As We Brace for Title V Changes, What Does This Mean for Our Local Degrees? Part II (big thanks to Craig Kutil for serving on the Statewide committee looking at local degrees and for coaching me through this article!)

CalGETC ushers in a new era for community colleges by implementing one transfer pathway (for those of you unclear on what CalGETC is or what its impact will be, please see the Faculty Focus from November 18). The transfer path does not guarantee that students will complete an AA degree before transferring, and indeed, many of our students currently transfer without them so that will probably not change. The CSUs in particular are suffering from enrollment losses, so they have no incentive to create barriers to community college students wanting to transfer. Those students that do complete degrees have choices as to what degrees they will pursue: an Associate Degree for Transfer, our local Associates in Arts, or our local Associates in Science.

The Associates Degree for Transfer (ADT) is the degree we offer to directly transfer to a CSU with the first 60 units of a Bachelor degree completed (more than 60 for some STEM degrees). This is a legislated degree – one that guarantees community college students a CSU placement as well as a guarantee they will complete their Bachelors in 120 units (again slightly more for some STEM fields). Since this is considered the first two years of another system’s degree, we have no control over what will count to fulfill transfer criteria (for example, only the courses in Transfer Model Curriculum can count for a degree major – we cannot substitute). The parameters for these degrees have been set through years of collaboration between legislative committees, the Board of Governors, and the Academic Senates of both the CSU and CCC systems. Local decision making is extremely limited when it comes to these degrees.

The other degrees, most of which existed prior to the creation of ADTs, are our local degrees – the Chabot and LPC AA and AS degree. While there is more and more state incursion into what criteria is required for awarding these degrees, we do still have some control over that these degrees mean for our students and our communities. It is still possible to reflect our values in these degrees.

Upcoming changes we expect (but not implemented until 2026) are compared to our current local degree requirements in this chart (the header says LPC, but Chabot has the same pattern):
We can expect two upcoming major changes in Title V (the statutes created by our Board of Governors to operationalize the laws in our Education Code). The first will take effect in Fall 2024 – the degree requirement of Ethnic Studies (see Faculty Focus from February 17 for more on this).

The second will most likely not take effect for several years, but we should have our decision about moving forward by the end of Fall 2025. But that doesn’t mean we shouldn’t begin discussions about what our local degrees will look like in the new CalGETC era. The column in the yellow is what we expect Title V will dictate our local degrees include, affecting student behavior in class selection significantly. The requirement of English composition remains the same, however oral communication is now combined with critical thinking which means that courses which fulfill the current critical thinking requirement but not the oral communication component will be at a disadvantage as students will mostly likely want to take a class that fulfills both (this is already happening, but it will most likely have an even greater impact). The requirement of mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning will most likely make the Mathematics Proficiency graduation requirement obsolete, and may even require all AA seeking students to take transfer level math (this is still under discussion). The natural sciences, humanities and social sciences have similar requirements to our current degrees, however, Ethnic Studies will most likely become its own area. Our requirements of kinesiology, health, and American institutions are not included currently as requirements for local degrees in the Title V discussions. Their exclusion, of course, means even greater strain on kinesiology and health which were excluded from CalGETC, and the removal of American Institutions would disproportionately impact History and Political Science.

The Title V requirements for local degrees are a baseline for colleges to create their AAs and ASs. We can, if we want, supplement this baseline with our own area requirements. This will take deep discussions across our faculty as to the pros and cons of adding requirements or eliminating current requirements.
Should we follow the minimum GE requirements outlined by Title V only? The disadvantages to this would be that we would not be able to put our “stamp” on the degree. It may also jeopardize already weakened disciplines excluded or minimized by CalGETC. The advantages are that every time we make one category of classes a requirement, another category may suffer. This would give students the most choices about what courses they want to take in addition to their GE and their major requirements.

If we do add, what do we add? What areas are critical enough to add into the fold? If we do choose to add, will we add to both the AA and the AS? The Title V requirements will apply to both AAs and ASs. That means that our GE requirements for ASs will most likely go up. Some ASs are already more than 60 units, this may increase the number of ASs that pass that threshold.

Should we eliminate the graduation requirements (since the Ethnic Studies and the Mathematical Concepts requirements are duplicative)? Should we add any others? (see the pros and cons above in the discussions about area requirements)

Do we need to adjust our major requirements in some disciplines in reaction to the new GE requirements?

If this is the last degree a student gets, what skills/ experiences do we want them to have? What does it mean to be awarded a Chabot College degree? A Las Positas College degree?

Participate in the Legislative Round Table! Discussing repeatability, undocumented students and part time faculty issues
https://faccmemberclicks.net/index.php?option=com_jevents&task=icalevent.detail&evid=262&year=2023&month=02&day=21&uid=a632c1234234bab0b71faab398c747f5

Our First Retired Faculty Member takes advantage of the changes in Article 20C.6. To review, the changes are for faculty members who moves out of state (to a state that does not have access to Kaiser) and needs health insurance but are not yet age 65 to sign up for Medicare. Before this change was written, the only choice for our retirees was the expensive PPO plan the district offered. Effective January 2023, if the retired employee is unable to enroll in the District’s Kaiser coverage or LPPO style plan, they may alternatively contract for medical insurance available in the geographic area, and shall make arrangements for the District to pay the carrier directly via check, credit or debit card, or Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT).(20C.6)

The retiree was able to find an affordable policy that they liked in the state they were living and purchased it (once they proved they no longer had the policy from the district). The receipt was then mailed to the district office and HR said they will reimburse with a maximum amount to the cost of the most expensive Medicare risk Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) plan the District provides to retirees within the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District Service Area. The faculty member also had to pay their part of percentage that the contract states given the number of years of service and age (see the percentage of premium contribution chart in Article 20C.3 for the chart). The district agreed in this instance to reimburse the faculty member monthly for that amount since they had to pay their premiums monthly. According to this faculty member, they were able to save almost 1000 dollars a month by purchasing a policy on the state open market vs. the PPO plan our district offers, which currently is the only other insurance package our district has for living in non-Kaiser states. Even though the district agreed to reimburse monthly, there is nothing in the contract that says the district must reimburse in this way. They agreed to do it because it was the right thing to do. Eventually, an MOU will need to be written cementing this procedure for reimbursement into the contract so others in the future will have this type of smooth transition into retirement

Meet your Faculty Association Membership Chair, Jerome Manos, Athletic Counseling, Chabot College

Hello Chabot Las Positas Community! I was first hired in 2008 as an adjunct Physical Education instructor and football coach, and then in 2014 hired full-time in Special Programs. I have served on the
Faculty Association as Membership Chair since the summer of 2020. I enjoy spending time with my family, my wife, and our three boys, Elijah, Jaxon, and Josiah! They keep us extremely busy, but we enjoy every moment. I still enjoy coaching football, as I just finished my 23rd straight year of coaching. My focus has always been dedicated to promoting an environment of respect and appreciation for student-athletes, knowing that intercollegiate athletics can be a transformative component in the structure of many institutions of higher education. I am very grateful to be in the role that I am in at Chabot College and look forward to working with our many great students, staff, and faculty for years to come.
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