. Support the backfilling of any remaining property tax shortfall and legislation which would require this.
4. Advocate for equalization funding.
5. Support State bond measures which allocate significant and equitable funds to community colleges and include funding for Americans with Disabilities Act projects.

- Move to p. 2 (access)*
6. Support increased funding and expanded eligibility for CAL Grants for community college students.

- delete?
not
needed?*
7. Support increased funding for instructional equipment and associated servicing, training, and maintenance.
 8. Support legislation making distance learning eligible for apportionment the same as classroom courses.
 9. Support State funding for technological improvements.

*Reorganized
this section*

WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Funds used for community college education are an investment in the economic growth of California. Community colleges will help the State regain its status as a leader in the emerging global economy by providing a trained and retrained workforce and by reaching out to directly support training and educational needs of business and industry.

Background

In 1996, SB1809 codified the community college/economic development relationship by adding "economic growth and global competitiveness through education, training, and services" to the primary mission of California's Community Colleges.

More than one million Californians enroll in community college vocational education classes each year. Local employees participate in short term vocational classes, customized job training, and continuing education programs. The proven cost-effective producer of current training is the community college system.

delete

California's community colleges are involved in retraining those who have been impacted by the downsizing defense industry and business and industry mergers from which nearly 200,000 jobs were lost in recent years.

Community colleges serve as the front door of opportunity for higher wage jobs and economic self-sufficiency for thousands who enter through pre-college work such as GED, English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) and remedial education programs.

ESL enrollment at Cuyamaca College has quadrupled in the last two years. The success of the New Horizons and CARE programs at Grossmont and Cuyamaca reflect the importance of support services such as child care and work study.

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District will:

1. Support initiatives which recognize community colleges as the state's primary delivery system for workforce training and retraining directed to adult learners and employers.
2. Support workforce training program designs that include support services and measure job placement and wage increases over three years or more.
3. Support proposals, including financial incentives, to encourage the use of industry equipment by community college students for training purposes.

4. Support favorable tax treatment of gifts of appreciated property and other charitable contributions.
5. Support funding for direct service to employers.

WELFARE REFORM

edited

Of the over 139,000 welfare recipients attending California's community colleges, about 70,000 are enrolled in vocational programs and thousands of others in basic education and GED preparation. Over 2,000 welfare recipients are students at Grossmont or Cuyamaca College. The educational challenge for community colleges is to assist welfare recipients in achieving the education and training they need to move to economic self sufficiency in an environment of changing workplace demands and opportunities. Experience has demonstrated that support systems, including child care and work study, maximize educational progress.

The 1996 federal welfare reform law limits recipients to one year of technical training, including remediation such as basic skills and English-as-a-Second-language. This is unrealistic given the educational handicaps of those with very limited basic skills who are often also have job and family responsibilities. It is also short sighted. The difference in earning power between a high school graduate and holder of an AA degree is \$250,000 over a lifetime.

For community colleges, involvement with welfare-to-work activities may involve one or more of the following:

1. Expansion of community college work-related activities such as work-study programs, cooperative work experience and internships and support services such as child care.
2. Expansion of basic education and ESL.
3. Education and training for welfare recipients in the workforce to help upgrade their skills and enhance opportunities.
4. Job development and placement activities for welfare recipients who have completed their educational program.

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District, in regard to welfare reform, will:

1. Advocate for inclusion of community colleges as a primary partner in the planning process for implementing welfare reform at the State level.
2. Support investment in programs that are long enough to provide sufficient level of training to support long-term workforce success.
3. Support a definition of work study as an activity that meets work verification goals.

4. Oppose overly restrictive provisions within welfare reform which impact the ability of welfare recipients to obtain employment and training which would have long term benefits and enable self support.

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

State-imposed regulations which are non-productive, duplicative or unnecessarily costly divert our attention from educational outcomes and focus us instead on wasteful processes. Increased interest in workforce development, welfare reform and performance based accountability is generating attention to measures of effectiveness.

Background

Government at all levels is looking to streamline, increase cost-effectiveness and ensure productivity. Community colleges have asked for increased flexibility which can recognize the advantages of consistency while allowing for experimentation and streamlining. Measurement of successful workplace preparation, wages earned, and responsiveness to labor market needs will need to be sensitive to short and long term assessment such as wage gains over time and occupational advancement. Measurement will also need to consider the complex lives of community college students whose college careers often consist of ~~period of~~ "stopping in" and "stopping out" in order to save money to afford further education or to deal with family issues.

Policy Positions with respect to administrative issues:

1. Support greater flexibility at local level including new procedures which allow focus on outcomes not process.
2. Seek reduction of state mandates in order to facilitate more local determination and as a means of reducing duplication. If new mandates are imposed, they must be accompanied by appropriate funding.
3. Support accountability standards that are quantifiable, educationally sound, and reduce duplication and include a context of long-term wage gain and occupational advancement.
4. Ensure that institutional default rates are measured accurately by the California Student Aid Commission and the federal government.
5. Support measures to streamline the community college facility planning and approval process.
6. Support administrative reform of Workers Compensation to reduce administrative costs and enhance service delivery.
7. Delete Field Act requirements for community colleges and replace them with the earthquake safety standards required of the UC and CSU systems.

8. Support legislation allowing local preference in the competitive bid process.

FEDERAL ISSUES

The 1997-98 legislative program at the federal level will include reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. This is now almost totally related to funding higher education student aid via both grants and loans. A federal commitment to education and training is a long-term investment in the country's human capital.

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District has positions addressing access to higher education, financing, workforce/economic development, welfare reform and administrative issues.

ACCESS

The Pell Grant program provides more than three-fourths of all financial aid for community college students, yet the need still exceeds available aid. To assure citizen access to higher education, the Clinton Administration has proposed a tax deduction of up to \$10,000 and a tax credit of up to \$1,500 to help families pay for college. Estimates of the cost of these "Hope Scholarships" are \$40 billion or more over a six year period.

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District will:

1. Support reauthorization of the Higher Education Act which will protect Pell Grant eligibility for low income students, those in vocation programs and those in need of remediation.
2. Support full funding of the Pell Grant program as currently structured.
3. Support an increase in grants, not loans, for first year students.
4. Support pilot projects to allow borrowers to earn loan forgiveness through community service work.

FINANCING

Experimentation with direct lending, which allows borrowers to make repayments to the IRS based on income, has proven cost-effective. The program should be retained and expanded to allow institutional choice between the loan programs.

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District will:

1. Support retention of both the guaranteed-loan program and the direct loan program without caps.

2. Support financial incentives, including favorable tax treatment, which would encourage gifts of appreciated property and other charitable contributions and the use of industry equipment by community college students for training purposes.

Section edited

WORKFORCE ISSUES

The U.S. Department of Labor's interpretation of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) requires community colleges to pay classified staff overtime at a blended salary rate if they teach a class beyond their usual job responsibilities. This results in classified staff earning more than full-time faculty or community members for equivalent work. It also inhibits local districts from hiring their own classified staff for part-time teaching positions.

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District will:

1. Support legislation which would amend the FLSA to allow community colleges to employ full time classified staff in part-time teaching positions with payment at the part-time teaching rate.
2. Seek maintenance of funding for workforce training programs through full funding of the Carl D. Perkins Act authorization, especially the Tech Prep Program.
3. Seek substantive involvement of California community colleges in major federal employment, training, and welfare initiatives with representation and authority on State and local boards.
4. Advocate for inclusion of California community colleges in the creation of voluntary industry education standards, work-based learning and apprenticeship programs and workforce development councils.
5. Support funding to enable assessment of job sites for accessibility for the disabled.

WELFARE REFORM

The educational challenge for community colleges is to assist welfare recipients in achieving the education and training they need to move them to economic self-sufficiency in an environment of changing workplace demands and opportunities. Experience has proven that support structures, including child care and work study, maximize educational progress.

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District will:

1. Support funding specifically targeted to education/training for welfare recipients.
2. Support definition of work study as a defined work activity meeting work verification goals.

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

Federal measures have been implemented to stop abuse of programs by institutions that are heavily reliant on them for their operating revenues. In California, federal Title IV funds, for example, constitute less than one-half of one percent of our institutional revenues, yet community colleges are among the most heavily scrutinized. In addition, Federal student loan policies determine eligibility, but hold institutions responsible for student repayment behavior.

The Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District will:

1. Support technical amendments to the 1992 Higher Education Act which would minimize local administrative burdens.
2. Seek a reduction in total number of federal mandates. If new mandates are imposed, they must be accompanied by appropriate funding.
3. Support modification of federal environmental law (The Environmental Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act) to require consideration of economic impacts.
4. Support initiatives to ensure that institutional default rates are measured accurately by the California Student Aid Commission and the federal government and do not unfairly penalize community colleges with low loan volume.

delete

