



SUBJECT: Disciplines List Revision Process

President
John Stankas
San Bernardino Valley College

Vice President
Dolores Davison
Foothill College

Secretary
Craig Rutan
Santiago Canyon College

Treasurer
Virginia "Ginni" May
Sacramento City College

Area A Representative
Geoffrey Dyer
Taft College

Area B Representative
Mayra Cruz
DeAnza College

Area C Representative
Rebecca Eikey
College of the Canyons

Area D Representative
Samuel Foster
Fullerton College

North Representative
Cheryl Aschenbach
Lassen College

North Representative
Carrie Roberson
Butte College

South Representative
LaTonya Parker
Moreno Valley College

South Representative
Anna Bruzzese
Los Angeles Pierce College

Representative at Large
Michelle Bean
Rio Hondo College

Representative at Large
Silvester Henderson
Los Medanos College

Executive Director
Krystinne Mica

Dear Colleagues:

In February, the process for formally reviewing the Disciplines List, which establishes the minimum qualifications for the faculty of California community colleges, was initiated. This letter serves as a notification that the ASCCC is currently accepting proposals to revise the Disciplines List for the 2019-2020 cycle. As a reminder, the review process is now an annual process. The deadline for submission of proposals is **September 30, 2019**. Proposals received after the deadline may be held for the 2020-2021 cycle.

Such a review was completed in fall 2018 for Homeland Security, which is now headed for a second hearing, before presentation for final approval by the delegates at the Spring 2019 Plenary Session.

The following resource materials are provided to assist you with developing and submitting proposed changes to the Disciplines List.

- Enclosure 1—Discipline List Proposal Process: This document provides you with a guide to the discipline review process.
- Enclosure 2—Discipline List Review Timeline: This timeline provides information about key deadlines. Please pay attention to the hearing dates, as each proposal must be heard in at least one hearing. Please note that the final day to accept proposals is **September 30, 2019**.
- Enclosure 3—Revisions to the Discipline List Form: This form is used to submit revisions.
- Enclosure 4 –FAQs on Minimum Qualifications: This FAQs document clarifies some common misunderstandings about minimum qualifications.

Please send this packet of materials to division/department chairs, curriculum committee members, your senators, vice president of instruction, and anyone else that might benefit from this information. All information noted above is available on our website by clicking [here](#). Information regarding the current minimum qualifications can be accessed [here](#).

If you have any questions, please contact us at disciplineslist@asccc.org. Please indicate Disciplines List on the subject line of the email.

DISCIPLINE LIST PROPOSAL PROCESS

How Changes Are Proposed?

There are two avenues for proposing changes: 1) through a local or district academic senate or 2) through a recognized organization*. Although the process for new proposals remains the same, a procedure for resubmissions has been added. For more detailed information about the process, we highly suggest you review the Disciplines handbook, which can be accessed on our website at: http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/DLHandbook_Final_0.pdf.

Any Disciplines List proposal must have the following evidence, which is essential because it provides the rationale about why the change is needed as well as informs the field that the research has been completed to ensure that the change is necessary. A lack of documentation about the need of Discipline List Revision may cause the proposal to be delayed or rejected by the Executive Committee. Please use the following check-list to ensure all you have conducted all necessary research.

Required investigation of the following and statement of findings:

- Contacted an associated professional organization to determine support of proposal
- Included evidence of degrees within the proposed revision of the discipline or new discipline.
- Provided a list of the titles of the degrees and programs to document the need for a new or revised discipline using the below criteria:
 - Minimum of three degrees
 - Regionally accredited institutions (all public institutions in California)
 - Disciplines in the Master's List requires evidence of the availability of master's degrees
 - Disciplines in the Non-master's List requires evidence of the availability of degree, certification, and/or professional experience, if necessary
- Provided statewide need documented by evidence to show a change is necessary and not merely a response to a unique need of one college, district or region. Demonstrated a balance of need across the state and included a discipline seconder from another district.
- Explained the impact of proposal across the state using a list the pro and con arguments and including refutation of the con arguments
- Provided other evidence such as significant changes to the field that requires a change to the Disciplines List.
- Provided a ½ page written rationale to be included in public documents.

New proposed changes may be submitted:

- 1. Through the local/district senate**
 - a. Any faculty member may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List.
 - b. Local academic senates should engage in discussion regarding the proposals among its faculty.
 - c. Local academic senates must approve any/all recommendations before forwarding them to the Academic Senate Office. This local senate president must sign the Discipline List Revision Form.
- 2. Through a recognized discipline or professional organization**
 - a. Any member of the organization may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List.
 - b. The organization should hold hearings or engage in discussion regarding the proposals among its members.
 - c. The governing body of the organization must approve any/all recommendations before forwarding them to the Academic Senate Office. The president of the organization must sign the Discipline List Revision Form.

*Recognized organization: an organization that is registered at the Chancellor's Office as

representing a specific discipline, or a regional, state, national, or international organization with a formally adopted constitution or by-laws.

Previously proposed changes that were not adopted at a plenary session, may be resubmitted only if a new justification and rationale are provided, AND the Discipline List Revision Form is submitted to the Senate Office by the final deadline of September 30, 2019.

DISCIPLINE REVIEW PROCESS
2019 – 20 TIMELINE

Month/Year	Process
February 2019	<p>Distribution of Process to the field 19-20. The Senate Office sends requests for proposals 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rostrum announcement and description of process • Website posting of announcement and description of process
March 2019	<p>Submission of Proposals. Proposals may be submitted to the Senate Office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through Local Senates: Any faculty member may initiate a proposal to change the Disciplines List. The local senate must approve and forward any such proposals, with the signature of the local senate president to acknowledge local senate support, to the Senate Office. • Through a 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 members of the organization should discuss proposals. The governing body of the organization must approve the recommendation. The organization’s president must sign the Disciplines List Change Proposal Form. <p>Discipline process is reinforced through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions at Area Meetings • Breakout Discussion at Spring Plenary • Update in <i>Rostrum</i> on the process <p>Initial review BEGINS when proposals are received and continues <u>until the proposal has had two hearings</u>. The Senate Staff and the Standards & Practices Committee perform an initial review of proposals using the following required investigation of the following and statement of findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contact with the professional organization to determine support of proposal ○ Evidence of degrees within the proposed revision of the discipline or new discipline. Please list the titles of the degrees and programs to document the need for a new or revised discipline. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimum of three degrees ▪ Regionally accredited institutions (all public institutions in California) ▪ Disciplines in the Master’s List requires evidence of the availability of masters degrees ▪ Disciplines in the Non-masters List requires evidence of the availability of degree, certification, and/or professional experience, if necessary • Statewide need documented by evidence to show a change is necessary and not merely a response to a unique need of one college, district or region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Balance of need across the state ▪ Discipline seconder from another district

**DISCIPLINE REVIEW PROCESS
2019 – 20 TIMELINE**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Impact of Proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact across the state ▪ List the pro and con arguments ▪ Include refutation of the con arguments ○ Other evidence such as significant changes to the field that requires a change to the Disciplines List. <p>In addition, the proposal must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be complete and accurate; • does not exceed the scope of the Disciplines List review process; • has not previously been considered and rejected by the plenary session or, if it has, it is supported by a new rationale; and • is not being submitted to deal with a district-specific problem that does not apply broadly. <p>Revising Proposals with Problems. Standards & Practices Committee Chair will contact the maker of the proposal to help resolve the problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If problems are resolved to the satisfaction of the Committee, the proposal will be considered. <p>The maker may withdraw a proposal.</p>
<p>April 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process reinforced at Area Meetings. • Prepare <i>Rostrum</i> Article on proposals and process. • At this point, the summary will not include recommendations from the Executive Committee but instead provide information to the field on the proposals received and to be discussed at the Spring Plenary Session. • Spring Plenary Session—<u>A preliminary session</u> on process and any proposals received. <i>[Note: At a minimum proposals must be vetted at two of the statewide hearings]</i>
<p>Sept 2019</p>	<p>Second and final call for proposals this cycle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senates and organizations can submit new proposals or revise proposals already submitted that were found to have problems. • The summary document will be distributed and include all proposals (new and updated). Any testimony information will be included in the summary. • Discussed at Area Meetings. • Any interested party may submit written comments to the Committee, via the Senate Office. <p>Standards & Practices Committee will update summary document with any new proposals, which will be included in the mailing for the Area Meetings. The summary will not include recommendations from the Executive Committee but instead provide information to the field on the proposals received and to be discussed at the Fall Plenary Session (even years).</p> <p>September 30, 2019 No new proposals will be accepted beyond September 30th to ensure that there are opportunities for publication and vetting of proposals prior to the fall plenary session. All proposals submitted beyond the September date will be held over to the next Discipline</p>

DISCIPLINE REVIEW PROCESS
2019 – 20 TIMELINE

	Review cycle.
Sept/Oct 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The summary document will be distributed and include all proposals (new and updated). Any testimony information will be included in the summary. Discussed at Area Meetings. Any interested party may submit written comments to the Committee, via the Senate Office.
November 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fall Plenary Session—First <u>hearing</u> on process and any proposals received. All testimony is collected. <i>[Note: At a minimum proposals must be vetted at two of the statewide hearings]</i> <p>Prepare <i>Rostrum</i> Article on proposals and process</p>
Jan/February 2020	<p>Submission to Executive Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Standards & Practices Committee Chair presents the proposals, evidence, and testimony to the Senate Executive Committee. The Senate Executive Committee considers each proposal for recommendation to move forward to the body for discussion and debate. <p>If the Executive Committee recommends that the proposal not be forwarded to the body for consideration, the initiator is contacted and given the opportunity to pull the proposal and provide more information at a later date or engage the appeal process. <u>Proposals forwarded to the body for consideration at the Spring Plenary Session may not be changed.</u></p> <p>(Process for 2020-2021 begins.)</p>
March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary document with Executive Committee positions will be included in the mailings for the Area meetings. Discussion at Area Meeting <p><i>Rostrum</i> Article (summary of additional proposals)</p>
April 2020	<p>Spring Plenary Session—The hearing that coincides with voting on the resolutions to adopt the Disciplines List Revisions is for the sole purpose of clarifying and discussing the final proposals to inform Saturday’s discussion and debate.</p> <p><i>[Note: At a minimum proposals must be vetted at two of the statewide hearings]</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delegates vote on resolution(s) to recommend changes to the Disciplines List. Because the field must have an opportunity to review and comment on any changes made to proposals, proposals may not be amended by the delegates. However, proposals to revise the Disciplines List may be withdrawn by a vote of the delegates..] <p>Appeal Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a proposal is rejected by the Executive Committee due to lack of evidence, the initiator may submit a proposal via a resolution through an Area Meeting requesting submission of the proposal into the hearing process for discussion and debate by the body. If a proposal is rejected by the body, then the proposal may be resubmitted but will need to be modified significantly and include new rationale and evidence for why it is

DISCIPLINE REVIEW PROCESS
2019 – 20 TIMELINE

	being brought forward again.
May/June 2020	Consultation with CIOs, CEOs, and COFO (faculty organizations). Informal consultation with personnel officers. This is done through an item on the Consultation Council agenda. Council members comment on the process, not the recommendations.
July 2020	Submit proposal to BOG (First reading): Each proposal adopted by the Academic 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.

Approved Spring 2014 by the Delegates.

Change to annual process approved Fall 2016 by the Delegates.

REVISIONS TO DISCIPLINES LIST FORM

PLEASE TYPE

(Note: Only typed forms will be accepted.)

DATE SUBMITTED: _____

DISCIPLINES LIST TITLE: _____

This proposal is for a New discipline
 Revision to existing discipline

Reason for the proposal Create a new discipline
 Update language in existing discipline to reflect new terminology
 Make minimum qualifications in existing discipline more restrictive
 Make minimum qualifications in existing discipline less restrictive

PROPOSAL LANGUAGE: (If this is an existing minimum qualification, please include the original language and change using strikeouts and *italics*).

PROPOSAL EVIDENCE:

Any Disciplines List proposal must have the following evidence, which is essential because it provides the rationale about why the change is needed as well as inform the field that the research has been completed to ensure that the change is necessary. A lack of documentation about the need of Discipline List Revision may cause the proposal to be delayed or rejected by the Executive Committee. Please use the following check list to ensure all you have conducted all necessary research.

Required investigation of the following and statement of findings:

- Contacted an associated professional organization to determine support of proposal
- Included evidence of degrees within the proposed revision of the discipline or new discipline.
- Provided a list of the titles of the degrees and programs to document the need for a new or revised discipline using the below criteria:
 - Minimum of three degrees
 - Regionally accredited institutions (all public institutions in California)
 - Disciplines in the Master's List requires evidence of the availability of masters degrees
 - Disciplines in the Non-masters List requires evidence of the availability of degree, certification, and/or professional experience, if necessary
- Provided statewide need documented by evidence to show a change is necessary and not merely a response to a unique need of one college, district or region. Demonstrated a balance of need across the state and included a discipline seconder from another district.
- Explained the impact of proposal across the state using a list the pro and con arguments and including refutation of the con arguments
- Provided other evidence such as significant changes to the field that requires a change to the Disciplines List.
- Provided a ½ page written rationale to be included in public documents.

SUBMISSION

Once a proposal is received by the Senate Office, it is reviewed by staff to ensure that all the information is complete and includes the revision, contact information, appropriate signatures and rationale. The Senate Office will also check to ensure that the proposal has not previously been considered and rejected by the delegates at a plenary session or, if it has, it is supported by a new rationale. The proposal is then sent to the S&P Chair to review the Senate Office information and to ensure that the proposal meets the initial requirements of the Disciplines List review process as well as to verify that the proposal is not being submitted to deal with a district-specific problem that does not apply broadly. If there are any concerns with the proposal, the S&P Chair, working with the S&P Committee, will immediately follow up with the initiator.

The contact person (or a designee) will be required to attend hearings where the proposal is presented. These hearings are typically held at the ASCCC plenary sessions. It should be noted that the contact person is responsible for investigating and documenting the need for changes to the Discipline List.

Please reference the Disciplines List Handbook for information about the process including the role of the initiator, the Standards and Practices Committee, the Executive Committee, and the delegates. This handbook can be found on our website at <http://asccc.org/disciplines-list>.



Contact person (author of proposal) _____

Phone number (please provide at least two numbers) _____

Email _____

Secunder (must be from another District) _____

Phone number (please provide at least two numbers) _____

Email _____

Signature of College Academic Senate President¹ _____

College _____

Email _____ Date approved by College Academic Senate _____

OR

Organization _____

President _____

Date Approved by Organization _____ Phone for President _____

RETURN FORM TO:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
One Capitol Mall, Suite 340, Sacramento, CA 95814
Email: disciplineslist@asccc.org

¹ By signing this document, the Senate President is certifying that the required investigation and statement of findings have been sufficiently addressed.