College of the Canyons Academic Senate

November 5, 2026
3:00 p.m. to 4:50 p.m.
Hybrid Format, via Zoom & in-person in BONH 330

Join Zoom Meeting
https://canyonsonline.zoom.us/j/81647762764?pwd=UlApeHKRcS9vext0KAGfNTnlO5biYQ.1
Meeting ID: 816 4776 2764; **Passcode:** 739323
One tap mobile +16694449171 US +12532158782 US (Tacoma)

Additional Teleconferencing locations can be found on page 2 of this agenda.

AGENDA

Notification: *The meetings may be audio recorded for note taking purposes. These recordings are deleted once the meeting summary is approved by the Academic Senate.*

ADA statement: If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation (including auxiliary aids or services) to participate in the public meeting, or if you need an agenda in an alternate form, please contact the Academic Senate Office at academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu College of the Canyons

A. Routine Matters

1. Call to order
2. Public Comment
   - *This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Academic Senate on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Public questions or comments can be submitted via email at academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu or asked via zoom chat feature.*
3. VP/Assistant Superintendents Executive Cabinet Report Out (*3 minutes)*
4. Approval of the Agenda
5. Committee Appointments: *none*
6. Sub-Committee Summaries:
   - Senate Executive Committee meeting summary, October 22, 2026 (pg. 9-12)
7. Approval of the Consent Calendar

1. Academic Senate Summary, October 22, 2026 (pg. 3-7)	2. Curriculum Committee Summary, October 29, 2026
3. Department Chair Training Series for Spring 2027 (pg. 8)	

B. Reports

These are informational items no discussion or action will be taken. However, clarification questions are welcomed.

1. Academic Integrity Committee annual chair report, Dr. Shane Ramey (pg. 13-22)
2. Guided Pathways Liaison Annual Report, Susan Ling
3. Communications Office Report, Erica Seubert
4. Vice President Report, Garrett Rieck

C. Action Items

Below is a list of items that the Senate will take action on. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.

1. AP 7121 (Minimum Qualifications) Policy, Alisha Kaminsky & Gary Collis
   - AP 7121 (Current) (pg. 23-33)

- AP 7211 (PRC Summary for Senate 2026) (pg. 34-35)
- AP 7211 (Equivalencies) (Final for Senate) (pg. 36-42)

D. Discussion

Below are items that the Senate will discuss and no action will be taken. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.

1. BP/AP 4030 Academic Freedom, Gary Collis
   - PRC Executive Summary for Senate regarding revisions (pg. 43)
   - AP 4030 Academic Freedom (Track Changes for Senate) (pg. 44)
   - AP 4030 Academic Freedom (Final Clean for Senate) (pg. 45)
   - BP 4030 Academic Freedom (Final Clean for Senate) (pg. 46-47)
   - BP 4030 Academic Freedom (Tracked Changes for Senate) (pg. 48-49)
2. Universal Desing for Learning (UDL), Tricia George

E. Unfinished Business

Below is a list of items that can be discussed for a future date.

1. *none*

F. New Future Business

Request to place an item for a future agenda is welcomed. Below is a list of topics that will be discussed at a future business date.

1. Tenure Committee Training Workshops, Collaboration with COCFA
2. Department Chair Training Series Schedule

G. Announcements

1. Next Academic Senate Meeting Dates for Fall 2026: Nov. 19th & Dec. 10th; Spring 2027: Feb. 11th, Feb. 25th, March 11th, March 25th, April 15th, April 29th, May 13th and May 27th
2. **Scholarly Presentation Committee-*The Boy Who Lived and The Author Who Shall Not Be Named: Reading Harry Potter in the Shadow of JK Rowling,*** Presenter, Erin Delaney (Professor of English) November 12, 2026, 6:00pm at the PAC
3. 2026 Fall Plenary Session, Nov. 5th – 7th, Grand Bay Hotel San Francisco, CA.
4. 2027 Spring Plenary Session, April 8th – 10th, Hyatt Regency Irvine, Irvine, CA.
5. 2027 Fall Plenary Session, Nov. 4th – 6th, Hyatt Regency Long Beach, Long Beach, CA.
6. 2027 Faculty Leadership Institute, June 10th - 12th, San Francisco Marriot Waterfront, Burlingame, CA.
7. 2027 Curriculum Institute, July 14th – 17th, Riverside Convention Center, Riverside, CA.

H. Adjournment

The teleconference is accessible though the following link:

https://canyonsonline.zoom.us/j/81647762764?pwd=UlApeHKRcS9vext0KAGfNTnlO5biYQ.1

Please note:

This meeting will be broadcasted at the following locations via zoom

none

Academic Senate Meeting Summary for October 22, 2026

Voting Members					
Senate President	Lisa Hooper	X	Business Senator	Gary Quire	X
Vice President	Garrett Rieck	X	Learning Resources Senator	Jennifer Thompson	X
Curriculum Chair	Tricia George	X	Personal & Professional Learning Senator	Garrett Rieck	X
Policy Review Chair	Gary Collis	X	Public Safety	*Erin Delane proxy for* Jessica Crowley	X
Communications Officer	Erica Seubert	X	At Large Senator	Alene Terzian-Zeitounian	X
AT Senator	Regina Blasberg	X	At Large Senator	Erin Delaney	X
MSHP-MSE Senator	*Erica Seubert proxy for* Thomas Gisel	X	At Large Senator	Rebecca Shepherd	X
MSHP-HPPS Senator	*Kathrina Almero Fabros proxy for* Lak Dhillon	X	At Large Senator	Shane Ramey	X
VAPA Senator	David Brill	X	At Large Senator	Alexandra Dimakos	X
Student Services Senator	Anne Marchesan	X	Part-Time Senator	*Lauren Rome proxy for* Joshua Rideaux	X
Humanities Senator	Annie Aboulian (via Zoom)	X	Part-Time Senator	Lauren Rome	X
Kinesiology/Athletics Senator	Kathrina Almero-Fabros	X	Part-Time Senator	Alma Juarez	X
SBS Senator	Jennifer Paris	X	X= Present	A= Absent	

Non-voting Members			
Dr. David Vakil (Interim, CIO)	X	Jennifer Brezina (VP of Instruction)	A
Marilyn Jimenez (Admin Assistant to the Academic Senate	X	Dilek Sanver Wang (COCFA President)	A
Dan Portillo (AFT President) via Zoom	X	Joielynn Belmonte (ASG Executive Vice President) via Zoom	X

Guest							
Alisha Kamisky	X	Collette Gibson	X	Graciela Martinez	X	Nadia Cotti	X
Anthony Michaelides	X	Dr. Daylene Mueschke	X	Jason Munoz	X	Reinhardt Schruger	X
Chad Peters	X	Dianne Avery	X	Julie Johnson	X	Robert Wonser	X
Chrislynn Quach (ASG)	X	Dr. Paloma Vargas	X	Kenneth Pelland	X	Ruth Rassool	X
Christopher Boltz	X	Eric Smith	X	Michael Felix	X	Sanda Vega	X
Claudenic McCalister	X	Erin Tague	X	Miranda Zamudio	X		X

I. Routine Matters

1. Call to order: 3:05 pm
2. Public Comment:
    a. **Academic Review Committee (ARC) panels concerns:** There are concerns with the (ARC) panels

process with faculty feeling that it may create some sort of antagonism between the student and faculty member. There are also concerns with faculty explaining to someone else what they may have done wrong. Faculty requested additional information regarding the pre-meeting and what goes into preparing students for the panel discussions.

b. **Concerns with using Turnitin to detect AI:** There are concerns that Turnitin may not be a sufficient instrument to detect AI. If the college is paying for the software, it may not be a viable form of evidence. Are there other programs that can be used and what is the protocol. Lisa Hooper explained that Senate leadership is aware of the concerns and revisions to the policy addressing the processes will be reviewed.

c. **Community College Humanities Association Literacy Magazine Competition**: Congratulations to the students in English 122 (Literary Magazine Production) as they have won second place again for the fourth year in a row. This is out of 9 states and hundreds of applicants.

3. VP/Assistant Superintendents Executive Cabinet Report Out (*3 minutes):*
   - **Dr. David Vakil (Interim, CIO) Report**:
     I. **A Course Dog Scheduling Module presentation:** Will take place at the next IAC meeting that is scheduled for Friday, Oct. 24th at 9:00am. Special kudos to Jennifer Brezina for bringing forward the idea of this specific product to Dr. Vakil.
     II. **CCCO Artificial Intelligence (AI) for Teaching and Learning Institution**: The state chancellor's office has put out a request for applications for an AI for Teaching and Learning Institution. CCCO would like teams of 5 to 6 people. Joy Shoemate and Dr. Paloma Vargas are coordinating the colleges efforts to apply. This is primarily for those learning to use IA and not AI experts. Dr. Vakil will share with Lisa the email announcement.

   b. **Miranda Zamudio (Interim VP of Human Resources) Report**:
     I. **Human Resource Recruitment Updates**: Recruitment will begin for both he VP President of Administrative Services and Instructional Services. Initial interviews will take place on the last week of November and early December. The recruitment will then move to forums on the week of December 7th or 14th. These will be held like those of the CEO position and will be livestreamed and recorded. People will be able to solicit questions in advance.

4. Approval of the Agenda:
   - **Motion** to approve the agenda by Regina Blasberg, seconded by Garrett Rieck. Erica Seubert proxy form Tom Gisel (yes, vote); Kathrina Almero-Fabros proxy for Tom Gisel (yes, vote); Erin Delaney proxy for Jessica Crowley (yes, vote); Lauren Rome proxy for Joshua Rideaux (yes, vote). Unanimous. Approved.
5. Committee Appointments: (pg. 3)
6. Sub-Committee Summaries:
   - Program Viability Committee meeting summary, October 15, 2026 (pg. 9-12)
7. Approval of the Consent Calendar
   - A correction was made on the Tenure Committee list as Sung Kim originally had two members from the same department appointed to his committee. Special thanks to Jennifer Thompson for stepping up to serve. Lauren Franco is in her fourth year as an AAC Counselor. Stephanie Lee is now Acting Director of AAC, and it was determined it would be best to keep her on the committee for continuity purposes. Erika Torgeson will assume the administrator role on this committee.
   - **Motion** to approve the agenda by Lauren Franco, seconded by Shane Ramey. Erica Seubert proxy form Tom Gisel (yes, vote); Kathrina Almero-Fabros proxy for Tom Gisel (yes, vote); Erin Delaney proxy for Jessica Crowley (yes, vote); Lauren Rome proxy for Joshua Rideaux (yes, vote). Unanimous. Approved.

4. Academic Senate Summary, October 8, 2026	5. Curriculum Committee Summary, October 15, 2026

(pg. 4-8)	
6. Update to the Tenure Committee List 2026-2027 (pg. 13)	

J. Reports

These are informational items no discussion or action will be taken. However, clarification questions are welcomed.

1. IDEAA Liaison Report, Dr. Alene Terzian
   - The IDEAA repository is still active and is housed in Pebble Pad that houses different resources on IDEAA for faculty. Katie Coleman, Alene Terzian and Julie Johnson have been working on updating broken links due to the current administration asking certain colleges to remove diversity statements. Most resources have been archived and/or saved as PDFs to prevent the issue of losing access. Originally the repository was to be used by faculty, however now students and administrators can have access. The link to the repository can be found on the CETL website. The IDEAA group has been working on scheduling IDEA Share Workshops, a STEM focus workshop (lead by Gretchen Staton on Nov. 13th), Sustaining Equity Work and hosting Artivism Day. In the spirit of shared governance, the committee is looking at all committees to streamline, as a result the Equity Minded Practitioners will be disbanded as a current SGT is doing this work. Alene is now serving on the Student Success and Inclusive Excellence Team, CETL and the Student Equity & Achievement (SEA) plan.
2. Academic Senate President's Report, Lisa Hooper
   - **AIC Meeting Update:** It was stated that faculty should be evaluated based on their primary assignment. Lisa Hooper will be evaluated as the Senate President by Erica Seubert in November. Erica will be launching a survey to collect anonymous feedback from the Academic Senate.
   - **ASCCC Plenary for FA26:** Lisa will be attending the next fall plenary and will not be available to attend the Senate meeting. Garrett Rieck will be leading the meeting on this date. Erica will be circulating the ASCCC Resolutions packet electronically. Curriculum committee unanimously supports the CALGETC resolution. CCN is also in a holding pattern.
   - **Department Chair Training:** Lisa asked for feedback from the Senate whether to host the Department Chair Training series once a year or once every other year to align with the Department Chair nomination.
   - **Planning Team Grants Development Presentation:** This meeting was led by Amber Cole and Eric Smith who presented on how the district handles grants. In addition, presenters shared information on how they can help. Lisa requested an update on all grant projects that have been awarded to the college.
   - **Student Earnings and Accountability Taskforce Update:** The taskforce is responding to latest federal changes regarding programs that may not result in a wage earning potential great than an equivalent high school graduate. The report is scheduled to be released in July 2027. Catalogs are published around the same time, and the college is obligated to notify students of any programs that fall under this area. Every effort will be made to ensure faculty associated with these programs is notified as soon as possible.
   - **Time Block Taskforce Update:** Lisa had to step off this taskforce due to other commitments. As a reminder this taskforce is interested in considering time blocks and seeing if different time blocks might serve students better. Anyone interested in joining can reach out to Dr. Vakil.
   - **BOT Meeting Update:** Lisa answered questions from the board regarding Senate work, processes and 10 +1.
   - **New Baccalaureate Degrees:** There are now between 2 and 5 new baccalaureate degree proposals. Lisa reached out the Chancellors office to see if Wendy Brill can provide some guidance to the Program Viability Committee. One of the metrics for colleges to consider bringing on a BA degree is to consider institutional capacity. Vice Chancellors Tony Cordova

stated at the last CCCOE meeting that CCCs are encouraged to submit for as many BAs as possible before 2027 before the laws change in 2028.

3. Vice President's Report, Garrett Rieck
   - Faculty office lottery was launched on Tuesday, and the deadline is next Monday at 12:00pm. There are 19 offices available. If anyone is interested in touring an office, please reach out Garrett Rieck and/or Marilyn Jimenez. Faculty need to be ready to move in November.
4. Program Review Committee Chair Annual Report, Gary Quire
   - There has been work on reviewing Program Review process, what it's for and what it's used for. Program Review primarily supports the department chairs and programs. A series of listening sessions have taken place that has discussed what is in program review and what is missing. Programs need to look at goals and determine if those were met and if they are aligning with the mission of the college, department and considering advancing continuous improvement and quality. A breakdown of the administrative and academic side was outlined. Program review focused on the budget, funding and staffing. How does a program navigate data to justify a need. Gary forwarded a timeline on all upcoming labs to the department chairs. There will also be a scheduled follow up session on data on Oct. 30th. Year 3 Program Review is due on Dec. 11th.

K. Action Items

Below is a list of items that the Senate will take action on. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.

1. AP 4101 (Independent Study), Gary Collis (pg. 14)
   - Motion to approve AP 4101 by Erica Seubert, seconded by Regina Blasberg. Erica Seubert proxy form Tom Gisel (yes, vote); Kathrina Almero-Fabros proxy for Tom Gisel (yes, vote); Erin Delaney proxy for Jessica Crowley (yes, vote); Lauren Rome proxy for Joshua Rideaux (yes, vote). Unanimous. Approved.

L. Discussion

Below are items that the Senate will discuss and no action will be taken. Discussion is welcomed by all attendees.

1. Aligning Program Review with Canyons Compass, Gary Quire & Dr. Daylene Mueschke
   - An updated version of the Academic Program Review with Canyons Compass presentation was shared. Dr. Mueschke and Gary have been hosting many listening sessions. There has been discussion about bringing in Program Viability into Program Review. There are some key themes that have come up in the listening sessions such as, "the purpose of program review is unclear, there is no feedback loop, there are disconnected processes, there is too much repetition and what is data used for?" The next step is to sit with the Deans Council on Nov. 9th to collect feedback. It is suggested to a list of instructional equipment and its useful life prediction and is continues operational budget. A program review listening session timeline was shared. Dr. Daylene and Gary will return with an update as to what can and can't be done.
2. Campus Door Locking Mechanisms, Reinhardt Schuerger, Kenneth Pelland & Jason Munoz
   - A presentation on "Key Fob Access: How electronic access works at College of the Canyons" was shared. An overview of how key fobs are set up was outlined. It was clarified when faculty are hired, they are given general classroom access however, specific access needs to be submitted as a request by a department. The Facilities department will be conducting a reconciling project to determine who has access to which areas. The library exterior door locks will be redone. Remote emergency lockdown can be done remotely for all classrooms and labs. Offices are not included in this system.
3. Puente Program Snapshot & Fact Sheet, Erika Torgeson, Alexa Dimakos, Erin Delaney & Mireya Milian
   - Special thanks to Juan Buriel and Jasmine Sotero who also are part of the team. The team will be attending the shared governance council next week. The presentation covered the three pillars, rigorous academics, support in the transfer process and access to a faculty champion. Puente students would have an English C10003 class in the spring and a C150 Counseling class.

COC would be required to have an in gift in kind of $10,000 that would go toward student activities along with the salaries of the employees. Statewide Puente would allocate additional funding however; these funds cannot be spent on salaries. Juan Buriel would require 20% release and 50% for a counselor and 20-30% with coordination with Juan the remaining would be for general counselor. This would be based on a cohort of 27-30 English student class size. This program is open to all students.

4. AP 7121 (Minimum Qualifications) Policy, Alisha Kaminsky & Gary Collis
   - AP 7121 (pg. 15-25)
   - AP 7211 (PRC Summary for Senate 2026) (pg. 26-27)
   - AP 7211 (Equivalencies) (Final for Senate) (pg. 28-34)
     - Special thanks to Alisha Kaminsky and Miranda Zamudio for their help. There are no track changes as there was much work needed to align the policy with the CCLC in the statewide MQ handbook there are 3 levels that faculty can teach in. The original AP only discussed the master's and bachelor's degree but didn't address the third level. The new language now addresses all three levels. Equivalencies is a local process. Department chairs should only interview faculty who have been cleared by HR as meeting MQ's. This item will return for action.

M. Unfinished Business

Below is a list of items that can be discussed for a future date.

1. none

N.New Future Business

Request to place an item for a future agenda is welcomed. Below is a list of topics that will be discussed at a future business date.

1. Tenure Committee Training Workshops, Collaboration with COCFA
2. Department Chair Training Series Schedule

O. Announcements

Next Academic Senate Meeting Dates for Fall 2026: Nov. 5th; Nov. 19th & Dec. 10th; Spring 2027: Feb. 11th, Feb. 25th, March 11th, March 25th, April 15th, April 29th, May 13th and May 27th

1. 2026 Fall Plenary Session, Nov. 5th – 7th, Grand Bay Hotel San Francisco, CA.
2. 2027 Spring Plenary Session, April 8th – 10th, Hyatt Regency Irvine, Irvine, CA.
3. 2027 Fall Plenary Session, Nov. 4th – 6th, Hyatt Regency Long Beach, Long Beach, CA.
4. 2027 Faculty Leadership Institute, June 10th - 12th, San Francisco Marriot Waterfront, Burlingame, CA.
5. 2027 Curriculum Institute, July 14th – 17th, Riverside Convention Center, Riverside, CA.

P. Adjournment: 5:04 pm.

The teleconference is accessible though the following link:

https://canyonsonline.zoom.us/j/81647762764?pwd=UIApeHKRcS9vext0KAGfNTnIO5biYQ.1

Please note:

This meeting will be broadcasted at the following locations via zoom

none

ACADEMIC SENATE
Sponsored
Department Chair Leadership Training Workshop Series
Spring 2027

1. The Role of the Department chair;
Presenter, TBD
Location: BONH 330 – No Zoom Option for this Workshop
Date: 02/26/2027
Time: 9:30am-11:30am (2 Hours)
FLEX Code: TBD

---

2. Understanding Contracts for Full & Part-Time Faculty.
Presenter, TBD
Location: BONH-330 & Zoom Option
Date: 03/05/2027
Time: 9:30am-11:30am (2 Hours)
FLEX Code: TBD

---

3. Scheduling & Staffing Courses
Presenter, TBD
Location: BONH-330 & Zoom Option
Date: 03/26/2027
Time: 9:30am-11:30am (2 Hours)
FLEX Code: TBD

---

4. Departmental Planning
Presenter, TBD
Location: BONH-330 & Zoom Option
Date: 4/16/2027
Time: 9:30am-11:30am (2 Hours)
FLEX Code: TBD

---

5. Developing & Maintaining Quality Academic Programs
Presenter, TBD
Location: BONH 330 & Zoom Option
Date: 04/23/2027
Time: 9:30am-11:30am (2 Hours)
FLEX Code: TBD

---

6. Leadership Styles & Strategies
Presenter, TBD
Location: BONH 330 & Zoom Option
Date: 05/27/2027
Time: 9:30am-11:30am (2 Hours)
FLEX Code: TBD

COLLEGE OF THE CANYONS
ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

October 22, 2026
11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., Via Zoom

SUMMARY

Non-Voting Members:

Faculty Name	Title		Faculty Name	Title	
Lisa Hooper	*Academic Senate President*	X	Jason Burgdorfer	*COCFA President*	A
Garrett Rieck	*Academic Senate Vice President*	X	Dan Portillo	*AFT President*	A
Erica Seubert	*Academic Senate Communications Officer*	A			

Voting Members:

Faculty Name	Title		Faculty Name	Title	
Alisha Kaminsky	*Equivalencies Committee*	X	Jesse Vera	*Legislative Liaison*	X
Chase Dimock	*Honors Steering Committee*	A	Julie Jonhson	*CETL*	X
Sara Breshears	*Elections Committee*	A	Lauren Rome	*Lead Adjunct Senator*	X
Erik Altenbernd	*Academic Staffing Committee Faculty*	A	Lisa Hooper	*President's Advisory Committee on the Budget Faculty*	X
Gary Quire	*Program Review Committee*	X	Katie Coleman	*Scholarly Presentation (Tentative)*	A
Garrett Reick	*Noncredit Liaison*	X	VACANT		A
Lisa Hooper	*Program Viability*	X	Tricia George	*Curriculum Committee*	X
Gary Collis	*Policy Review Committee*	X	VACANT	*College Planning Team Committee Faculty*	
Regina Blasberg	*Career Education Liaison*	A			

Additional Voting Members:

Faculty Name	Title		Faculty Name	Title	
Shane Ramey	*Academic Integrity Committee*	A	Alene Terzian	*Equity Minded Practitioners*	A
Karyl Kicenski	*Academic Freedom Committee*	A			

Non-Voting Members and Guest

Faculty Name	Title		Faculty Name	Title	
Marilyn Jimenez	*Academic Senate Administrative Assistant*	X			

A. Routine Matters

1. Call to order: 11:04 am
2. Public Comment: none
3. Approval of the Agenda:
    - Motion to approve the agenda by Lisa Hooper, seconded by Jesse Vera. Unanimous. Approved.

B. Consent Calendar

1. Adoption of September 17, 2026, Senate Executive Committee Summary (pg. 3-5)
    - Motion to approve the consent calendar by Lisa Hooper, seconded by Gary Collis. Unanimous. Approved.

C. Reports

1. Presidents Report, Lisa Hooper
    - **CIO Search Position:** Due to late recruitment start for the CIO position, campus forums will be scheduled after the semester ends. There will be Zoom options and the forums will be recorded. There will be some predetermined questions. There was a previous online form for submitting anonymous questions in advance during the last recruitment for the CEO. It has not been confirmed by HR if this will be the same process. It may be challenging to get more faculty to participate or attend the forums as faculty will be off contract.
    - **Business Services and IT Search positions:** Jason Hinkle's positions currently combine Business Services and IT. The new position will be combination of the two and the forums will take place next semester. The district had chosen to work with the same recruitment third body to help with the recruitment process. This will occur the week after the semester ends.
    - **Student Conduct Process:** Michelle Labrie feels there are some areas that require changes to the policy and is working with Policy Review Committee to discuss these changes. There are now 42 faculty volunteers on the various panels that include representatives from all schools/divisions and modalities. This is important as academic dishonesty looks different in different modalities.
2. Vice President Report, Garrett Rieck
    - **Faculty office lottery:** The lottery was launched on Tuesday afternoon and all need to get their submission by 12:00pm on Monday. If anyone wants to tour an office, please reach out to Garrett and/or Marilyn. If there are any faculty offices that are experiencing water leakage, please contact Garrett and/or Lisa.

D. Action: *None*

E. Discussion

1. Artificial Intelligence Taskforce, Lisa Hooper
    - **Taskforce Compositions:** Dr. Jasmine Ruys has called for an AI Taskforce, and the union has been asking the district for a variety of actions regarding AI. As a result, the district chooses to put together an AI taskforce. Dr. Ruys will appoint Dr. Shane Ramey to the AI Taskforce. Dr. Ramey has attended the meeting that discussed the mission and the vision for the taskforce. This taskforce is now composed of 40 or so members. The Senate would like faculty to continue to provide guidance in the AI area. The original goal was to appointment 6-8 faculty that have a variety of a vision on AI and which teach in various modalities.
    - **Additional representation:** CETL was mentioned due to the resources offered to support online teaching and a suggestion is to have CETL committee members sit on the taskforce. Andrew Jones Cathcart with Ed Tech stated they work well with the CETL committee. The committee feels it is more helpful to provide guidance to faculty than to offer a course on AI. It is not clear with some software programs if certain AI

features can be turned off.

- **AI & the Academic Review and Academic Freedom Committees:** The Academic Review committee and Grade Review process is a great example of what faculty needs to know. This also includes administrative and supportive personnel to ensure committee's function. Most of the credible education-based papers have been forwarded to the Academic Integrity Committee meeting. Academic Freedom has also been challenged with navigating AI. Julie attends the Ed Tech Committee as she sits on that committee.
- **AI Focus:** The significate area of focus in AI is on the workplace regarding classified professionals. It is possible that the Academic Senate will oversee the area of faculty and AI. Policy Committee will discuss AI and student conduct.
- **AI in various disciplines:** It is not clear if it is worth having a conversation relating how to best incorporate AI in various disciplines. In the business department there is a lot of frustration and Nicole Faudree and Lori Young are implementing an AI course.
- **Next Steps for the Taskforce:** The taskforce is still at the beginning stages, and it is not clear which direction it may move in the future. Much of the work is on educating people and there are so many ways AI can be used for students and faculty. This is more so about guidelines, best practices and communications. Students also need to understand how they are interacting with AI as many don't realize they are interacting with AI. The specifics of how AI functions are rapidly advancing and changing. Any ideas can be shared with Lisa Hooper and/or Garrett Rieck.

2. Shared Governance Team (SGT) Reporting Draft Template, Lisa Hooper (pg. 6)
    - Due to the new SGT many faculty were appointed to teams. These used to be called PATS, and they are now called SGT's. The new shared governance model aims to be open and transparent and inform decisions. SGTs and the Senate do not have a way to communicate back and forth. The report can be in the form of a summary. There is also an online form that will be linked to the academic senate website.

F. Future Business

1. Future Meeting Times/Days for Fall 2026
    - The idea is to restructure the meeting times and commit a 2-hour meeting during FLEX and get all senate chairs together due to teaching schedules. There is one more meeting scheduled for Nov. 19th. The suggestion is to do a call out and get feedback as to when the committee should meet. Garrett will send this out with the agenda.
2. Future Discussion Topics: *none*

G. Unfinished Business: *None*

H. Announcements

- Next Academic Senate Meeting Dates for Fall 2026: Oct. 22nd; Nov. 5th; Nov. 19th & Dec. 10th
- 2026 Fall Plenary Session, Nov. 5th – 7th, Grand Bay Hotel San Francisco, CA.
- 2027 Spring Plenary Session, April 8th – 10th, Hyatt Regency Irvin, Irvine, CA.
- 2027 Fall Plenary Session, Nov. 4th – 6th, Hyatt Regency Long Beach, Long Beach, CA.
- 2027 Faculty Leadership Institute, June 10th - 12th, San Francisco Marriot Waterfront,

Burlingame, CA.

- 2027 Curriculum Institute, July 14th – 17th, Riverside Convention Center, Riverside, CA.

I. Adjournment: 11:50 am.

If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation (including auxiliary aids or services) to participate in the public meeting, or if you need an agenda in an alternate form, please contact the Academic Senate Office at academicsenateinfo@canyons.edu College of the Canyons.

Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) Annual Report

Prepared by: Dr. Shane Ramey
Date: November 5th, 2026

A. Committee & Committee Chair Name and Meeting Times/Location

- **Committee Name:** Academic Integrity Committee (AIC)
- **Committee Chair:** Dr. Shane Ramey
- **Meeting Times:** Last Tuesday of each month, 1:30-3:00 PM
- **Location:** BONH-330

B. Committee Membership Composition List

- **Chair:** Dr. Shane Ramey - Mathematics, Science & Engineering
- **Members:**
  - Regina Blasberg - Applied Technologies
  - Sara Breshears - Learning Resources
  - Sylvia Duncan - Health Professions
  - Michelle LaBrie - Social & Behavioral Sciences
  - Jennifer Overdevest - Visual & Performing Arts
  - Scott McAfee - Social & Behavioral Sciences (Part-time)
  - Ruth Rassool - Humanities (Part-time)

C. Time Stamp on Report

November 5th, 2026

D. Committee Background, Purpose, Objectives, or Goals

The Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) is a standing subcommittee of the Academic Senate that provides leadership, guidance, and resources to promote and maintain academic integrity across College of the Canyons. The Committee's work extends beyond preventing academic dishonesty to fostering a broader culture of honesty, responsibility, and ethical scholarship among students and faculty.

The AIC serves as an advisory and educational body that develops recommendations, frameworks, and practical strategies to support integrity within teaching, learning, and assessment. The Committee emphasizes proactive and collaborative approaches, encouraging policies and pedagogies that help both faculty and students internalize values such as integrity, accountability, and respect for intellectual work.

While the AIC does not adjudicate individual cases of student misconduct, it plays a key role in shaping institutional practice through the development of Senate statements, faculty guides, and policy recommendations. In recent years, this has included a growing focus on academic integrity in the age of artificial intelligence (AI). The AIC now provides campus leadership on the ethical and pedagogical implications of generative AI, ensuring that faculty and students alike are equipped to navigate new technologies responsibly.

Through this work, the AIC aims to sustain a campus culture where academic integrity is understood not as a rule to enforce, but as a shared professional and educational value to uphold.

E. Summary of Committee Work

During the 2025–2026 academic year and Fall 2026 semester, the Academic Integrity Committee continued its work promoting academic integrity across College of the Canyons, with particular emphasis on the challenges presented by artificial intelligence (AI), assessment integrity, and the implementation of updated academic dishonesty procedures. The committee's efforts increasingly focused on providing faculty with practical guidance, promoting fair and consistent procedures, and supporting informed discussions about academic integrity in a rapidly changing educational environment.

1. Academic Senate Statement on Faculty Use of Artificial Intelligence in Grading and Feedback

The AIC developed and advanced the *Statement on Faculty Use of Artificial Intelligence in Grading and Feedback*, which was approved by the Academic Senate on February 26, 2026. The statement emphasizes that academic integrity is a shared responsibility extending to faculty as well as students. It affirms that evaluating student learning is a fundamental faculty responsibility requiring professional judgment, disciplinary expertise, and accountability. While AI may assist faculty with certain instructional tasks, it should not replace human judgment in grading and feedback. The statement also addresses concerns regarding student privacy, transparency, and the ethical use of AI in assessment.

2. Faculty Education and Guidance on AP 5522: Grade Penalty Procedures

Following the adoption of AP 5522 (formerly AP 5521) through the Academic Senate and College Policy Council, the AIC began working to help faculty understand and navigate the revised academic dishonesty reporting and grade penalty procedures. Although the procedure was developed by the Policy Review Committee, the AIC has focused on supporting its implementation through faculty education and practical guidance.

The committee is currently developing *AP 5522: Academic Dishonesty Reporting — Faculty Cheat Sheet*, a resource designed to clarify faculty responsibilities regarding student notification, meaningful dialogue, grade penalties, reporting requirements, and student appeals. The working draft also provides guidance on completing the Academic Dishonesty Reporting Form,

developing clear course policies, evaluating evidence of suspected AI misuse, and understanding the Academic Review Committee (ARC) appeal process. Particular attention is given to the limitations of AI-detection technologies and the importance of evidence-based determinations of academic dishonesty.

The faculty primer is scheduled for discussion at the November 19, 2026, Academic Senate meeting.

3. Faculty Professional Development and Outreach

The AIC continued promoting faculty awareness and professional dialogue regarding academic integrity and AI. During Fall 2026 Flex Week, the committee chair facilitated an in-person workshop titled *Academic Integrity in a Changing Classroom: Policy, Practice, and AI*. The workshop addressed the development of course-specific AI policies, challenges associated with detecting unauthorized AI use, and faculty responsibilities under the revised grade penalty procedures.

Additionally, the committee chair attended the ASCCC *AI and Academia 2026: Navigating the Future* conference, held March 19–21, 2026. Key issues included the growing challenges of assessing student learning in AI-enabled environments, faculty academic freedom, the quality and ethical implementation of AI educational tools, and the importance of protecting student privacy. These discussions helped inform the committee's ongoing work and future priorities.

4. Assessment Integrity in the Age of AI

The committee continued examining the implications of generative AI for the validity and reliability of student assessment. A central concern is ensuring that assessments accurately measure students' knowledge, skills, and achievement of course learning objectives rather than evaluating AI-generated work presented as student-produced.

The AIC has increasingly emphasized the concept of *assessment integrity* to frame these discussions. This approach recognizes that the central challenge is not simply preventing students from using AI, but ensuring that faculty can meaningfully evaluate student learning while maintaining academic standards, respecting faculty academic freedom, and preserving the learning objectives established in the Course Outline of Record.

The committee also continued examining the limitations of AI-detection technologies and the importance of evidence-based approaches to suspected academic dishonesty, particularly given the potential consequences of inaccurate allegations.

5. Evolving Priorities and Development of Targeted Resources

Following the presentation and discussion of the draft *Academic Integrity in the Age of AI: A Faculty Guide* at the Academic Senate in Spring 2025, the committee shifted its priorities from developing a comprehensive faculty guide toward addressing more focused and immediate academic integrity concerns. This approach allows the AIC to respond more effectively to

emerging challenges, provide timely guidance on specific issues, and develop practical resources that address the evolving needs of faculty and students.

6. Collaboration with Campus Partners

The AIC continued strengthening collaboration with campus groups to promote a consistent, transparent, and collaborative approach to academic integrity. These efforts included ongoing discussions with Student Conduct regarding AP 5522, faculty reporting responsibilities, student due-process protections, and the Academic Review Committee.

The AIC initiated collaboration with the Academic Freedom Committee (AFC) to explore issues at the intersection of academic integrity, academic freedom, and emerging technologies. An AIC representative attended the AFC meeting on October 26, 2026, and AFC Chair Karyl Kicenski participated in the AIC meeting on October 27, 2026. Discussions focused particularly on the use of generative AI in developing instructional materials, including Open Educational Resources (OER), and the complex questions surrounding authorship, attribution, disclosure, and faculty responsibility for AI-assisted content. Both committees recognized the need for thoughtful guidance that supports responsible innovation while respecting faculty academic freedom. The discussion also identified opportunities for continued collaboration, including the possibility of a jointly facilitated Flex workshop in Spring 2027.

F. Main Objectives, Goals, or Projects for the Current Year

During the 2026–2027 academic year, the Academic Integrity Committee will continue focusing on practical strategies and resources that support academic integrity across College of the Canyons. The committee's priorities include assisting faculty with the implementation of revised academic dishonesty procedures, addressing emerging challenges associated with artificial intelligence (AI), and collaborating with campus groups to promote responsible and effective educational practices.

1. Finalization of the AP 5522 Faculty Primer and Continued Faculty Support

The committee will finalize *AP 5522: Academic Dishonesty Reporting — Faculty Cheat Sheet*, a practical resource designed to help faculty understand and navigate the revised grade penalty and reporting procedures. The primer is scheduled for Academic Senate discussion on November 19, 2026, with potential action on December 10, 2026.

Beyond publication, the AIC will continue supporting faculty through educational outreach and guidance on AP 5522 implementation, including reporting requirements, student communication, evidence documentation, and due-process protections. The committee will also work with Student Conduct and other campus partners to promote consistent understanding of the procedures and encourage faculty participation in the Academic Review Committee (ARC).

2. Supporting the Development and Implementation of the Campus AI Task Force

The AIC will support the establishment and ongoing work of the college's emerging AI Task Force, particularly in areas involving academic integrity, assessment practices, and the ethical use of AI in teaching and learning.

The committee will seek opportunities for collaboration while maintaining its distinct role as an Academic Senate subcommittee. This partnership should help ensure that academic integrity considerations are incorporated into broader institutional discussions about AI adoption, faculty professional development, student learning, and institutional policy, while avoiding unnecessary duplication of efforts.

3. Review of Proposed BP 3775 and AP 3775: Artificial Intelligence (AI)

The AIC is reviewing the proposed Board Policy (BP 3775) and Administrative Procedure (AP 3775) addressing the use of artificial intelligence at College of the Canyons. The committee will evaluate these proposals from an academic integrity perspective, with particular attention to responsible AI use, transparency, accountability, student privacy, faculty academic freedom, and the ethical development and use of AI-generated instructional materials.

The committee intends to provide feedback and recommendations to the Academic Senate and Policy Review Committee to help ensure that the proposed policies support academic integrity while providing clear, practical guidance for faculty, staff, and students.

4. Assessment Integrity in the Age of AI

The committee will continue exploring strategies for maintaining assessment integrity as generative AI becomes increasingly capable and accessible. Particular attention will be given to ensuring that assessments meaningfully evaluate students' knowledge, skills, and achievement of course learning objectives rather than AI-generated products presented as student work.

Discussions will address challenges across instructional modalities, especially online education, while recognizing the importance of faculty academic freedom, disciplinary differences, and the learning objectives established in the Course Outline of Record. The committee will also consider emerging AI-enabled technologies, including wearable devices, and their implications for assessment security and integrity.

5. AI-Detection Tools and Evidence-Based Academic Integrity Practices

The AIC will continue examining the reliability and limitations of AI-detection technologies and their appropriate role, if any, in academic dishonesty determinations. Given concerns about false positives, false negatives, and the misinterpretation of detection scores, the committee will emphasize the importance of evaluating credible evidence rather than relying on automated detection results.

This work will complement the AP 5522 faculty primer and support fair, consistent, and evidence-based approaches to suspected unauthorized AI use, while respecting faculty professional judgment and student due-process rights.

6. AI-Authored and AI-Coauthored Instructional Materials

The committee will explore the academic integrity implications of faculty using generative AI to create or substantially contribute to instructional materials, including Open Educational Resources (OER), textbooks, assignments, and other course content.

Discussions will consider appropriate disclosure and attribution of AI contributions, faculty responsibility for accuracy and quality, intellectual property concerns, and the importance of maintaining professional accountability for instructional materials provided to students. The goal will be to identify principles and practices that support responsible innovation while upholding academic and professional standards.

G. Challenges the Committee Has Faced

The rapid evolution of artificial intelligence continues to present significant challenges for the Academic Integrity Committee and the broader college community. As AI tools become increasingly sophisticated and integrated into educational settings, developing timely, practical, and evidence-based guidance remains difficult. The pace of technological change frequently exceeds the ability of institutions to develop and implement effective policies and practices.

One of the most pressing challenges involves assessment integrity. As generative AI becomes increasingly capable of completing academic tasks, faculty face growing difficulty determining whether submitted work accurately reflects students' knowledge, skills, and achievement of course learning objectives. These concerns are particularly significant in online instructional environments, where opportunities to independently verify student learning may be limited. Developing effective solutions requires balancing academic standards, faculty academic freedom, instructional modality, and the learning objectives established in the Course Outline of Record. Moreover, continuously redesigning assessments to address emerging AI capabilities can impose substantial and potentially unsustainable demands on faculty.

Another persistent challenge involves the limitations of AI-detection technologies and the difficulty of establishing reliable evidence of unauthorized AI use. Current detection tools remain susceptible to false positives and false negatives, creating risks of inaccurate allegations and inconsistent academic dishonesty determinations. Faculty must navigate the difficult distinction between reasonable suspicion and sufficient evidence while respecting student due-process rights. The committee continues examining how best to support fair, consistent, and evidence-based approaches without imposing unreasonable investigative burdens on instructors.

The implementation of AP 5522: Grade Penalty Procedures has introduced additional challenges associated with faculty awareness, procedural clarity, and consistent application. Faculty must understand their responsibilities regarding student communication, reporting deadlines, documentation, grade penalties, and the student appeal process. Translating these requirements into clear, accessible guidance is an important ongoing task, particularly as faculty navigate complex or ambiguous academic dishonesty cases.

Finally, the committee continues navigating differing perspectives regarding the appropriate role of AI in education. Faculty vary considerably in their willingness to adopt AI tools, their approaches to assessment, and their concerns about academic freedom, student privacy, intellectual property, and professional responsibility. Developing guidance that respects these differences while promoting consistent academic integrity standards requires ongoing dialogue and collaboration across the college.

Addressing these challenges will require sustained institutional support, faculty engagement, and continued collaboration among the Academic Senate, AIC, Student Conduct, Academic Freedom Committee, and other campus stakeholders.

H. Support Needed from the Academic Senate or Other Campus Groups

The Academic Integrity Committee welcomes the Academic Senate's continued support in addressing the rapidly evolving challenges associated with academic integrity and artificial intelligence. Many of these challenges extend beyond the scope of the committee and require broader institutional engagement, coordinated action, and appropriate resources. The committee has identified several areas where Senate leadership and advocacy would be particularly valuable.

1. Institutional Dialogue and Action on Assessment Integrity

The AIC encourages the Academic Senate to take a more active role in facilitating campus-wide discussions about assessment integrity and the future of student assessment in the age of AI. As generative AI becomes increasingly capable of completing academic tasks, ensuring that assessments accurately measure student

knowledge, skills, and achievement of course learning objectives presents a growing challenge, particularly in online education.

These discussions must move beyond simply encouraging faculty to redesign assignments or develop AI-resistant assessments. Meaningful solutions require examining the implications for instructional modalities, academic standards, faculty workload, academic freedom, and the Course Outline of Record. Given the pace of technological change, the committee believes these conversations require greater institutional attention and urgency.

2. Clear Institutional Guidance on AI-Detection Tools

The committee encourages the development of clear, institutionally supported guidance regarding the appropriate use and limitations of AI-detection technologies. Faculty need to understand whether, when, and how these tools may be used, particularly when evaluating suspected academic dishonesty.

Such guidance should address the reliability of AI-detection results, the risks of false positives and false negatives, appropriate evidentiary standards, and the protections afforded to students under established academic dishonesty procedures. The AIC welcomes collaboration with the Academic Senate, Academic Freedom Committee, Student Conduct, and other relevant campus stakeholders in developing recommendations that promote fair, consistent, and evidence-based practices.

3. Access to District-Approved AI Tools

The AIC encourages the Academic Senate to advocate for access to district-approved AI tools for faculty, staff, and students who wish to use them or require them for approved instructional and institutional activities.

Providing access to appropriately vetted tools would help address concerns regarding student privacy, data security, intellectual property, accessibility, and equitable access. Institutional support should also include clear guidance on acceptable uses and appropriate training, while respecting faculty academic freedom and recognizing that AI integration may not be appropriate for every course or instructional context.

4. Continued Faculty Education and Consistent Application of Academic Integrity Procedures

The committee requests continued Senate support for faculty education regarding AP 5522: Grade Penalty Procedures, particularly the relationship between grade penalties, mandatory reporting, and student due-process rights.

A significant concern is the possibility that some faculty may impose grade penalties for academic dishonesty without submitting the required report to Student Services. Such practices, if occurring, may prevent students from receiving formal notification of their appeal rights and undermine the procedural protections established under AP 5522.

The AIC encourages the Senate to support continued faculty outreach, dissemination of practical resources, and collaboration with Student Conduct to promote consistent understanding and application of the procedures.

5. Continued Professional Development and Statewide Engagement

The committee encourages continued institutional support for faculty professional development, including participation in statewide conferences, workshops, and collaborative initiatives addressing AI, academic integrity, assessment practices, and academic freedom.

The opportunity for the AIC chair to attend the *ASCCC AI and Academia 2026: Navigating the Future* conference in March 2026 provided valuable insights into emerging challenges, statewide initiatives, and approaches being explored by other California community colleges. Continued opportunities for this type of engagement will help the committee remain informed, bring relevant perspectives back to the college, and contribute meaningfully to campus discussions and institutional planning.

The AIC also welcomes opportunities to collaborate with other Academic Senate committees on faculty professional development, including the possibility of a jointly facilitated Flex workshop with the Academic Freedom Committee in Spring 2027.

I. Upcoming Senate Agenda Items or New Future Senate Business from this Committee

The Academic Integrity Committee anticipates bringing the following matters to the Academic Senate for discussion and consideration during the 2026–2027 academic year:

1. **AP 5522 Faculty Primer:** Present *AP 5522: Academic Dishonesty Reporting — Faculty Cheat Sheet* for Senate discussion on November 19, 2026, with potential action on December 10, 2026. The resource is intended to help faculty understand their responsibilities under the revised procedures and promote consistent application of academic integrity standards and student due-process protections.
2. **AI-Detection Tools:** Engage the Senate in discussions regarding the appropriate use, limitations, and evidentiary role of AI-detection technologies in academic dishonesty cases, with the potential development of institutional guidance.

3. **Assessment Integrity:** Encourage broader Senate discussions regarding assessment integrity in the age of AI, particularly the challenges of ensuring meaningful evaluation of student learning across instructional modalities, including online education.

AP 7121 Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies

Reference:

Education Code 87001, 87003 and 87743.2
Title 5 Sections 53400 et seq.
Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges 2016 (CCCCO publication, 2012)
Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications (ASCCC publication, 2016)
ASCCC Curriculum Committee website: http//www.ccccurriculum.net/about-us/ accessed August 5, 2012.

J. MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

It is the philosophy of the ASCCC and of the Academic Senate of College of the Canyons that faculty hiring procedures and guidelines provide for qualified college faculty who are experts in their subject areas, who are skilled in teaching and serving the needs of a varied student population, who can foster overall college effectiveness, and who are sensitive to and themselves represent the racial and cultural diversity of the students they serve. The Board of Trustees, represented by the administration, has the principal legal and public responsibility for ensuring an effective hiring process. The faculty, represented by the Academic Senate, has an inherent professional responsibility to ensure the quality of its faculty peers through the development and implementation of policies and procedures governing the hiring process.

The Office of Human Resources, in consultation with the Academic Senate's Minimum Qualification and Equivalencies Committee and the Department Chairs, evaluates the minimum qualifications of an applicant to teach in a discipline at COC. The determination is based on the requirements determined by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges in consultation with the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges (ASCCC) and published in the *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators of California Community Colleges*, also known as the "Disciplines List." Minimum qualifications are determined for disciplines, not for courses or subject areas within disciplines, not for programs or for divisions/schools.

Disciplines are divided into 3 categories:

- Disciplines requiring a Master's degree
- Disciplines in which a Master's degree is not generally available
- Disciplines in which a Master's degree is not generally available but which requires a specific Bachelor's or Associate degree.

Title 5 regulations also specify minimum qualifications for additional faculty members, including health services professionals, non-credit instructors, apprenticeship instructors, Disabled Student Programs and Services personnel, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services personnel, learning assistance and tutoring coordinators, and work experience coordinators.

The minimum qualifications for disciplines, in which a Master's degree is not generally available, are one of the following:

1. Any Bachelor's degree and two years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment. Professional experience includes both work/occupational experience and teaching experience.

2. Any Associate degree and six years of professional experience directly related to the faculty member's teaching assignment. Professional experience includes both work/occupational experience and teaching experience.

a) EQUIVALENCY TO THE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

The faculty in each discipline determine whether they will accept equivalencies to the minimum qualifications to teach in their discipline.

Beginning in 2015 and every five years thereafter, the discipline/department faculty will review, decide, and inform the Academic Senate whether the discipline will accept equivalencies to the minimum qualifications. These decisions will be presented to the Academic Senate at the second Academic Senate meeting of the academic year.

If a discipline needs to make a change in their acceptance of equivalencies prior to the Senate's established five-year cycle due to Board Certification or other professional requirements, such as in Nursing or Paralegal Studies, the department must make a request to the MQE Committee to make a change off cycle in the acceptance of equivalencies.

b) BURDEN OF PROOF AND QUESTIONABLE MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

The burden of proof, with regard to the degree and with regard to experience, is on the applicant. Clear and thorough evidence with substantiating documentation must be presented with the application for employment. The Human Resources Office will verify minimum qualifications using the published *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators of California Community Colleges,* also known as the "Disciplines List."

Applications with questionable minimum qualifications will be brought to the Department Chair of the discipline and to the Hiring Committee Chair for their review. If an agreement cannot be reached between the Hiring Committee Chair and the Chair of the Department, the application will be brought to the MQE Committee of the Academic Senate for a resolution during fall and spring semesters and to the MQE Committee Chair or designee during the winter and summer terms when the MQE Committee does not meet.

Information and links to past and current disciplines lists are available on the Academic Senate's website at www.canyons.edu/offices/Acad_Sen.

K. EQUIVALENCY TO A DEGREE

AB1725 provides for the hiring of faculty who do not meet minimum qualifications, provided that "the governing board determines that he or she possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent" (title 5, Sec 87359). The criteria and process for reaching this judgment must be determined jointly by the Board of Trustees of a Community College District and the Academic Senate (Title 5, Sec 53430).

Together, they are responsible for establishing and monitoring the process to assure its fairness, efficiency, and consistent adherence to maintaining standards. The agreed upon process includes reasonable procedures to ensure that the governing Board of Trustees relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate to determine that each individual faculty employed possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications specified in the published *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators of California Community Colleges*.

The process also requires that the Academic Senate be provided with an opportunity to present its views to the Board of Trustees before the governing board makes a determination; and that the written record of the decision, including the views of the Academic Senate, shall be available for review pursuant to Education Code Section 87358. Until a joint agreement is reached and approved, the faculty member will be bound by the minimum qualification.

The authority to determine equivalent qualifications allows College of the Canyons (COC) to hire the most qualified individuals. The standards of the disciplines list published in the Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators of California Community Colleges cannot be waived. The fact that a particular candidate is the best that the college can find does not affect the question of whether he or she possesses equivalent qualifications. Professional experience includes both work/occupational experience and teaching experience. Regardless of staffing needs, faculty must meet the minimum qualifications or equivalency. Care has been given in this document to establish guidelines for equivalent criteria and to draft a supplemental application page that elicits relevant information. Determination of equivalency must be done fairly and expeditiously while maintaining the standards of AB1725.

a) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING DEGREE EQUIVALENCY

As per the paper, Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications adopted by ASCCC in spring 1999 and revised spring 2016, the Academic Senate believes that faculty members must exemplify to their students the value of an education that is both well-rounded and specialized. Therefore, the Academic Senate supports the following basic principles for granting equivalency:

1. Equivalent to the minimum qualifications means equal to the minimum qualifications, not nearly equal
2. The applicant for an equivalency must provide evidence of attaining coursework or experience equal to the general education component required of an Associate or Bachelor degree
3. The applicant for an equivalency must provide evidence of attaining the skills and knowledge provided by specialized course work component required for a major in an Associate, Bachelor's or Master's degree

The Academic Senate has developed procedures to meet the responsibility to determine equivalencies when an applicant for a faculty position, though lacking the exact degree or experience specified in the disciplines list, nonetheless does possess qualifications that are at least equivalent. The equivalency process is, by statute, is one upon which the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate jointly agree.

The Human Resources Office will verify equivalencies using the established equivalencies set out in this procedure. Applications with questionable equivalencies will be brought to the Department Chair of the discipline and to the Hiring Committee Chair for their review. If agreement cannot be reached between the Hiring Committee Chair and the Chair of the Department, the application will be brought to the MQE

Committee of the Academic Senate for a resolution during fall and spring semesters and to the MQE Committee Chair or designee during the winter and summer terms when the MQE Committee does not meet.

To determine equivalencies for current full-time faculty when they request additional discipline assignments, applications will be sent to the Human Resources Department. Questionable applications will be sent to the MQE Committee for resolution or to the MQE Committee Chair or designee during the winter and summer terms when the MQE Committee does not meet.

The equivalencies established in this document will apply to new full-time and part-time faculty employees hired after June 1, 2014. Current full-time faculty employees of the district hired prior to this date are subject to prior established equivalencies. Prior part-time faculty employees will be grand-fathered under the prior equivalencies but they must meet new equivalencies starting June 1, 2014, if they have not taught in the district for three continuous years.

b) EQUIVALENCY TO A MASTER DEGREE

(Applies to disciplines in category 1 – Disciplines requiring a Master's degree)
Revised 2016[1]

In order to establish the equivalent of a Master's degree in a discipline, applicants must show possession of at least the equivalent in level of achievement, breadth, and depth of understanding. The responsibility for supplying documentation to verify equivalency to a Master's degree in a requested discipline lies with the applicant. Documentation must include the following:

> An official transcript documenting successful completion of any Master's degree from an accredited institution of higher learning AND official transcripts documenting successful completion of 24 semester units in the discipline at the upper division and graduate level, a minimum of which must be 12 graduate level semester units.

An applicant who does not provide conclusive evidence in regard to all sections of an option above does not possess the equivalent of the Master's degree in question. The applicant is expected to provide evidence of equivalent preparation, and this evidence must be as reliable, objective, and thorough as a transcript. No set amount of knowledge can be said to be equivalent to any degree; equivalency depends on the nature of the knowledge. Many criteria for determining equivalency seem obvious and can be handled in a simple manner. Others are more complicated. One easy-to-address situation occurs when someone has all the appropriate courses/thesis for the relevant degree but the degree has another name. A review of the transcript might show that the coursework completed is the same as the coursework required by the Master's program and establishes that an applicant does have the broad background and depth of experience to be judged equivalent to the content of the academic work of the Master's degree in question.

[1] On November 10, 2016, the College of the Canyons Academic Senate voted to remove the following Equivalencies that were first established in 2013: Equivalency to a Masters Option #2 • Equivalency to a Bachelors Option #3 • Equivalency to an Associates Option #3.

c) EQUIVALENCY TO A BACHELOR DEGREE

(Applies to disciplines in categories 2 and 3 – Disciplines in which a Master's degree is not generally available)

Revised 2016[1]

In order to establish the equivalent of a Bachelor's degree in a requested discipline, applicants must show possession of at least the equivalent in level of achievement, breadth, and depth of understanding. The responsibility for supplying documentation to verify equivalency to a Bachelor's degree lies with the applicant. Documentation of equivalency must meet the requirements of one of the following two options:

Option 1

The applicant must submit an official transcript documenting successful completion of 120 semester units of college coursework at an accredited institution of higher learning. The transcript must include successful completion of 60 semester units of lower division and 60 semester units of upper division coursework. Also, the transcript must include successful completion of 36 semester units of general education courses as described in *Academic Procedures 7121 Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies* and 24 discipline-specific semester units in courses for any one discipline-specific major. Credits on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam, credits by exam, and credits on a military transcript are acceptable.

Option 2

The applicant must submit an official transcript documenting successful completion of a combination of a minimum of 80 semester units of college coursework at an accredited institution of higher learning including the general education course units, as described in *Academic Procedures 7121 Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies*, required for the Bachelor's degree and documented and verifiable evidence of 640 hours of significant professionally sanctioned discipline-specific training through certification courses, approved apprenticeships, and licensing programs in the requested discipline. Examples of approved training programs include but are not limited to those provided by labor unions, state and national certification boards, and governmental agencies. Credits on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam, credits by exam, and credits on a military transcript are acceptable.

[1] On November 10, 2016, the College of the Canyons Academic Senate voted to remove the following Equivalencies that were first established in 2013: Equivalency to a Masters Option #2 • Equivalency to a Bachelors Option #3 • Equivalency to an Associates Option #3.

General Education for the Bachelor Degree

To meet the general education requirements for the Bachelor's degree, the applicant must include an official transcript documenting successful completion of a minimum of 36 semester units including 3 semester units in each of the following courses. A passing grade on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam are equivalent to 3 units for the related general education course. Credits by exam are acceptable.

- English Composition (Expository writing)
- Critical Thinking (e.g. Logic, Argumentation, Composition based on analytical reading)
- Oral Communications (e.g. Public Speaking, Group Communications)
- Physical Science* (e.g. Astronomy, Chemistry, Environmental Science, Geology, Oceanography, Physical Geography, Physical Science, Physics)
- Biological/Life Science* (e.g. Biology, Physical Anthropology)
- College Level Math (e.g. Mathematics above Intermediate Algebra)
- Fine/Performing Arts (e.g. Animation, Art, Dance, Design, Graphic Design, Music, Photo, Theater)
- Humanities (e.g. Foreign Language, Humanities, Literature, Philosophy) One course in either Fine/Performing Arts or Humanities
- One course in Social and/or Behavioral Science (e.g. Cultural Anthropology, Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology)
- A second course in Social and/or Behavioral Science (e.g. Cultural Anthropology, Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology)
- A third course in Social and/or Behavioral Science (e.g. Cultural Anthropology, Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology)

* One of the Physical or Biological science courses above must include a laboratory.

An applicant who does not provide conclusive evidence in regard to both general education and major courses does not possess the equivalent of a Bachelor's degree. The applicant is expected to provide evidence of equivalent preparation, and this evidence must be as reliable, objective, and thorough as a transcript. The applicant must show possession of the equivalent of not only specialized knowledge of a particular major, but also of the general education component. No set amount of knowledge can be said to be equivalent to any degree; equivalency depends on the nature of the knowledge. Many criteria for determining equivalency seem obvious and can be handled in a simple manner. Others are more complicated. One easy-to-address situation occurs when someone has all the appropriate courses/thesis for a degree but the degree was never granted. A review of the transcript might show that the coursework was completed and establishes that a candidate really does have the broad background and depth of experience to be judged equivalent to the content of the academic work of a Bachelor's degree.

d) EQUIVALENCY TO AN ASSOCIATE DEGREE
(Applies to disciplines in categories 2 and 3)
Revised 2016[1]

In order to establish the equivalent of an Associate degree in a discipline, applicants must show possession of at least the equivalent in level of achievement, breadth, and depth of understanding. The responsibility for supplying documentation to verify equivalency to an Associate degree in a requested discipline lies with the applicant/candidate. Documentation of equivalency must meet the requirements of one of the following options:

Option 1
The applicant must submit an official transcript documenting successful completion of 60 units of college coursework at an accredited institution of higher learning. The transcript must include 15 units of general education courses as described in *Academic Procedures 7121 Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies*. Also, the transcript must include 18 units of discipline-specific units for any one discipline-specific major. Credits on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam, credits by exam, and credits on a military transcript are acceptable.

Option 2
The applicant must submit an official transcript documenting successful completion of a minimum of 40 units of college coursework at an accredited institution of higher learning including a minimum of 18 general education course units as described in *Academic Procedures 7121 Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies* and required for the Associate degree and documented and verifiable evidence of 320 hours of significant professionally sanctioned discipline-specific training through certification courses, approved apprenticeships, and licensing programs in the requested discipline. Examples of approved training programs include but are not limited to those provided by labor unions, state and national certification boards, and governmental agencies. Credits on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam, credits by exam, and credits on a military transcript are acceptable.

[1] On November 10, 2016, the College of the Canyons Academic Senate voted to remove the following Equivalencies that were first established in 2013: Equivalency to a Masters Option #2 • Equivalency to a Bachelors Option #3 • Equivalency to an Associates Option #3.

General Education for the Associate Degree (Title 5 Section 55063(b))

To meet the general education requirements for the Associate degree or equivalent, the applicant must include an official transcript documenting successful completion of a minimum of 18 semester units from the course categories listed below and including a minimum of 3 semester units in each of the 5 areas. A passing grade on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam are equivalent to 3 units for the related general education course. Credits by exam are acceptable.

- Natural Science (e.g. Astronomy, Biology, Chemistry, Environmental Science, Physical Anthropology, Physical Science, Physics)
- Social Sciences (e.g. Cultural Anthropology, Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology)
- Humanities (e.g. Art, Dance, Design, Foreign Language, Humanities, Literature, Music, Philosophy, Photography, Theater)
- English Composition (Expository writing)
- Communication and Analytical Thinking (oral communication, mathematics at minimum one level below transferable, logic, statistics, computer language and programming)

An applicant who does not provide conclusive evidence in regard to both general education and major specific courses does not possess the equivalent of the Associate degree. The applicant is expected to provide evidence of equivalent preparation, and this evidence must be as reliable, objective, and thorough as a transcript. The applicant must show possession of the equivalent of not only specialized knowledge of a particular major, but also of the general education component.

No set amount of knowledge can be said to be equivalent to any degree; equivalency depends on the nature of the knowledge. Many criteria for determining equivalency seem obvious and can be handled in a simple manner. Others are more complicated. One easy-to- address situation occurs when someone has all the appropriate courses for a degree but the degree was never granted. A review of the transcript might show that the coursework was completed and establishes that a candidate really does have the broad background and depth of experience to be judged equivalent to the content of the academic work of an Associate degree.

L. CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING EXPERIENCE

In order to establish experience, a candidate must show possession of thorough and broad skill and knowledge for each of the following:

- ï Mastery of the skills of the vocation thorough enough for the specific assignment and broad enough to serve as a basis for teaching the other courses in the discipline

- ï Extensive and diverse knowledge of the working environment of the vocation.

Examples of documents in support of relevant experience might include:

- ï Documentation of prior teaching experience in the requested discipline.
- ï Employer statements or other evidence validating related work experience. In the case of self-employment, continuity of experience evidenced by presenting copies of relevant tax forms (schedule C or partnership forms) over the number of requested years.

- ï Documentation of apprenticeships and journeyman training.
- ï Examples of substantial evidence of work products that show a command of the discipline and time expended on the products.

M. EQUIVALENCY COMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

a) APPLICATION TO REQUEST EQUIVALENCY

1. The *Request for Equivalency* form must be completed and attached to the application for employment together with official transcripts and/or other supporting documentation as evidence of equivalency and submitted to the Office of Human Resources. Request for Equivalency to an Associate's Degree, to a Bachelor's Degree and to a Master's Degree forms are available on the Office of Human Resources Website: http://www.canyons.edu/Offices/HumanResources/Pages/minimum.aspx

2. The Human Resources Office will verify equivalencies using the established equivalencies set out in this procedure. Applications with questionable equivalencies will be brought to the Department Chair of the discipline and to the Hiring Committee Chair for their review. If agreement cannot be reached between the Hiring Committee Chair and the Chair of the Department, the application will be brought to the MQE Committee of the Academic Senate for a resolution during fall and spring semesters and to the MQE Committee Chair or designee during the winter and summer terms when the MQE Committee does not meet.

   To determine equivalencies for current full-time faculty when they request additional discipline assignments, applications will be sent to the Human Resources Department. Questionable applications will be sent to the MQE Committee for resolution or to the MQE Committee Chair or designee during the winter and summer terms when the MQE Committee does not meet

3. Decisions regarding equivalencies to the minimum qualifications for a discipline when an applicant for employment submits the application will be made prior to the hiring interview. If the discipline faculty members on the Hiring Committee do not reach a unanimous decision, the equivalency is not granted.

4. If a full-time faculty member requests an additional equivalency after hiring, a *Request for Equivalency* form will be referred to the Equivalency Committee of the Academic Senate. Official transcripts and other supporting documentation must be attached to the application and submitted to the Office of Human Resources. If the Equivalency Committee does not reach a unanimous decision, the equivalency is not granted. A determination of equivalency does not guarantee a teaching assignment in the requested discipline.

5. A determination of equivalency does not guarantee a teaching assignment in the requested discipline.

6. Decisions of the Equivalency Committee will be reported to Human Resources for a possible interview and upon hire submitted to and approved by the Academic Senate in the same way that decisions of the Curriculum Committee are submitted to and approved by the Academic Senate.

7. In all equivalency procedures, the Office of Human Resources shall inform the applicant of the decision.

8. All records involved in equivalency proceedings, regardless of whether the equivalency was granted or not, shall be confidential. At the conclusion of the equivalency determination by the Equivalency Committee, the *Request for Equivalency* form and all supporting documents shall be returned to the Office of Human Resources.

b) COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

1. All faculty members serving on the committee shall be contract faculty.

2. Members of the committee will participate in annual training to take place at the first meeting of each academic year.

3. Members of the committee will review the Administrative Procedures of the Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies (AP 7121) each spring term of the academic year.

4. All decisions of the Equivalency Committee will be made by vote of its members. A vote will not take place unless a quorum, as established by a majority of its members, is present.

5. The committee will have one faculty representative from each division/school. The Equivalency Committee may consult with discipline faculty for the requested discipline if no faculty member from the division/school where the discipline resides serves on the Equivalency Committee.

6. The committee will have two non-voting members from the Human Resources Office.

7. A full-time faculty member seeking an equivalency must abstain from deliberating on the determination of that equivalency if the faculty member making the request serves on the Equivalency Committee. In such a case, the committee must request an alternate faculty member from the division, which the faculty member represents on the committee.

8. The Committee will meet at least once a month during the fall and spring semesters, the date and time to be determined by the members of the committee.

9. A unanimous decision of the quorum (defined as 50%+1) must be reached by the Equivalency Committee or the equivalency is not granted. A member of the Committee who is not present when a *Request for Equivalency* form is reviewed forfeits his or her right to vote. Voting will take place at the scheduled monthly committee meetings, however, in the event when a timely vote must take precedence, voting may take place by email.

c) APPEAL PROCEDURE FOR CONTRACT FACULTY ONLY

If a contract faculty member applies for equivalency for an additional discipline disagrees with the decision, the applicant may appeal by submitting new written documentation or clarifications to the Equivalency Committee. This appeal must be submitted within 15 contract days after the applicant has

received notification of the committee's decision. The applicant may make an oral statement explaining this new material to the committee at its next scheduled meeting. The committee will deliberate again without the applicant present and the committee's decision shall be final. If a unanimous decision cannot be reached, the equivalency is not granted and the appeal process ends.

d) RE-APPLICATION PROCEDURE

If a current full-time or part-time faculty was denied an equivalency in the past but has after one academic year since completed additional coursework and/or possesses new supporting documentation, the applicant may re-apply for the equivalency. This is not an appeal; this is a re-application because of the time elapsed since the last equivalency decision. The Equivalency

Committee will review any and all records involved in past considerations of equivalency for that particular applicant, along with the new supporting documentation. Faculty members may not re-apply unless there is new coursework and/or new supporting documentation. The re- application process is subject to the appeal procedure.

SOURCES

1. Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges 2016 (CCCCO publication, 2016) http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Reports/2016-Minimum-Qualifications-Report-ADA.pdf

2. Equivalence to the Minimum Qualifications (ASCCC publication, 2016) http://www.asccc.org/papers/equivalence-minimum-qualifications-1

3. ASCCC Curriculum Committee website: http//www.ccccurriculum.net/about-us/ accessed August 5, 2012.

Revised May 2017

TO: College of the Canyons Academic Senate

FROM: Gary Collis, Chair of Policy Review Committee

DATE: October 10, 2026

RE: Summary of Revisions to AP 7121 (Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies) – to be AP 7211 (Equivalencies)

This memorandum highlights the proposed, important, and substantive changes to AP 7121 (Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies), which would be renumbered and renamed AP 7211 (Equivalencies).

1. **Different equivalency pathways for disciplines requiring a specific degree versus any degree**: Under the current AP, the "specific degree" and "any degree" categories outlined in the Disciplines List use the same bachelor's and associate's equivalency options. The proposed changes remove the discipline-specific major coursework requirement for "any degree" equivalencies - 24 units for a bachelor's and 18 units for an associate's. However, it also eliminates the coursework-plus-training option for that category: applicants would need the full 120 or 60 college units. The training alternatives remain available for disciplines requiring a specific degree.
2. **New minimum grades for qualifying coursework**: The current AP generally requires successful completion of coursework without specifying letter grades. The proposal requires C or better for bachelor's general education, the discipline-specific major units under Option 1 for specific bachelor's and associate's degrees, and the coursework for an "any bachelor's degree" equivalency. Associate's general education requires C– or better.
3. **Different general education requirements**: The proposal replaces the AP's fixed lists of general education subjects with references to California's general education transfer curriculum for bachelor's equivalencies and the District's general education curriculum for associate's equivalencies. Bachelor's requirements would follow the curriculum in effect when the applicant applies. This changes which subject areas applicants must satisfy and allows those requirements to change without revising the AP's own course list.
4. **Explicit acceptance of evaluated foreign education**: The proposal expressly permits foreign educational equivalents evaluated by a member of the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services (NACES). The current AP does not state this allowance expressly.

5. **Broader express recognition of Credit for Prior Learning**: The proposal permits Credit for Prior Learning toward general education, including credit by examination. The current AP expressly identifies examination credit but does not explicitly allow other forms of CPL.
6. **A restriction for faculty teaching upper-division baccalaureate courses**: The proposal expressly prohibits using equivalency for the bachelor's degree required for those assignments. The current AP contains no corresponding restriction. This limitation comes from California law.
7. **Direct committee review of questionable minimum qualifications**: Currently, the AP states that HR will refer questionable qualifications to the Department Chair and Hiring Committee Chair, with unresolved disagreements referred to the committee. The proposal sends these cases directly to the Equivalency Committee for review and a recommendation.
8. **Required documentation of discipline assignments**: The proposal requires HR to prepare a discipline assignment memo at hire for both full-time and part-time faculty. It also requires a memo to the Academic Senate following committee verification of a questioned minimum-qualifications case. This reflects current practice.
9. **Required equivalency language in recruitment materials**: All faculty position announcements would have to state the possibility of qualifying through equivalency. Application forms would have to ask applicants whether they meet minimum qualifications or claim equivalency, with reasons and supporting evidence required for the latter. This reflects current practice.
10. **Authority to establish separate operating procedures**: The proposal expressly directs the Equivalency Committee to create, maintain, and revise operating procedures regarding its own processes and operations and, in collaboration with HR, must establish a review and reconsideration process. The current AP itself specifies at least some of the procedural rules that are more appropriately adopted by the committee itself.

AP 7211 Faculty Service Areas, Minimum Qualifications, and Equivalencies

References:

Education Code Sections 87001, 87003, and 87743.2;
Title 5 Sections 53400 et seq.;
ACCJC Accreditation Standard 3

Faculty Service Areas

Faculty service areas may be established after negotiation and consultation as required by law with the appropriate faculty representatives.

Minimum Qualifications

Faculty shall meet minimum qualifications established by the Board of Governors or shall possess qualifications that are at least equivalent to the minimum qualifications set out in the regulations of the Board of Governors.

The applicant bears the burden of proving possession of the required degree and experience. Clear and thorough evidence with substantiating documentation must be presented with the application for employment. The Office of Human Resources ("HR") will verify whether an applicant satisfies the minimum qualifications ("MQs") using the published "Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators of California Community Colleges" ("Disciplines List").

If questions or concerns arise as to whether an applicant's degree or qualifications satisfy the established MQs, HR will refer the materials to the Academic Senate's Equivalency Committee ("Equivalency Committee") for review, verification, and a recommendation as to whether the applicant meets MQs. Upon receiving verification from the Equivalency Committee that the applicant meets the required MQs, HR will prepare a discipline assignment memo and provide it to the Academic Senate. Human Resources will document and maintain the Equivalency Committee's determination.

At the time of hire, HR will verify that full-time and part-time faculty meet the applicable MQs and will prepare a discipline assignment memo identifying the discipline(s) for which the faculty member is qualified.

Information and links to archived and current Disciplines Lists are available on the website of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (www.asccc.org).

Equivalencies

The District shall not accept equivalencies by default. Rather, every five years, the Department Chair, in collaboration with faculty within the applicable discipline, shall review and determine whether equivalencies will be accepted to teach in that discipline. The Department Chair shall ensure that the review includes appropriate participation by faculty within the applicable discipline and is conducted using a fair, reasonable, and documented process consistent with established Academic Senate and District procedures.

Equivalency Committee – The Academic Senate has established the Equivalency Committee to fulfill the requirements of Education Code Section 87359, which states that the equivalency process "shall include reasonable procedures to ensure that the Governing Board relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate to determine that each individual employed under the authority granted by the regulations possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable minimum qualifications." To ensure that the Board of Trustees relies primarily on the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate, the Equivalency Committee shall:

- Establish a five-year cycle for departmental decision-making regarding accepting equivalencies, including the circumstances, if any, under which a department may be permitted to change its decision regarding accepting equivalencies off cycle.

- Report departmental decisions regarding accepting equivalencies to the Academic Senate and HR in a timely manner.

- Be available to screening and selection committees as a resource regarding equivalency determinations;

- Recommend all equivalency determinations to the Board of Trustees made pursuant to standards and procedure outlined in Operating Procedures that the Equivalency Committee shall create, maintain, and revise as necessary;

    - In addition to other standard elements of operating procedures used by Academic Senate subcommittees, the Equivalency Committee, in collaboration with HR, shall establish and maintain procedures governing the equivalency review process, including a reasonable process for reconsideration of an equivalency determination.

- Further clarify the criteria to be used for determining equivalency;

- Ensure that records of all equivalency determinations are transmitted to HR, which shall maintain them;

- Periodically review this procedure and recommend necessary changes to the Academic Senate and Board of Trustees; and

- In general, ensure that the equivalency process, including, but not limited to, gathering departmental decisions regarding equivalencies, works well and meets the requirements of the law.

Equivalency to a Degree

California law (AB 1725) provides for the hiring of faculty who do not meet MQs, provided that "the governing board determines that [the applicant] possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent …." (Cal. Educ. Code § 87359). The criteria and process for reaching this judgment must be determined jointly by the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate. (Title 5, § 53430).

Together, the Board of Trustees and Academic Senate are responsible for establishing and monitoring the process to assure its fairness, efficiency, and consistent adherence to established standards. The agreed-upon process includes reasonable procedures to ensure that the Board of Trustees relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate to determine that each individual faculty employed possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to the applicable MQs specified in the published Disciplines List.

The process also requires that the District (1) provide the Academic Senate an opportunity to present its views to the Board of Trustees before it makes a determination and (2) make the written record of the decision, including the views of the Academic Senate, available for review pursuant to Education Code Section 87358.

The authority to determine equivalent qualifications allows the District to hire the most qualified individuals. The standards of the Disciplines List cannot be waived. That a particular applicant within the pool may be the most preferable does not equate to possession of equivalent qualifications to the MQs. Professional experience includes both work/occupational experience and teaching experience. Regardless of staffing needs, faculty must meet the MQs or possess the equivalent of them. Equivalency determinations shall be made fairly and reasonably expeditiously and must comply with the requirements of California law.

Determination of Equivalencies – This procedure shall be used to determine whether an applicant for a faculty position, although lacking the exact degree or experience specified in the Disciplines List of the Board of Governors that establishes the MQs for hire, nonetheless possesses qualifications that are at least equivalent to those required by the Disciplines List. The procedure is intended to ensure a fair and objective process for determining when an applicant has the equivalent qualifications. It is not intended to grant waivers for lack of the required qualifications. For faculty assigned to teach upper-division courses in a baccalaureate degree program, equivalency is not permitted for the bachelor's degree required under Title 5 Section 53410.

All faculty position announcements will state the required qualifications as specified by the Disciplines List, including the possibility of meeting the equivalent of the required degree or experience.

District application forms for faculty positions will require that applicants state whether they meet the MQs of the Disciplines List or whether they believe they meet the equivalent. Those claiming equivalency will then be required to state their reasons and to present supporting evidence.

The Equivalency Committee shall send its decisions concerning equivalency and non-equivalency to HR.

Criteria for Equivalency: Master's Disciplines

To establish the equivalent of a master's degree in a requested discipline, applicants must provide (1) an official transcript documenting successful completion of any master's degree from an institutionally accredited institution of higher learning (or the equivalent from a foreign institution as evaluated by a member of the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services ("NACES") and (2) official transcripts documenting successful completion of 24 semester units in the applicable discipline at the upper division and graduate level, a minimum of which must be 12 graduate-level semester units (with a passing grade, as determined by the institution awarding the credit).

Criteria for Equivalency: Non-Master's Disciplines Requiring a *Specific* Bachelor's or Associate's Degree and Professional Experience

Equivalency is not a waiver of MQs but a determination that an applicant possesses qualifications at least equivalent to the required degree.

- **Equivalency to a Specific Bachelor's Degree**: An applicant who does not hold a conferred bachelor's degree may establish equivalency by demonstrating educational preparation and professional accomplishment that collectively provide the same level of knowledge and competency expected of an individual who has completed the required bachelor's degree. Documentation of equivalency must meet the requirements of one of the following two options:

    - Equivalency Option 1: The applicant must submit an official transcript documenting successful completion of 120 semester units of college coursework at an institutionally accredited institution of higher learning (or the equivalent from a foreign institution as evaluated by a member of NACES). The transcript must include successful completion of 60 semester units of lower division and 60 semester units of upper division coursework. The transcript must also reveal successful completion of 36 semester units of general education courses, as described herein, and 24 discipline-specific semester units in courses for any one discipline-specific major (with a grade of C or better). Credits posted on a transcript from an accredited institution of higher learning are acceptable. The applicant must also submit documented and verifiable evidence of two years of full-time work in the discipline.

- Equivalency Option 2: The applicant must submit an official transcript documenting successful completion of a combination of a minimum of 80 semester units of college coursework at an institutionally accredited institution of higher learning (or the equivalent from a foreign institution as evaluated by a member of NACES) including the general education course units, as described herein, and documented and verifiable evidence of 640 hours of significant professionally sanctioned discipline-specific training through certification courses, approved apprenticeships, and licensing programs in the requested discipline. Examples of approved training programs include, but are not limited to, those provided by labor unions, state and national certification boards, and governmental agencies. The applicant must also submit documented and verifiable evidence of two years of full-time work in the discipline.

- **General Education for the Bachelor's Degree**: To meet the general education requirements for the bachelor's degree, the applicant must include an official transcript documenting successful completion of a minimum of 36 semester units including 3 semester units in each of the California general education transfer curriculum areas and sub-areas required of students in effect at the time the applicant applies for employment (grade of C or better). A passing grade on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam is equivalent to 3 units for the related general education course. Credit for Prior Learning, including credit by exam, is acceptable.

- **Equivalency to a Specific Associate's Degree**: An applicant who does not hold a conferred associate's degree may establish equivalency by demonstrating educational preparation and professional accomplishment that collectively provide the same level of knowledge and competency expected of an individual who has completed the required associate's degree. Documentation of equivalency must meet the requirements of one of the following two options:

    - Equivalency Option 1: The applicant must submit an official transcript documenting successful completion of 60 units of college coursework at an institutionally accredited institution of higher learning (or the equivalent from a foreign institution as evaluated by a member of NACES). The transcript must include 18 units of general education courses, as described herein. Also, the transcript must include 18 units of discipline-specific units for any one discipline-specific major (with a grade of C or better). Credits on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam, credits by exam, and credits on a military transcript are acceptable. The applicant must also submit documented and verifiable evidence of six years of full-time work in the discipline.

    - Equivalency Option 2: The applicant must submit an official transcript documenting successful completion of a minimum of 40 units of college coursework at an institutionally accredited institution of higher learning (or the equivalent from a foreign institution as evaluated by a member of NACES), including a minimum of 18 general education course units, as

described herein, and documented and verifiable evidence of 320 hours of significant professionally sanctioned discipline-specific training through certification courses, approved apprenticeships, and licensing programs in the requested discipline. Examples of approved training programs include but are not limited to those provided by labor unions, state and national certification boards, and governmental agencies. Credits posted on a transcript from an accredited institution of higher learning are acceptable. The applicant must also submit documented and verifiable evidence of six years of full-time work in the discipline.

- **General Education for the Associate's Degree:** To meet the general education requirements for the associate degree or equivalent, the applicant must include an official transcript documenting successful completion of a minimum of 18 semester units from the District's associate degree general education curriculum areas and sub-areas (grade of C- or better). A passing grade on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam is equivalent to 3 units for the related general education course. Credit for Prior Learning, including credit by exam, is acceptable.

Criteria for Equivalency: Non-Master's Disciplines Requiring *Any* Degree and Professional Experience

Equivalency is not a waiver of minimum qualifications but a determination that an applicant possesses qualifications at least equivalent to the required degree.

- **Equivalency to Any Bachelor's Degree**: An applicant who does not hold a conferred bachelor's degree may establish equivalency by demonstrating educational preparation and professional years of service that collectively provide the same level of knowledge and competency expected of an individual who has completed a bachelor's degree. Documentation of equivalency must meet the following requirements:

    - The applicant must submit an official transcript documenting successful completion of 120 semester units of college coursework at an institutionally accredited institution of higher learning (or the equivalent from a foreign institution as evaluated by a member of NACES). The transcript must include successful completion of 60 semester units of lower division and 60 semester units of upper division coursework (grade of C or better). The transcript must also reveal successful completion of 36 semester units of general education courses, as described herein. Credits posted on a transcript from an accredited institution of higher learning are acceptable. The applicant must also submit documented and verifiable evidence of two years of full-time work in the discipline.

- **General Education for the Bachelor's Degree:** To meet the general education requirements for the bachelor's degree, the applicant must include an official transcript documenting successful completion of a minimum of 36 semester units, including 3 semester units in each of the current California general

education transfer curriculum areas and sub-areas required of students in effect at the time the applicant applies for employment (grade of C or better). A passing grade on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam is equivalent to 3 units for the related general education course. Credit for Prior Learning, including credit by exam, is acceptable.

- **Equivalency to Any Associate's Degree**: An applicant who does not hold a conferred associate's degree may establish equivalency by demonstrating educational preparation and professional years of service that collectively provide the same level of knowledge and competency expected of an individual who has completed the required associate's degree. Documentation of equivalency must meet the following requirements:

    - The applicant must submit an official transcript documenting successful completion of 60 units of college coursework at an institutionally accredited institution of higher learning (or the equivalent from a foreign institution as evaluated by a member of NACES). The transcript must include 18 units of general education courses as described herein. Credits on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam, credits by exam, and credits on a military transcript are acceptable. The applicant must also submit documented and verifiable evidence of six years of full-time work in the discipline.

- **General Education for the Associate's Degree**: To meet the general education requirements for the associate degree or equivalent, the applicant must include an official transcript documenting successful completion of a minimum of 18 semester units from the District's associate degree general education curriculum areas and sub-areas (grade of C- or better). A passing grade on a CLEP, IB, or AP exam is equivalent to 3 units for the related general education course. Credit for Prior Learning, including credit by exam, is acceptable.

Applicability

The equivalency criteria established herein shall apply to all faculty hired by the District after this procedure's adoption.

The District shall continue recognizing equivalencies that it recognized prior to the adoption of this procedure, including those of part-time faculty seeking full-time employment, until there has been a break in continuous District employment, as defined by the applicable part-time faculty collective bargaining agreement. A faculty member who has a break in service and seeks re-employment with the District shall be subject to the equivalency requirements and procedures in effect at the time of re-employment, regardless of any equivalency determination previously granted by the District.

A faculty member, after adoption of this procedure, who seeks to secure an additional disciplinary assignment from the District based on an equivalency will be subject to the equivalency requirements in effect at the time of the request.

TO: College of the Canyons Academic Senate

FROM: Gary Collis, Chair of Policy Review Committee

DATE: October 20, 2026

RE: Summary of Revisions to BP/AP 4030 (Academic Freedom)

The District last revised BP/AP 4030 (Academic Freedom) six years ago. While there have been no legal developments necessitating the Policy Committee's recent review and changes, accreditation standards require review of all policies and procedures on a regular basis nonetheless. Basically, it was time to examine the documents and consider changes.

A brief summary of the noteworthy changes:

Board Policy

- The references were updated to incorporate changes to ACCJC numbering.
- The Board Policy was revised to change language appearing to command the Academic Senate to establish a committee on academic freedom. The Academic Senate alone decides questions relating to its subcommittees.

Administrative Procedure

- The AP is filled with rules and requirements regarding the operation of the Academic Senate's Subcommittee on Academic Freedom, such as committee membership, report types, and voting procedures, that are more appropriately left to the committee's operating procedures. Indeed, the Committee on Academic Freedom has already incorporated the rules in the AP into its operating procedures, which the Academic Senate has, pursuant to its regular process, endorsed. The changes to the AP would simply delete these rules and requirements. The Academic Senate should have exclusive control over questions relating to its subcommittee's operations. Not only does that make structural sense but it allows the Senate itself to change the rules by which its committee operates without the need to bring those changes to College Policy Council.

AP 4030 ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Reference: ***Education Code section 76120; Title 5 section 51023; ACCJC Accreditation Eligibility 13 and 20; Accreditation Standard4.1***

A. THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE

The Academic Senate has established a standing committee to consider matters of academic freedom (hereinafter, "committee").

B.

C. COMMITTEE WORK

The District recognizes that the committee's work, as determined by the Senate, currently includes (1) making formal recommendations on academic freedom matters to the Senate in relation to a dispute, controversy, or other matter including, but not limited to, an alleged violation of Board Policy 4030, (2) offering informal advice or guidance on matters of academic freedom, (3) undertaking initiatives to educate the campus community with respect to academic freedom, and (4) other activities relating to academic freedom assigned by the Senate.

Revised _____

AP 4030 ACADEMIC FREEDOM

References: Education Code section 76120; Title 5 section 51023; ACCJC Accreditation Eligibility 13 and 20; Accreditation Standard 4.1

A. THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE

The Academic Senate has established a standing committee to consider matters of academic freedom (hereinafter, "committee").

B. COMMITTEE WORK

The District recognizes that the committee's work, as determined by the Senate, currently includes (1) making formal recommendations on academic freedom matters to the Senate in relation to a dispute, controversy, or other matter including, but not limited to, an alleged violation of Board Policy 4030, (2) offering informal advice or guidance on matters of academic freedom, (3) undertaking initiatives to educate the campus community with respect to academic freedom, and (4) other activities relating to academic freedom assigned by the Senate.

Revised _____

BP 4030 ACADEMIC FREEDOM

References: Education Code section 76120; Title 5 section 51023; ACCJC Accreditation Eligibility 13 and 20; Accreditation Standard 4.1; 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with Interpretative Comments, in AAUP POLICY DOCUMENTS & REPORTS (11th ed. 2015)

A. GENERAL PRINCIPLES ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

1. The free expression guarantee provided by the United States Constitution's First Amendment is vital to America's democracy; the functioning of democratic institutions depends on the people's freedom to vigorously discuss, debate, disagree, challenge and dialogue on all topics of public concern.
2. To fulfill its civic and educational mission, an institution of higher education must encourage its campus community to comprehend and value the importance of the right of free expression to an open society and an educated populace.
3. Developing the critical inquiry and thought required for individual success and societal progress can only occur in an academic environment that promotes an open and free exchange of ideas and freedom of expression must, therefore, extend to students and faculty in an educational environment.
4. The Santa Clarita Community College District ("District") supports academic freedom for its faculty and students and encourages them to develop and engage in opportunities for critical thinking and personal growth without compromising the respect to which all persons are entitled.

B. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND THE FACULTY

The District adopts the definition of academic freedom provided by the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, including the 1970 Interpretive Comments. That definition, in summary, declares that academic freedom is the freedom to teach, both in and outside the classroom, to conduct research and to publish the results of those investigations, and to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance. Professors should also have the freedom to address the larger community with regard to any matter of social, political, economic or other interest, without institutional discipline or restraint, save in response to fundamental violations of professional ethics or statements that suggest disciplinary incompetence.

C. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND STUDENTS

1. By engaging in academic study within the District, students should accept that they will study in an environment designed to present a full, open, and thoughtful range of

academic insights, perspectives, and viewpoints and that they are likely to be exposed to conflicting and controversial views as a result.
2. Academic freedom allows students to take reasoned exception to the concepts and conclusions presented in any course of study in a manner that is consistent with the District's Code of Student Conduct. Students remain responsible, however, for learning the content of any course in which they are enrolled, and can expect to be evaluated on their knowledge of such information.

D. DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES AND SUPPORT

1. The District is committed to the full support of the principle of academic freedom within all its activities.
2. The District supports the freedom of all faculty to inquire, to teach controversial content, to model and encourage critical thinking, and to present multiple viewpoints within each discipline.
3. The District supports the freedom of all students to inquire, access the full range of information available, explore difficult and controversial material, develop and practice critical thinking skills, and learn in a climate free of intimidation and conducive to the free exchange of ideas.
4. The District recognizes that the California Education Code grants faculty the right and the professional responsibility to assign grades free from political influence, intimidation, or legal threat.

E. ROLE OF ACADEMIC SENATE

1. The District recognizes that the Academic Senate has established a Committee on Academic Freedom to provide clarification and advice on matters relating to academic freedom.

See Administrative Procedure [AP 4030]
Revised _____

BP 4030 ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Reference: ***Education Code section 76120; Title 5 section 51023; ACCJC Accreditation Eligibility 13 and 20; Accreditation Standard 4.1; 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with Interpretative Comments, in AAUP POLICY DOCUMENTS & REPORTS (11th ed. 2015)***

A. GENERAL PRINCIPLES ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

1. The free expression guarantee provided by the United States Constitution's First Amendment is vital to America's democracy; the functioning of democratic institutions depends on the people's freedom to vigorously discuss, debate, disagree, challenge and dialogue on all topics of public concern.
2. To fulfill its civic and educational mission, an institution of higher education must encourage its campus community to comprehend and value the importance of the right of free expression to an open society and an educated populace.
3. Developing the critical inquiry and thought required for individual success and societal progress can only occur in an academic environment that promotes an open and free exchange of ideas and freedom of expression must, therefore, extend to students and faculty in an educational environment.
4. The Santa Clarita Community College District ("District") supports academic freedom for its faculty and students and encourages them to develop and engage in opportunities for critical thinking and personal growth without compromising the respect to which all persons are entitled.

B. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND THE FACULTY

The District adopts the definition of academic freedom provided by the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, including the 1970 Interpretive Comments. That definition, in summary, declares that academic freedom is the freedom to teach, both in and outside the classroom, to conduct research and to publish the results of those investigations, and to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance. Professors should also have the freedom to address the larger community with regard to any matter of social, political, economic or other interest, without institutional discipline or restraint, save in response to fundamental violations of professional ethics or statements that suggest disciplinary incompetence.

C. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND STUDENTS

3. By engaging in academic study within the District, students should accept that they will study in an environment designed to present a full, open, and thoughtful range of

academic insights, perspectives, and viewpoints and that they are likely to be exposed to conflicting and controversial views as a result.

4. Academic freedom allows students to take reasoned exception to the concepts and conclusions presented in any course of study in a manner that is consistent with the District's Code of Student Conduct. Students remain responsible, however, for learning the content of any course in which they are enrolled, and can expect to be evaluated on their knowledge of such information.

D. DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES AND SUPPORT

5. The District is committed to the full support of the principle of academic freedom within all its activities.
6. The District supports the freedom of all faculty to inquire, to teach controversial content, to model and encourage critical thinking, and to present multiple viewpoints within each discipline.
7. The District supports the freedom of all students to inquire, access the full range of information available, explore difficult and controversial material, develop and practice critical thinking skills, and learn in a climate free of intimidation and conducive to the free exchange of ideas.
8. The District recognizes that the California Education Code grants faculty the right and the professional responsibility to assign grades free from political influence, intimidation, or legal threat.

E. ROLE OF ACADEMIC SENATE

2. The District recognizes that the Academic Senate has established a Committee on Academic Freedom to provide clarification and advice on matters relating to academic freedom.

See Administrative Procedure [AP 4030]
Revised _____