Academic Senate President's Report

18 November 2026 / John A Stover III, PhD

Welcome back, everyone.

As you know, I recently attended the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Fall 2026 Plenary and learned quite a bit as well as voted on statewide resolutions with more input from faculty than ever before. We devoted time at our last Senate meeting (4 November) in discussion of the Pre-Resolution Packet, and Senators, especially our math colleagues, provided recommendations on voting. It was very helpful to be in conversation with faculty and represent their voice at the state level, especially as the final 2026 Fall Plenary Resolutions for Debate Packet was released. The Math Department's Senators and Department Chair provided statements that I read at the CON and PRO mics during our voting this past Saturday, and I've included a full summary for your review at the end of this report. While I did not follow every recommendation I received, I did find the process to be reflective of the Fall Plenary's theme – Amplying Faculty Voice and Building the Future.

In terms of new information, I learned that College and Career Academic Pathways (CCAP) and Dual Enrollment efforts, both here locally and across the state, are lacking in the proper inclusion of the Academic Senate and its 10+1 purview. I am working with the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Senate Vice President to take steps that ensure our purview on matters of curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, and grading policies which are at the core of the 10+1, are met properly. Decisions on courses being offered MUST include faculty input, with department chairs at a minimum involved in planning discussions. In the meantime, I've already asked the Vice President of Academic Affairs to not make any future decisions until we have a chance to formalize the Academic Senate's role in these matters.

In our next Senate meeting (December 2nd) we'll hear from Araceli Nuñez, North Bay Subregion Coordinator from the Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC) who will help us learn more about regional opportunities and resources for supporting our programs and connecting students to careers and job opportunities throughout the region, and we'll formally consider the final proposed reorganization plans of Academic Affairs and Student Services.

Thanks to all the Senators for all you do to support students and our 10+1 purview.

Fall 2026 Plenary Resolutions Summary

from SRJC's Delegate *(Academic Senate President John Stover)*

To start, the Consent Calendar items were approved at the start of voting (see pp 5—6 of the resolutions debate packet). You can also review the final status of all resolutions at the 2026 Fall Plenary Sessions Resolution packet here, with failed resolutions summarized on pp31–38).

Here also is a run-down of resolutions passed that were either non-controversial or voted on by acclimation:

- 101.02 Transparency in Cal-GETC Course Review and Denials by acclimation and also including amendment 101.02.01 *(p9 of the resolutions debate packet and passed at 99% voting yes)*
- 102.01 Develop Guidance on Catalog Rights and Cal-GETC *(passed at 93.4% voting yes)*
- 105.02 Supporting Accessibility of Discipline-Specific and Specialized Instructional Content
- 105.04 Revising Default Placement Rules for Math *(passed at 90% voting yes)*
- 108.03 Improve Access to Presentation Materials at ASCCC Events *(passed at 79% voting yes)*
- 110.01 Institutional Planning and Budgeting Support for Transfer Center *(passed at +90% voting yes)*
- 110.02 Faculty Consultation on the Use of Categorical Funds and Block Grants with Local Flexibility *(passed at 86% voting yes)*
- 111.05 Resolution on Increasing Senate Dues *(passed at 76% voting yes)*
- 113.01 Removal of "Master" from the California Master Plan for Higher Education *(passed at 74% voting yes)*
- 114.01 Minimum Qualifications for Mirrored Courses *(resolution passed)*
- 114.04 Common Course Numbering: Keep the Prefixes Common *(resolution passed at 90% voting yes)*

Resolutions that failed non-controversially included…

- 108.02 Recognize November as Artificial Intelligence Literacy Month *(failed at +90% voting no)*
- 111.06 Resolution on Local Senate President Approval of ASCCC Faculty Appointments *(failed at 86% voting no)*. I'll note here I spoke at the CON mic on this resolution, as any statewide, ASCCC committee faculty appointments I've made as Senate President have been only in response to names forwarded to me by ASCCC with the only input Senate Presidents provide is whether or not a faculty member is eligible to serve.

Resolutions that passed that were razor thin, complicated, and or otherwise controversial included….

- 101.04 Protecting Modality-Neutral Articulation and Transfer of California Community College Courses *(local faculty asked me to vote no on the resolution, which PASSED at 67%)*
- 101.06 Academic Freedom and Transferrable Mathematics Articulation *(local faculty asked me to vote no on the resolution, which PASSED at 69%)*
- 106.01 Faculty Governance and Equitable Review of Artificial Intelligence Technologies in the California Community Colleges *(resolution passed but only after a second vote was taken after quorum was reestablish)*
- 111.03 Supporting the Autonomy, Cultural Foundations, Representation, and Development of Autonomous Disciplines of Africana/African American/Black Studies, Asian American Studies, American Indian and Native American Studies, and Chicana/o/x and Latina/o/x Studies, Referred to as Ethnic Studies *(resolution TIE was broken in FAVOR OF resolution by ASCCC President)*

Resolutions considered as a block (together) included the following:

- **102.03 – Defining the Accelerated Applied Baccalaureate Degree in Title 5 – YES carried**

- 102.04 – Add Accelerated Applied Baccalaureate Degrees to Title 5 – NO *(I voted yes based on faculty input)*
- 102.05 Change Requirements of Baccalaureate Degrees to Accelerated Baccalaureate Degrees in Title 5 – NO
- 102.06 – Decrease Upper Division General Education Requirements – NO

The major takeaway here is that the Chancellor's Office is/was already engaged in a process by which accelerated applied baccalaureate degrees were being considered and implemented, and the ASCCC resolution process was trying to "catch up" and contribute to that process in support of inclusion of the faculty voice and purview. Here are the RESOLVE statements from 102.03 for reference (see also pp 11–12 in the debate resolution packet here).

> Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) to modify Title 5 to define an accelerated applied baccalaureate degree at California community colleges as a minimum of 90 semester or 135 quarter units, while retaining the 120-unit minimum for the baccalaureate degree; and
>
> Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) to ensure that an accelerated applied baccalaureate degree builds on the existing associate degree and California General Education Transfer Curriculum pathway without change to lower division general education, includes upper division coursework and upper division general education as required by Title 5, is approved through the local curriculum process, and is offered only where a college chooses to offer it.
>
> ***Footnotes included:***
>
> *11 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Resolution 09.02 F15, Defining the Parameters of the California Community College Baccalaureate Degree in Title 5 (Fall 2015), https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/defining-parameters-california-communitycollege-baccalaureate-degree-title-5*
>
> *12 California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 55092, Conditions for Awarding the Baccalaureate Degree, https://www.law.cornell.edu/regulations/california/5-CCR-55092*
>
> *13 Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Accreditation Handbook, May 2026 Edition, Glossary, p. 39, https://accjc.org/accreditation-handbook-and-report-templates/*

A Celebratory Resolution included…

- 111.01 Senator Emeritus for Virginia "Ginni" May - Ginni is retiring and the resolution was lovingly debated and celebratory of all of Ginni's accomplishments and contributions.

Resolutions that failed controversially included…

- 105.01 In-Person Assessment for Classes *(failed at 68%, more on this below)* and included extended debate on amendments… *(pp.19—21 of the resolutions debate packet)*

Academic Senate President's Report
18 November 2026 / John A Stover III, PhD

I want to be clear - I did **NOT** vote in favor of supporting mandatory in-person assessments for all distance education classes. ***Also, the perfected motion,*** which included an amended resolution from Jefferey Hernandez from Los Angeles City Colleges, Area D (passed and included below), ***FAILED at 68% NO votes***.

What I DID vote in favor of was the amendment to the original resolution which made any future efforts to mandate in person assessment far more nuanced and constrained. The resolution debate packet on pp 19 – 21 included an amended resolution from Jefferey Hernandez from Los Angeles City Colleges, Area D. Pay close attention to what is ~~struck out~~ and what was added (which is underlined) and particularly the new language in the last paragraph, which I've also highlighted.

^105.01.02 F26 Amend 105.01 F26 In-Person Assessments for Classes
Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, at its Spring 2026 plenary, recognized that "the rapid advancement and increasing accessibility of agentic artificial intelligence (AI) tools has created significant and growing challenges to academic integrity in distance education… that disproportionately burden individual faculty and that no single college can effectively address in isolation," [40] and these developments have included an environment where students may use AI agents to take an entire asynchronous online class; [41]

~~Whereas, Community college faculty, who are increasingly encountering students handing off their coursework to agentic AI tools instead of devoting their efforts to learning and mastering the course material, have limited checks against this misuse of AI, particularly in asynchronous online classes;~~

Whereas, System partners are growing increasingly concerned about the efficacy of instruction in the California Community Colleges in the absence of checks such as in-person, proctored assessments, as evidence by the California State University Math Council Resolution Regarding Academic Integrity and In-Person Testing Requirements; [42]

Whereas, California Community Colleges' online students face reputational harm as the perception grows that the students are not learning, [43] even though online education has been vital to expanding access to students with legitimate limitations from in-person instruction; [44]

Whereas, Without new legislation, the Board of Governors for the California Community Colleges may not have the authority to require mandatory in-person assessments for asynchronous online classes in the California Community Colleges; [45]

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, working with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and system partners, shall develop a legislative proposal whereby ~~urge~~ the California legislature would authorize the Board of Governors for the California Community Colleges to adopt regulations for ~~to require~~ mandatory in-person assessments for select California Community College classes, supported by a system-wide proctoring network, with exceptions for classes with other in-person attendance requirements and ~~exceptions for~~ individual students when warranted, including students out of the country due to immigration status.