The Role of Noncredit in the California Community Colleges

THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES


**Educational Policies Committee 2005-2006**

Mark Wade Lieu, Ohlone College, Chair  
Cathy Crane-McCoy, Long Beach City College  
Greg Gilbert, Copper Mountain College  
Karolyn Hanna, Santa Barbara City College  
Andrea Sibley-Smith, North Orange County CCD/Noncredit  
Beth Smith, Grossmont College  
Alice Murillo, Diablo Valley College—CIO Representative
Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ................................................................. 1
INTRODUCTION .............................................................................. 4
DEFINITIONS .................................................................................. 8
HISTORY OF ADULT AND NONCREDIT EDUCATION ....................... 10
LAW AND REGULATION ................................................................. 14
CREDIT AND NONCREDIT: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES .......... 17
A SNAPSHOT OF NONCREDIT IN THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES .......... 22
RECOMMENDATIONS .................................................................. 30
SOURCES ...................................................................................... 32
APPENDIX A. ACADEMIC SENATE NONCREDIT RESOLUTIONS .......... 33
APPENDIX B. REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO NONCREDIT ............... 40
APPENDIX C. ACADEMIC SENATE NONCREDIT PROGRAM SURVEY ........ 46
Executive Summary

In spite of the fact that noncredit generates approximately 10% of enrollment in the California Community College System, many people outside and even within the System are not aware of or do not fully understand the importance of noncredit and how it serves California’s educational needs.

For many people, there is confusion between the similar terms noncredit, non-degree applicable credit, non-transferable credit, and not-for-credit. Non-degree applicable credit courses are actually credit courses, the units of which are not applicable towards graduation with an associate degree. Non-transferable courses are credit courses of which the units cannot be transferred to a four-year institution. The term “not-for-credit” is typically used in reference to classes where the students (or in some cases, the agency that arranges for the class) pay the full cost of the class and receive no college-credit for the classwork.

In contrast, noncredit courses are basically what its title suggests—community college instruction that has no credit associated with it. Students who enroll in noncredit courses do not receive any type of college credit for these courses, nor do they receive official grades. Noncredit courses require no fees on the part of students. Noncredit instruction in the community colleges shares much in common with adult education offered through K-12 districts, and in fact, noncredit instruction has its origins in K-12 adult education.

Noncredit instruction can only be offered in specific areas detailed in regulation and Education Code. These areas comprise the following:
1. Parenting, including parent cooperative preschools, classes in child growth and development and parent-child relationships.

2. Elementary and secondary basic skills and other courses and classes such as remedial academic courses or classes in reading, mathematics, and language arts.

3. English as a second language.

4. Classes and courses for immigrants eligible for educational services in citizenship, English as a second language, and workforce preparation classes in the basic skills of speaking, listening, reading, writing, mathematics, decision-making and problem solving skills, and other classes required for preparation to participate in job-specific technical training.

5. Education programs for persons with substantial disabilities.

6. Short-term vocational programs with high employment potential.

7. Education programs for older adults.

8. Education programs for home economics.


10. Apprenticeship programs.

Credit and noncredit instruction share some important similarities. Both types of instruction are supported by state apportionment. Of the ten areas approved for noncredit instruction, four are also offered as credit instruction: pre-collegiate basic skills, vocational courses, English as second language (ESL), and apprenticeship programs. There are also significant differences between credit and noncredit instruction, including minimum qualifications for faculty, apportionment calculation, and regulations regarding such issues as course repetition.

Overall, both systems strive to provide quality education and services to meet increasingly diverse student needs and support student success, while struggling to overcome the challenges created by insufficient funding to both areas. Credit and noncredit can be viewed as an educational continuum where the two complement each other and can be used by students to meet their needs in different ways and at different stages of learning.

System data and an Academic Senate survey of the largest noncredit programs provide a snapshot of noncredit instruction in California community colleges. Twenty-two colleges comprise 68% of noncredit students and generate more than three-fourths of total noncredit full-time equivalent students (FTES). Of the nine areas authorized for apportionment under Title 5 Regulations, courses for older adults comprise the largest single area, 24% of all courses offered. Short-term vocational courses come in second with 20% of the total. The range of short-term noncredit vocational programs is broad and
includes subjects such as architecture technician, financial planner, clothing construction, welding, hazardous waste, networking, meat cutting, upholstery, early childhood education, and medical assisting. English as a second language (ESL) is third with 19%, and elementary/secondary basic skills is fourth with 16%. For many colleges, noncredit instruction consists solely of noncredit supervised tutoring courses (these fall under secondary basic skills), which support credit courses.

Fall 2005 data about faculty teaching noncredit courses shows a huge reliance on part-time faculty, 87.7% of the total faculty in noncredit. Almost two-thirds of faculty teaching in noncredit are white, and the majority of faculty are age 50 or older.

Survey responses (26 colleges total) provide additional information about the current status of noncredit instruction. While less than half of colleges explicitly mention noncredit in their mission statements, half include noncredit explicitly in strategic plans. Few resources are currently allocated to data collection and monitoring of student progress and success in noncredit courses, with only one respondent reporting the collection of success data on noncredit students after transitioning from noncredit to credit. While respondents acknowledged the importance of linkages between noncredit and credit, they generally report the need to build on existing or establish such linkages.

Many processes in noncredit are in tandem with those used for credit instruction. These include program review, accreditation, and curriculum course approval. However, with a ratio of part-time to full-time faculty of 20:1, including nine colleges that report no full-time faculty in noncredit courses, there is generally a lack of full-time faculty in noncredit to engage in all of these activities. Ten of the sixteen colleges that have full-time faculty teaching in noncredit require classroom loads of 25 to 30 hours. Salaries and union representation vary from college to college.

The two unmet needs most often mentioned by respondents were the need for adequate funding for noncredit and for facilities for faculty, staff, and courses.

This paper concludes with recommendations on both the statewide and local levels. On the statewide level, the recommendations include better inclusion of noncredit viewpoints and concerns in the work of the Academic Senate; efforts to increase the number of full-time noncredit faculty; promotion of noncredit as a pathway into credit; advocacy for increased funding support for noncredit courses; and the establishing of an Academic Senate ad hoc committee on noncredit. On the local level, the recommendations similarly call for better inclusion of noncredit viewpoints and concerns in local senates, efforts to increase the number of full-time faculty serving noncredit, and more coordination in articulating noncredit and credit coursework. In addition, the paper encourages local senates to ensure that augmentations in noncredit funding are used to expand support for noncredit instruction and asks for increased resources for data collection and analyses of noncredit instruction.
Introduction

Noncredit programs\(^1\) and courses within California community colleges have long been overshadowed by credit programs and courses. In spite of the fact that noncredit generates approximately 10% of enrollment in the California Community College System, many people outside and even within the System are not aware of or do not fully understand the importance of noncredit and how it serves California’s educational needs.

Noncredit, however, is an indefatigable program, and in spite of being ignored, in some cases neglected, and funded at approximately half the rate of credit courses, noncredit has persisted and succeeded in fulfilling its function and its part of the mission of California community colleges. Noncredit has provided a second chance for Californians to obtain a high school diploma or equivalency. It has opened the door to literacy and increased basic skills for untold numbers of undereducated individuals. It has been the portal for millions of immigrants to participate in American society through language and citizenship courses. For both immigrants and residents alike, noncredit has provided short-term vocational programs leading to viable employment in a vast array of fields and specialties and apprenticeship programs. Noncredit has served the needs of parents, older adults, and individuals with disabilities with specially-targeted courses, as well as providing “open access” to educational opportunities and lifelong learning to increasingly diverse communities.

Noncredit has proven to be a gateway into the credit programs of the System, bringing in students from one of the areas mentioned above and showing them the possibilities beyond noncredit—an associate degree, a vocational certificate, or the prospect of transfer to a four-year institution. Recent research from the City College of San Francisco that analyzes System data shows that statewide 23% of all AA/AS degree earners began in noncredit. (Smith, 2006) However, while pathways are being forged between noncredit and credit at some colleges, many colleges have far to go at establishing such linkages.

Noncredit also supports the needs of students in credit programs. Credit students benefit from the educational support of supervised tutoring and supplemental instruction while pursuing their goals in credit courses. Statewide, 33% of credit students getting an AA/AS accessed noncredit at some point in their degree path\(^2\). (Smith, 2006)

---

\(^1\) The use of the term “program” in connection with noncredit is not recognized in Title 5 Regulation as it is with reference to credit. Rather its usage is more general, reflecting a general organization of courses, only some of which lead to specific educational/vocational goals.

\(^2\) This figure does not include supervised tutoring, which is, at many colleges, the only noncredit instruction offered.
Noncredit, however, is an indefatigable program, and in spite of being ignored, in some cases neglected, and funded at approximately half the rate of credit courses, noncredit has persisted and succeeded in fulfilling its function and its part of the mission of California community colleges.

Noncredit faculty in California, of whom approximately 90% are adjunct faculty, have faced a challenge for recognition amidst the predominantly credit ranks of community college faculty. There are two officially recognized noncredit centers with local senates composed of solely noncredit faculty, with representatives to Academic Senate plenary sessions (San Diego and North Orange County). But representation from other colleges and districts, even those with large noncredit programs, has been inconsistent. A review of participant lists over the last few years to Academic Senate plenary sessions shows that fewer than 2% come from noncredit programs—and this includes the official representatives from the two local senates mentioned above. Noncredit faculty also often lack representation on local curriculum committees, and the lack of full-time noncredit faculty is likely a contributing factor with regards to both local senate and curriculum committee participation. Noncredit faculty may have little contact with credit faculty, isolating them from the larger network of faculty and college governance and processes. Indeed, noncredit faculty may have little contact with each other and lack the networking and organization that would connect them. The fact that many noncredit courses are offered at sites off campus can add to this isolation.

Such marginalization of noncredit faculty and other noncredit issues have long been part of the discussion in the Academic Senate. Resolutions from the past decade have called for improvement in the funding for noncredit instruction, emphasized the need for full-time faculty and counseling services in noncredit programs, and reiterated the need to integrate noncredit programs and faculty into the general processes and governance structures of colleges and districts.

A call for the Academic Senate to research and report on the role and status of noncredit in California community colleges was made over a decade ago in Resolution 6.03 S94:

Resolved that the Academic Senate direct the Executive Committee to prepare a position paper on the role of community colleges in providing noncredit education in the nine program apportionment funding categories.

Unaddressed, this call was reaffirmed in Spring 2005.
13.03 Noncredit
Spring 2005

Whereas, Many faculty and academic senate leaders may be unfamiliar with non-credit courses and programs at their colleges, in their districts, and in the California Community College System;

Whereas, Over 800,000 students enroll in noncredit courses and programs every year, and noncredit courses and programs provide a demonstrated gateway to enrollment in credit programs, entry or re-entry into the job market, and critical life skills;

Whereas, Noncredit programs offer courses central to the mission of California Community Colleges; and

Whereas, Academic senate leaders need to be well-informed about noncredit programs and courses in order to make informed decisions about proposals related to noncredit funding, course alignment, articulation with credit programs, and quality standards;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges reaffirm the vital function that noncredit programs and courses play within the mission of the California Community Colleges; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges produce a paper on the status of and current issues concerning noncredit courses and programs within the California Community College System.

The undertaking of this paper on noncredit in response to these resolutions coincides with growing critical educational needs in California and a renewed interest in noncredit by the System Office and the Board of Governors. The statewide interest in economic development and workforce preparation along with the increasing numbers of underemployed and under-prepared workers has brought greater attention to the role of noncredit in vocational education and workforce preparation. The huge increase in the number of immigrants has elicited a need for increased English language proficiency and other skills for community integration and economic self-sufficiency. An increasing number of students are under-prepared and not

The statewide interest in economic development and workforce preparation along with the increasing numbers of underemployed and under-prepared workers has brought greater attention to the role of noncredit in vocational education and workforce preparation.
ready to do college-level work. A recent American College Testing (ACT) report indicates that almost 50% of high school graduates who took the ACT exam lacked the reading skills to succeed in college or job training (ACT, 2006), and an increasing high school drop-out rate (up to 29%, and as high as 60% in some urban areas), indicates a need for increased basic skills in all educational areas, including noncredit. (Smith, 2006)

The Board of Governors has held study sessions on the status of noncredit, and the System’s funding proposal for 2006-2007 has resulted in an augmentation to noncredit funding of $30 million, the largest increase to noncredit funding in decades. Funding was provided in 2005-2006 for the Noncredit Alignment Project, the purpose of which was to review, clarify the noncredit scope of instruction, define existing processes, and better align them with credit processes to provide noncredit with greater authority and respect. The Board of Governors approved a System Strategic Plan in January 2006, and the plan notes that “noncredit programs are aimed to increase the educational attainment of adults who lack English language proficiency and other basic skills.” The Plan also stresses that “many community college students use noncredit as a bridge to higher education, especially students from under-represented populations.” (CCCBOG, 2006)

This overview of noncredit, its history, its development, its unique identity, its current place in the California community colleges, and the challenges it faces in the future is intended to open your eyes and provide you with an appreciation for a part of the community colleges that you may never have visited before.
Definitions

Before we begin our discussion of noncredit instruction in California community colleges, it is very important that we make clear what we are referring to, especially as there are several similar terms used in the system which can cause confusion.³

Noncredit courses are basically what its title suggests—community college instruction that has no credit associated with it. Students who enroll in noncredit courses do not receive any type of college credit for these courses, nor do they receive official grades (ones that appear on a transcript). Noncredit courses require no fees on the part of students. Noncredit instruction can only be offered in specific areas detailed in regulation and Education Code (outlined later in the paper). Noncredit instruction is very much like what is called “adult education.” Many courses offered are similar, and the main difference lies in which system oversees instruction. Noncredit is an entity unique to the community colleges. Adult education, while a potentially general term, is the umbrella term for courses offered for adults through the K-12 system of adult schools⁴. In general, adult schools and noncredit programs serve adults 18 years and older. Even though there are many similarities between the two systems and the students they serve, there are some differences, such as policies for the admission of minors, the required qualifications for instructors and the state funding levels. Both educational systems usually co-exist in communities, although one may be predominant.

Now to review what is NOT noncredit instruction. First, courses offered for non-degree applicable credit are not under discussion in this paper. Non-degree applicable credit courses are actually credit courses, the units for which are not applicable towards graduation with an associate degree. Non-degree applicable courses typically comprise college-preparatory courses such as basic skills and ESL.

Second, discussion of noncredit instruction has nothing to do with non-transferable courses. Non-transferable courses are credit courses for which the units cannot be transferred to a four-year institution, typically a University of California (UC) or California State University (CSU). In general, non-degree applicable credit courses and non-transferable courses are eligible for state apportionment funding at the established rate for credit courses.

³ In addition to the distinctions made in this section, there is also a grading option called “credit/no credit.” Under this option, a student may elect to receive a designation of “credit” for passing the course or “no credit” for failing the course rather than a letter grade. Only courses offered for credit offer such a grading option.

⁴ Adult education is also offered through community based organizations (CBOs), county offices of education, public libraries, the California Conservation Corps, and providers of incarcerated adults.
Third, noncredit courses are very different from not-for-credit courses. The term “not-for-credit” is typically used in reference to classes where the students (or in some cases, the agency that arranges for the class) pay the full cost of the class and receive no college-credit for the classwork. Such-classes may also be called community service, community education, tuition or fee-based classes and receive no state apportionment. Courses offered under contract to employers, generally under the title of Contract Education, also fall into this category.

The figure below affords a side-by-side comparison of the similar terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noncredit</th>
<th>Non-Degree Applicable Credit</th>
<th>Non-Transferable Credit</th>
<th>Not-for-Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding support</strong></td>
<td>Supported by state apportionment per student; calculated by hours of attendance</td>
<td>Supported by state apportionment per student; calculated by course units</td>
<td>Supported by state apportionment per student; calculated by course units</td>
<td>Does not receive state apportionment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student fees</strong></td>
<td>No fees</td>
<td>Students pay per unit fee set by the Legislature</td>
<td>Students pay per unit fee set by the Legislature</td>
<td>Students (or sponsoring agency) pay the full cost of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading</strong></td>
<td>No grades; no credit for completion of the course</td>
<td>Credit and grade given for the course, but not applicable towards an associate degree</td>
<td>Credit and grade given for the course, but credit cannot be transferred to a four-year institution</td>
<td>No grades; no credit for completion of the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repeatability</strong></td>
<td>Courses may be repeated as often as desired and still qualify for apportionment.</td>
<td>Courses may be repeated once for apportionment.</td>
<td>Courses may be repeated once for apportionment.</td>
<td>Classes may be repeated as often as desired.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is generally agreed that the term “noncredit” is easily confused with other terms in use in the System, and the System Office is working with the field to explore options for changing the name.
History of Adult and Noncredit Education

Noncredit instruction offered by California community colleges and adult education offered through K-12 adult schools both have the same historical roots. Both emerged out of extensions to the K-12 system that were targeted at adults. In the following history, the term “adult education” refers to courses offered for adults, first solely by K-12 and later jointly with community colleges as noncredit courses and instruction. The courses mentioned in this history refer to courses offered as either adult education (K-12) or noncredit (community college) unless specifically differentiated.

“Adult Education,” originally called “evening school,” actually began in California even before there was universal schooling for children and before the “junior colleges” were created in 1907.

Over 150 years ago, in 1856, the first “evening school” in California was established in San Francisco. Other evening schools were established in Oakland in 1871, Sacramento in 1872, and Los Angeles in 1887. These very first schools for adults offered elementary basic skills, vocational training, and English for immigrants. The idea of educating adults remains important to this day and is just as critical for our society now as it was when it began.

In 1907 school districts were authorized to extend secondary education beyond the 12th grade and the first “junior colleges” were established to cover grades 13 and 14. To this day, this early relationship with K-12 continues to cloud the status of community colleges as a part of higher education. Over the years, both adult education and junior college programs offered courses to respond to societal needs.

In the 1920’s adult education vocational classes supported the industrial economy of the post-World War I era, parenting classes increased, and “Americanization” classes taught about American government and history, citizenship, and English literacy. When federal law allowed women to become citizens separate from their husbands (women only gained the right to vote in 1911), there was an increase in citizenship classes.

Up until 1941, the K-12 school districts were the educational system authorized to provide adult education. During World War II, the Legislature authorized the junior colleges to have evening classes for adults separate from K-12, and “evening junior college” was a way to meet the increased need for national defense job training. At this point, there was adult education in both the junior colleges and in the K-12 school districts. Evening junior college was the genesis of noncredit instruction and courses in the community colleges. Between 1940 and 1945 almost one million California workers were trained to work in defense plants.
In the early 50's the State Advisory Commission on Adult Education recommended that state-supported adult education focus on the development of a “literate and productive society” and also allowed school districts to offer other “community service” classes for tuition/fees.

In 1954, the commission specified the subjects that adult education in both the junior colleges and the K-12 school districts could offer: supplemental and cultural classes, short-term vocational and occupational training, citizenship, English language development, homemaking, parental education, civic affairs, gerontology, civil defense, and driver education. These look similar to the current nine authorized apportionment areas, plus apprenticeship, that are state-funded today, and reflect the past and current societal needs. Also at this time, adult education in school districts was given permission to offer programs leading to elementary and high school level diplomas of graduation. The evening junior colleges were allowed to provide instruction leading to high school graduation if the local high school requested it.

The “baby boom” generation born after WWII caused an explosion in the public school system and the junior colleges were seen as a way to accommodate the flood of students wanting higher education.

In 1960 the Donahoe Higher Education Act implemented the landmark “California Master Plan for Higher Education 1960-1975” and mandated that junior colleges be independent of unified school/high school districts. The separation of adult education in the community colleges from adult education in the K-12 districts brought about the two current systems that are familiar today. Adult education in the community colleges was now called “noncredit” and was run solely by the community colleges.

In 1967 the Board of Governors was established to govern both credit and noncredit programs and the “junior colleges” were renamed the “California Community Colleges.” Adult education, also called adult schools, was governed by school districts or county offices of education under the umbrella of the California Department of Education.

In 1972, the state wanted to avoid a duplication of classes being offered in a community, so Senate Bill (SB) 765 mandated that the adult schools and the community colleges had to mutually agree on a “Delineation of Function” agreement to decide who was...
to provide what classes to the adults in their area. In 1997 a court decision held that mutual agreement was not needed between the local K-12 adult education school district and the local community college in order for a community college to provide noncredit instruction. As a result, delineation of function agreements are no longer required, leaving community colleges free to provide noncredit without the agreement of the local K-12 Adult Education.

Proposition 13, passed in 1978, reduced property taxes by more than 50% and affected all California educational systems dependent on this funding. Subsequent laws locked adult schools’ ability to expand their programs because of revenue limits and a cap on average daily attendance (ADA). Because of this, many areas of need went unserved or were underserved as the demand for educational opportunities for adults continued to grow. However, these constraints did not apply to the community colleges’ noncredit and the colleges continued to expand their noncredit programs to meet the demand.

By the late 70’s, noncredit courses were being funded at a higher rate than courses offered through K-12 adult education. In 1981 the Behr Commission was established with the intention that the K-12 adult school rate would be increased. Instead, it recommended that noncredit be reduced to the statewide K-12 adult education average. It was at this point that the inequity between noncredit and credit funding began. This also explains the current funding situation in adult education and noncredit. K-12 adult education rates vary due to the variance in local tax rates at the time that Proposition 13 came into being. Community college noncredit rates are the same across the System. Since the rate was based on an average of adult education rates, some adult education programs are being funded at a higher rate than noncredit.

During the 80’s, there were numerous changes to adult and noncredit education: the apportionment categories were changed to what they are today, and additional legislation and state oversight were implemented. The Immigration and Reform Act created a high demand for ESL and Citizenship classes. Numerous pieces of legislation addressed issues such as in 1988 the Legislature recommended lifting a “cap” on the funding for ESL, citizenship, and basic skills in order to meet the student demand for these courses. Welfare legislation was passed and the Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) program created.

The late 80’s and early 90’s brought more legislation including the landmark community college bill AB 1725, which changed the way community colleges operated. In 1996 the Education Code was amended to include adult noncredit education and community service to the missions and functions of California community colleges.

In 1992-93 model program standards were jointly developed for adult education and noncredit in the areas of ESL, Adult Basic Education, Adult Secondary Education, Parent Education, Older Adults, and Adults with Disabilities.
The California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS) Program was established through The Adult Education Act, which was repealed and replaced by the Workforce Investment Act in 1998.

The last decade has brought with it significant changes to the demographics in California. The population has become increasingly diverse, as well as undereducated, underemployed, and under-prepared. Of significance to adult education and noncredit, the “skills gap” among adults has widened due to increases in the high school drop-out rate, the number of immigrants, the number of working poor, and the number of educationally under-prepared. As a result, California is experiencing a decrease in the number of citizens who are capable of meeting the workforce and educational needs and demands of the 21st century. (CAAL, 2005) There is building interest in and appreciation for adult education and noncredit, likely due to the role they can play with addressing some of these issues.

Increased attention from the California State Legislature for all forms of adult education brought about numerous studies and recommendations, such as studies and revisions to the California Master Plan for Education and research conducted by the Adult Select Committee on Adult Education.

As of the writing of this paper, noncredit is on track to receive the largest infusion of new funds in decades coupled with a significant change to its funding formula.
Law and Regulation

Noncredit instruction, to a lesser extent than with credit instruction, is governed by Title 5 Regulation and legal provisions of the California Education Code.

The inclusion of noncredit as “an essential and important function of the community colleges” in the mission of community colleges is found in §66010.4 of the California Education Code:

(2) In addition to the primary mission of academic and vocational instruction, the community colleges shall offer instruction and courses to achieve all of the following:

(A) The provision of remedial instruction for those in need of it and, in conjunction with the school districts, instruction in English as a second language, adult noncredit instruction, support services which help students succeed at the postsecondary level are reaffirmed and supported as essential and important functions of the community colleges.

(B) The provision of adult noncredit education curricula in areas defined as being in the state’s interest is an essential and important function of the community colleges.

(C) The provision of community services courses and programs is an authorized function of the community colleges so long as their provision is compatible with an institution’s ability to meet its obligations in its primary missions.

(3) A primary mission of the California Community Colleges is to advance California’s economic growth and global competitiveness through education, training, and services that contribute to continuous workforce improvement.

Education Code §84757 delineates the areas of the state’s interest for noncredit education mentioned in section (B) above. Only these areas are approved for apportionment funding.

84757.(a) For purposes of this chapter, the following noncredit courses and classes shall be eligible for funding:

(1) Parenting, including parent cooperative preschools, classes in child growth and development and parent-child relationships.

(2) Elementary and secondary basic skills and other courses and classes such as remedial academic courses or classes in reading, mathematics, and language arts.

(3) English as a second language.
(4) Classes and courses for immigrants eligible for educational services in citizenship, English as a second language, and work force preparation classes in the basic skills of speaking, listening, reading, writing, mathematics, decision-making and problem solving skills, and other classes required for preparation to participate in job-specific technical training.

(5) Education programs for persons with substantial disabilities.

(6) Short-term vocational programs with high employment potential.

(7) Education programs for older adults.

(8) Education programs for home economics.

(9) Health and safety education.

(b) No state apportionment shall be made for any course or class that is not set forth in subdivision (a) and for which no credit is given.

Education Code §8152 and Labor Code §3074 authorize the community colleges to provide related and supplemental instruction for apprenticeship courses, and apprenticeship courses are supported through funds from the 1970 Montoya Act. The nine areas cited above plus apprenticeships apply to both community college noncredit and K-12 adult education schools. Because three of the designations reflect targeted populations (immigrants, disabled, older adults) while the others reflect instructional areas (parenting, basic skills, ESL, short-term vocational, home economics, and health and safety), there can be some overlap in courses among the areas.

The noncredit area of elementary and secondary basic skills can offer courses from beginning literacy through high school diploma/equivalency programs. Although the following terms are not in Title 5, “Adult Basic Education” and “Adult Secondary Education” are often used in the field to describe elementary and secondary basic skills offered by adult and noncredit education. When model program standards were written in 1993 and revised with content and performance standards in 2003, they were identified under these two terms.

Supplemental instruction and supervised tutoring are included under the area of elementary and secondary basic skills. Supplemental instruction must directly support a specific course. Tutoring must be provided by trained tutors and under the supervision of an academic employee. Supplemental instruction and supervised tutoring, while noncredit courses, generally support courses offered for credit and credit students.

Title 5 §53412 specifies the minimum qualifications for noncredit faculty (as opposed to §§53407 and 53410 for credit faculty). In general, this section specifies that noncredit instructors have a bachelor’s degree in the noncredit area or in a related area. Section 53413 details minimum qualifications for noncredit apprenticeship instructors, either an associate degree plus four years of relevant occupational experience or six years of
occupation experience, a journeyman’s certificate in the subject area, and 18 semester units of degree-applicable college coursework. Counseling and library faculty have the same minimum qualifications whether they are serving credit or noncredit students. Requirements for faculty and staff serving in Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS) are specified in §53414. (See Appendix B for the full text of §§53412, 53413, and 53414.)

Standards and criteria for noncredit courses are delineated in Title 5 §55002(c). The standards and criteria requirements for credit courses are extensive, while noncredit has fewer regulations. Per Title 5, noncredit courses must meet the needs of enrolled students and must be approved by the local curriculum committee, local governing board, and the System Office. There must be an official course outline of record with scope, objectives, contents, instructional methodology, and methods for determining if objectives have been met and courses must be taught by a qualified instructor.

In the early 1990s, California implemented a strategic plan for adult and noncredit education in response to state and national goals. The California Department of Education (adult education) and the System Office for the California Community Colleges (noncredit) jointly developed “model program standards” for ESL, Adult Basic Education, Adult Secondary Education, Parenting Education, Older Adults, and Adults with Disabilities. The Adult Basic Education and Adult Secondary Education standards were formalized and published, but the others remain in draft form. In 2000 content and performance standards were added to ESL, Adult Basic Education, Adult Secondary Education, Parent Education, and Older Adults. The California Department of Education decided that it was best to use the standards for guidance in adult education instead of mandating them. Given that academic senates have primacy in curricular decisions, the standards were also provided to community colleges solely for guidance.

Throughout 2005-06, the System’s Noncredit Alignment Project has been developing clearer definitions and criteria for all noncredit apportionment areas in addition to recommendations for changes in curriculum guidelines and processes to better serve the needs of noncredit instruction.
Credit and Noncredit: Similarities and Differences

While credit and noncredit courses both fulfill parts of the mission of the California community colleges, the two areas are usually separate within an institution, and credit faculty generally know as little about noncredit as noncredit faculty know about credit. In this section, the similarities and differences between credit and noncredit are examined not only for the edification of the general reader but for credit and noncredit faculty as well.

Education Code §84757 delineates the nine areas of noncredit instruction that qualify for state apportionment dollars. Six of the areas are unique to noncredit and provide valuable opportunities for lifelong learning that benefit individuals, their families, their communities, the economy, and ultimately the welfare of the State of California. Parenting skills courses help to provide a strong foundation for the parent-child relationship, and are invaluable not only to individual families but the society at large. Citizenship courses for immigrants support integration into our society through an understanding of governmental structures and societal values. Home economics and health and safety courses provide valuable personal skills necessary for a good quality of life. Classes for adults with disabilities support their independent living skills and provide workforce preparation in order to become contributing members of society.

According to the System Strategic Plan, “the aging California population is creating an additional educational challenge to be addressed....between 2005 and 2020, the population of older adults age 60 and older will increase by 59% in California.” Through courses for older adults, noncredit courses contribute greatly to the mental and physical well being of older adults, allowing them to remain independent as contributing members of society for a much longer time. Eighty percent of “baby boomers” plan to work during their retirement years and noncredit courses can give them new skills for job opportunities or new careers. (CCCBOG, 2006)

While Education Code does not explicitly list the areas approved for apportionment in credit instruction, there is overlap with credit in three of the areas approved for noncredit. Like noncredit, credit offers courses in pre-collegiate basic skills (sometimes called “developmental education”) and ESL. Credit also has short-term vocational courses, and
credit programs are just as involved in responding to welfare to work legislation such as the Workforce Investment Act and CalWORKs. VTEA (Carl Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act) dollars flow to both credit and noncredit as well. The other focuses of noncredit—older adults, parenting, adults with disabilities, citizenship, home economics, and health and safety—are generally not covered in credit programs. Current legislative support for noncredit suggests that the focus for additional support and funding is on areas that straddle both credit and noncredit, namely basic skills, ESL, and short-term vocational programs.

Because there is overlap between courses offered as credit or noncredit, and the two systems can also offer different educational experiences and outcomes, student needs and intent play a significant role in where they enroll. Noncredit courses are generally categorized as open entry/open exit, meaning that students have the flexibility to attend when their schedules permit. An inability to attend a class session or early withdrawal from a course carries no penalties for the student. In addition, noncredit courses carry no fees or course grades. Noncredit courses often appeal to students who are unclear about their educational goals and may have significant work or family demands. Immigrants often turn to noncredit because of the lack of fees and the relative ease of enrollment into noncredit courses. Noncredit courses are offered at a wide variety of community sites, so they are often more accessible as well.

Noncredit courses can be repeated an unlimited number of times, while credit courses are generally limited to one repetition. For courses in basic skills and ESL, noncredit can provide the additional time often needed for the development of foundational skills needed for success in life and education.

With regard to vocational programs, it can generally be said that noncredit short-term vocational programs concentrate more on entry-level employment skills, while credit vocational programs educate and train students for a more advanced level of employment. Credit vocational programs award vocational certificates to students completing both long- and short-term vocational programs, while noncredit grants “Certificates of Completion” for completing short-term vocational programs.

While there is some overlap in the disciplines covered by credit and noncredit, the minimum qualifications for faculty who teach in credit and noncredit are not always the same. The minimum qualification for teaching in noncredit is generally a bachelor's
degree in the subject area or a related area\(^5\). In this respect, the minimum credit qualifications for vocational programs are similar. Many credit vocational disciplines require a bachelor’s degree and two years of experience. For credit basic skills, ESL, and vocational areas that may lead to professional programs such as nursing, administration of justice, and early childhood education, the minimum qualification is generally a master’s degree in the discipline. While such a difference exists in minimum qualifications for faculty between credit and noncredit, colleges are permitted to set minimum qualifications that are higher than those established statewide. Hence, there are several colleges in the System which require the same minimum qualifications for both credit and noncredit instruction, set at the more stringent level required for credit instruction.

There has been some discussion of whether pre-collegiate basic skills courses and ESL are appropriately placed in credit programs. There has also been discussion of whether some vocational courses and programs are appropriately placed into noncredit. It is possible they are appropriate for both if they are meeting different student needs, but this needs to be determined by each college or district. Local curriculum committees and senates need to fully understand the students who are being served in both credit and noncredit courses and programs and how best to meet their needs.

Much of the discussion around appropriate placement of courses in credit vs. noncredit arises because of the difference in funding for credit and noncredit courses. As it currently stands, noncredit is funded at approximately half the rate of credit instruction per FTES. Unlike credit courses, whose apportionment rate varies from college to college due to Proposition 13 (1978), noncredit courses are currently funded at a single rate across the state (refer to the history section of this paper). The proposed augmentation for 2006-2007 for noncredit should raise the rate for noncredit courses in the areas of “career development and college preparation” to $3,092 per FTES and set a uniform rate for the rest of noncredit of $2,626. Additional funds to further improve the funding for noncredit will continue to be sought. This augmentation to noncredit funding only brings some courses part way to the current rate for credit apportionment. The Academic Senate has expressed concern about the continuing disparities between funding for credit and noncredit and about differential funding in the areas under noncredit in resolutions F04 5.02 and S06 5.02 (See Appendix A). Discussions concerning the appropriate or desirable placement of courses in credit or noncredit will take on increased weight as funding disparities become less of a factor driving some decisions about whether courses should be offered in credit or noncredit.

---

\(^5\) The minimum qualifications for teaching in adult education (K-12) programs follow requirements set by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. While requirements vary somewhat by discipline, the general qualifications include a high school diploma (or equivalent), five years of experience/education in the subject matter, passage of the CBEST, and knowledge of the U.S. Constitution. Specific information can be found at http://www.ctc.ca.gov.
In addition to the difference in apportionment, the method of calculating FTES participation also differs. Until 1991, both credit and noncredit employed positive attendance as the basis for apportionment. Following AB1725, Title 5 was amended to provide five options for credit apportionment calculation, based on scheduling configurations, to better align the community colleges with other postsecondary education systems and separate them from their historical K-12 roots. While some credit courses still employ positive attendance, almost all credit courses now claim FTES based on a census of enrolled students at a point 20% into the semester. In the same legislation, noncredit was limited to only one option, positive attendance, in spite of the fact that noncredit courses fit several scheduling configurations just as credit courses do. (Educational Services Unit, System Office, 2002) Noncredit faculty desire to have other options available for apportionment calculation which are more appropriate to the course format. Even the Joint Commission to Develop a Master Plan for Education (2002) recommended that noncredit FTES not be based on hour-by-hour attendance.

The prevalence of open entry/open exit courses in noncredit reflects the ability of a student to enroll, attend, and drop a course according to his/her needs and goals. In an open entry/open exit course, students can enroll at any time during a semester and can leave the course at any time as well. Even though many noncredit courses, except for labs, do have a start date with registration and an ending date, there is no “penalty” for the student for absences or dropping a course. Many courses accept a student into the course at any point of the term, even though this has challenges for teaching a sequenced curriculum. Open-entry/open-exit in noncredit courses provides a structure that is well suited for students who are not yet ready to or cannot make a full commitment to attending college. Such students might be recent immigrants, single parents, people with disabilities, and older adults. Each of these groups often has life situations that make regular and committed attendance to a college course problematic. Work, childcare, changes in health status, and other family commitments often take precedence. Courses grant no credit, so there is no penalty for students who must discontinue their studies.

In contrast, almost all credit courses have fixed entry points, and students are expected to stay with the course for the full duration of the term. Withdrawal from a course after an established cut-off usually results in a failing grade or a withdrawal notation on a student’s transcript.

However, noncredit has some courses and programs that are not open entry/open exit. Many of the short-term vocational programs have fixed start dates and require completion...
to obtain a certificate of completion. While grades may not be given for these noncredit courses, other types of record-keeping are involved, such as for CalWORKS or other welfare programs.

One issue that negatively impacts students in both credit and noncredit is the need for more full-time faculty. While there are Title 5 Regulation sections §51025 and §§53300-53314 that require the maintenance of full-time faculty in credit, for noncredit there are no such regulations with the unsurprising result that nearly 90% of noncredit faculty are part-time. This lack of full-time noncredit faculty hinders the ability to build noncredit programs and develop noncredit curriculum and makes it difficult for meaningful participation of noncredit faculty in local senates and governance processes. The Academic Senate has passed numerous resolutions calling for increased funding for additional faculty, and specifically counselors, in both noncredit and credit (See Appendix A).

Overall, there are likely more similarities than differences between credit and noncredit as both strive to provide quality education and services to meet increasingly diverse student needs and support student success, while struggling to overcome the challenges created by insufficient funding to both areas. Credit and noncredit can be viewed as an educational continuum where the two complement each other and can be used by students to meet their needs in different ways and at different stages of learning.
A Snapshot of Noncredit in the California Community Colleges

A review of the role of noncredit in California community colleges would be incomplete without a better understanding of how noncredit currently operates in the System. A presentation by the Educational Services Unit of the System Office to the Board of Governors in January 2005 provides a good overview based on 2003-2004 data. Of the 109 colleges in the California Community College System, 98 offer at least one noncredit course. However, the distribution of noncredit instruction is far from even. Noncredit has evolved differently at each college and continues to be unique at each college that offers it. Twenty-two colleges comprise 68% of noncredit students and generate more than three-fourths of total noncredit FTES. In 2003/2004, the three largest noncredit programs were in the San Diego Community College District (87,905 students), San Francisco City College District (61,817), and North Orange County Community College District (60,038).

Noncredit instruction, as described in the history section of this paper, is divided between community college and unified school districts, generally delineated by formal or informal historical agreements. As explained earlier in this paper, noncredit offered through unified school districts is labeled adult education. Of the 2 million adults being served by both educational systems, 58%, or over 1.1 million students attend adult education schools and over 800,000 students, attend noncredit in the community colleges.

In the community colleges, noncredit comprises about 10% of all instruction. In 2003-2004, 17% of community college students enrolled only in noncredit courses, and 12% enrolled in a combination of credit and noncredit courses. Of the nine areas authorized for apportionment under Title 5, courses for older adults is the largest single area, comprising 24% of all courses offered; short-term vocational courses come in second with 20% of the total; ESL is third with 19%; elementary/secondary basic skills is fourth with 16%; health and safety has 10%, and courses for persons with substantial disabilities comprises 6%. The remaining areas have 2% or less.

Courses in noncredit elementary/secondary basic skills are offered at most colleges that have noncredit courses (87 out of the 98). For many colleges, however, this consists solely of noncredit supervised tutoring courses which support credit courses. Short-term vocational courses and courses for older adults are offered at 58 colleges; ESL at 49 colleges; courses for persons with substantial disabilities at 42 colleges; and health and safety courses at 35.
### The Role of No CREDIT in The California Community Colleges

The range of short-term noncredit vocational programs is broad and includes subjects such as architecture technician, financial planner, clothing construction, welding, hazardous waste, networking, meat cutting, upholstery, early childhood education, and medical assisting.

Research conducted by the City College of San Francisco (Smith, 2006) shows the importance of noncredit to the statewide attainment of an associate of arts/science degree. While only 16% of students enrolled in credit coursework had previously taken noncredit coursework, 30% of those who attained an AA or AS had prior noncredit coursework. This holds true for every ethnic group and is especially true for Hispanic students, of whom 35% had prior noncredit coursework (excludes supervised tutoring).

---

6 The chart groups the nine apportionment areas into three basic instructional areas: Literacy, Workforce Preparation and Short-term Vocational, and Family and Community Education. These are not official groupings, but the System Office uses this organization as a way to clarify the main areas of noncredit course offerings.
Percentage of Community College students that have taken Noncredit Coursework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Of all students enrolled in credit—Fall 2004</th>
<th>Of all students who attained an AA or AS—Fall 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-White</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data obtained through the Management Information System (MIS) reports submitted by colleges for Fall 2004 provides some information about the demographics of students in noncredit. (Datamart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Ethnicity</th>
<th>19 or less</th>
<th>20 to 24</th>
<th>25 to 29</th>
<th>30 to 34</th>
<th>35 to 39</th>
<th>40 to 49</th>
<th>50+</th>
<th>unknown</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>3018</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>2816</td>
<td>2681</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td>10659</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>28505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8488</td>
<td>12911</td>
<td>10541</td>
<td>9047</td>
<td>7314</td>
<td>8983</td>
<td>8209</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>65863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-White</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>2649</td>
<td>3313</td>
<td>2708</td>
<td>2835</td>
<td>2985</td>
<td>6997</td>
<td>44127</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>66635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>2186</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>2733</td>
<td>17930</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>31385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16752</td>
<td>23452</td>
<td>18422</td>
<td>17633</td>
<td>15602</td>
<td>26208</td>
<td>85784</td>
<td>3195</td>
<td>207048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of ethnicity, the largest single group of noncredit students is White Non-Hispanic, with slightly over 32% of all students. The second largest group is Hispanic, with slightly under 32%. Asians (not including Filipino or Pacific Islander) comprise 13.77% of all students, and African Americans are 3.34%. Noncredit has a higher proportion of students of color than for the System overall (36.47% White Non-Hispanic; 28.98% Hispanic; and 12.05% Asian), but a lower percentage of African-American students (7.40% overall compared to 3.34% in noncredit). Fifteen percent of students did not indicate their ethnicity.

---

7 As of the writing of this paper, this was the latest group for which data was available through the Datamart.
While many people believe that recent high-school graduates comprise the largest group of community college students, this is far from true in noncredit. Over 41% of all noncredit students are 50 years of age or older with less than 20% under the age of 25. In the System as a whole, under-25 comprises over 52% of community college students, while those 50+ comprise less than 22%. The large number of older adults in noncredit correlates with the large numbers of noncredit courses for older adults offered throughout the System.

Female noncredit students (60.74%) far outnumber male noncredit students (35.89%). For the System overall, the sexes are more evenly balanced with 55.70% female and 43.11% male. Noncredit Instruction—A Portal to the Future also points out that 23% of noncredit students are immigrants, 15% dropped out of high school, and 5.35% self-identify as being disabled; this points to the reality that noncredit serves the most under-prepared and generally neediest populations in the state.

A request to the Technology, Research and Information Systems (TRIS) unit of the System Office in Spring 2006 also provided demographic information about faculty that teach in noncredit.

Fall 2005 data show 4,472 faculty teaching noncredit courses in the System (unduplicated headcount) were part-time (87.7%). Women faculty (67.1%) far outnumber men (32.9%) in noncredit, with similar proportions in both full- and part-time ranks. In terms of teaching load (rather than head count) part-time faculty comprise 83%.

While the headcount of full-time faculty is 548, many faculty teach in more than one noncredit area or teach in both noncredit and credit. As a result, the number of full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) for noncredit faculty is 325.8. The highest concentration of full-time noncredit faculty is in ESL (TOP Codes 493080-493082) with 135.7 FTEF. Elementary and secondary basic skills (TOP Codes 493000-493021 and 493040-493072) have 57.0 FTEF. The rest is largely distributed among the vocational Taxonomy Of Programs (TOP) Codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2005 Unduplicated Headcount</th>
<th>Tenured / Tenure Track</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Academic Temporary</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>8.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12.77%</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>13.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Role of Non-Credit in the California Community Colleges

In terms of ethnicity, White Non-Hispanics comprise the largest group of both full- (65.9%) and part-time (70.5%) faculty. Hispanics make up 12.8% of full-time faculty and 13.1% of part-time faculty. Asians come in third with 10.4% of full-time faculty and 8.2% of part-time faculty, and Black Non-Hispanic represent 6.2% of full-time faculty and 3.44% of part-time faculty.

### Fall 2005 - Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>&lt;=34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount of Employees Who Taught a Non-Credit Course</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured / Tenure Track</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Temporary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age data show that the majority of both full- and part-time noncredit faculty tend to be age 50 or older.

While data submitted by the colleges provide some information about the status of noncredit in California community colleges, the Educational Policies Committee of the Academic Senate had additional questions that such data could not answer. The Committee drafted a survey of the additional questions, and given that the bulk of noncredit was offered by a limited number of colleges, the Committee decided to administer the survey to the top 20 colleges either in terms of total noncredit FTES or in terms of relative size of the noncredit program at a college. The survey and the resulting list of the 26 colleges surveyed can be found in Appendix C.

To get a sense of the perceived importance of noncredit by the college, the Committee asked whether or not noncredit was specifically mentioned in college mission statements and/or strategic plans. Nine indicated explicit reference to noncredit in the mission statement, and several of the others mentioned that noncredit was referenced indirectly in statements about lifelong learning. The reverse was true for strategic plans with 13 citing explicit references and inclusion of noncredit.

Quote: “President has made this credit/noncredit equality a priority and sets the tone for the campus.”

Quote: “Noncredit brings in 17% of the college funding, yet still has that stepchild syndrome.”
The relative importance of noncredit was also reflected in the resources allocated to data collection and monitoring of student progress and success. Fourteen colleges reported collection of matriculation data on noncredit students, often only in areas which articulated with credit instruction such as ESL and basic skills. All but two of the colleges collect demographic data, but such data are not always compiled or analyzed. Only one college reported collecting success data on noncredit students after they had transitioned from noncredit to credit. Only five reported use of data for planning purposes.

A variety of matriculation services are available to noncredit students at the colleges surveyed, and several of the colleges specifically cited categorical noncredit matriculation funds as the reason. All colleges use such funds to provide counseling support. Most provide services for students with disabilities. Twenty-two provide access to libraries and learning centers. Sixteen provide tutoring support for noncredit courses (this does not include noncredit supervised tutoring, which supports credit courses). Only nine offer financial aid, generally in the form of book loans, transportation, and child care. Although there are no fees in noncredit, expenses for books and transportation are major costs for students in both credit and noncredit. Many colleges have a large part of their noncredit programs located off campus, but few mentioned how they deliver matriculation services to off-campus noncredit students.

Quote: “Although student services are separate, we communicate closely through scheduled meetings and additional meetings as needed. We have a good integration and good working relationship with credit.”

As cited in the City College of San Francisco research, linkages between noncredit and credit can provide an important pathway for students from noncredit courses to credit vocational, transfer, and degree programs. The System Strategic Plan echoes this idea, “Another important long-term strategy is to improve the collaboration and alignment between the colleges and their own noncredit programs, as well as adult schools in the community.” (CCCBOG, 2006) Linkages exist on different levels, and the quality of such linkages is variable. However, respondents generally reported the need to build on existing or establish such linkages.

Quote: “Our ESL Program, in particular, works specifically to move students from noncredit ESL to credit ESL, to regular vocational and general education offerings.”

Quote: “…vocational noncredit faculty have worked with credit faculty to better prepare voc. students for movement into certificate programs.”

Quote: “… many in credit still have a lack of understanding and misperceptions about noncredit, who we are, who our students are, and the
role we play in the district; there is competition where there needs to be collaboration.”

Nineteen of the colleges surveyed use the same program review processes for credit and noncredit. A few link the review of credit and noncredit together for specific areas that overlap noncredit and credit such as basic skills and ESL. Only three cited program review processes specifically tailored to noncredit.

Accreditation is generally handled in conjunction with credit programs. However, three colleges report that the noncredit area is not formally reviewed in the accreditation process as a separate area. Two respondents have a separate accreditation through the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Adult Schools. In addition, some noncredit short-term vocational programs in areas such as health care are subject to vocation-specific accreditation standards.

All colleges reported that noncredit course approval follows the same processes as for credit course approval. However, several cited the lack of noncredit membership on curriculum committees and the concomitant lack of understanding of noncredit courses overall. While credit program and course development is primarily initiated and developed by faculty, only seven of the colleges surveyed indicate that this is true in noncredit. Most of the others had managers and faculty involved in program and course development and some had credit faculty developing noncredit curriculum.

The lack of noncredit faculty on curriculum committees and taking the lead in curriculum development is not surprising when one considers the ratio of full- to part-time faculty. The Committee’s survey seems to suggest a ratio even worse than that provided by System Office data, approximately 1:20, rather than the 1:9 cited previously. In addition, not captured in the System Office data is the fact that many colleges have no dedicated full-time noncredit faculty at all. Nine of the colleges reported no full-time noncredit faculty; two reported one full-time faculty member only by virtue of the fact that a credit faculty member was teaching part of his/her load in noncredit. In the open-ended section of the survey, lack of full-time faculty to carry out programmatic responsibilities was the number one unmet need cited by respondents.

Quote: “The small number of full-time faculty impedes program development and expansion, as well as the level of participation in the college community as a whole.”

Quote: “Full-time faculty - can’t run a program without them, still hard to convince college of the need.”

Quote: “Would likely push for more full-time faculty positions, but the district would oppose this.”
While the determination of the workload for a full-time faculty member is a bargaining issue, current practices at some colleges also raise concerns for the ability of faculty to meaningfully participate in college governance and curriculum development. There are also impacts on a faculty member’s ability to adequately prepare for classes and provide evaluation and feedback to students. For some colleges, full-time teaching loads for noncredit faculty are equal to that for full-time credit faculty. However, ten of the colleges report a full-time load of 25 to 30 instructional contact hours per week. Because several of the colleges have no full-time faculty, a full-time load needs to be interpolated from the maximum part-time load. In such cases, the interpolated load is 35 hours per week based on a maximum part-time load of 21 hours. Loads also vary depending on the program and whether or not a faculty member is teaching in both credit and noncredit at the same time.

For colleges with full-time noncredit faculty, the pay scale is usually the same as for credit faculty (13 of 16 colleges). However, 16 colleges reported that part-time pay for noncredit is lower than for credit. Whether or not this is connected with union representation of noncredit faculty is unclear given the various arrangements at the colleges surveyed. Eleven colleges have bargaining units that represent all faculty, credit and noncredit/full- and part-time, together. Five have representation for full-time faculty, credit and noncredit, separate from representation for part-time faculty, credit and noncredit. Other arrangements include separate representation for all noncredit faculty, separate representation only for noncredit part-time faculty, no representation only for faculty teaching in a specific noncredit area, or no representation for any noncredit faculty at all (three colleges).

The vast majority of noncredit programs primarily use the minimum qualifications for noncredit faculty (as described previously), but two colleges use the same minimum qualifications for noncredit faculty as for credit faculty, where applicable.

In addition to the need for more full-time faculty, the two unmet needs most often mentioned by respondents were the need for adequate funding for noncredit and the need for facilities for faculty, staff, and courses. With additional resources, most programs would expand their offerings in response to present demand from their communities and hire more full-time faculty. It seems clear that the lack of adequate funding is tied to the lack of full-time faculty and physical resources, and contributes to the many challenges noncredit is dealing with.
Recommendations

Many colleges offer few or no noncredit courses, and of those that do, the full potential of noncredit may not yet be exploited. While noncredit courses may not serve the needs of all colleges, we hope that the information provided in this paper will encourage colleges to re-examine the role that noncredit might play in a college’s mission and service to its community.

As with the California Community College System as a whole, the issues facing noncredit are varied and often inter-related. Based on the responses to the survey conducted by the Educational Policies Committee and related research, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges makes the following recommendations.

On a statewide level:

1. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges should seek to better integrate the concerns and viewpoints of noncredit faculty and programs into its discussions and work through involvement of noncredit faculty in its committees and appointments.

2. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges should work with the System Office on a plan to increase the number of full-time noncredit faculty in the system and the employment of full-time noncredit faculty in all noncredit programs.

3. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges should promote the role that noncredit can play as a pathway to credit instruction and encourage the local articulation and linkages between credit and noncredit that creates these pathways.

4. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges should continue to advocate for increases in noncredit funding to expand support for instruction in all approved noncredit areas.

5. Given the multitude of issues related to noncredit that need to be addressed, including investigation of the wide variety of issues raised in the noncredit survey conducted for this paper, the Academic Senate should establish an ad hoc committee on noncredit.

On a local level:

1. Local senates should seek to better integrate the concerns and viewpoints of noncredit faculty and programs into its discussions and work through involvement of noncredit faculty in the local senate, its committees and appointments.
2. Local senates should work through local planning and budget processes and hiring processes to increase the number of full-time faculty serving noncredit programs and instruction.

3. Local senates should work through local planning and budget processes to ensure that augmentations in noncredit funding are used to expand support for noncredit programs and instruction at their colleges and districts.

4. Local senates should work with their curriculum committees and faculty to establish much needed and beneficial articulation and linkages between their colleges’ noncredit and credit programs to encourage and facilitate the movement of students from noncredit to credit.

5. Local senates should work with their colleges and districts to encourage and support data collection on noncredit programs and students in order to better ascertain needs and provide documentation of the benefits of noncredit programs and instruction.
Sources
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Appendix A. Academic Senate Noncredit Resolutions

9.05 Noncredit Instruction and Shared Governance
Fall 1989

Whereas the principle of shared governance means that those who are governed participate in the governance, and

Whereas many noncredit faculty teach, counsel, or provide library services in districts where there is scant provision for their self-representation on professional and academic matters,

Resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with noncredit faculty and local senates to ensure that noncredit faculty are fully represented on local senates.

9.03 Increasing Full-Time Noncredit Faculty
Spring 1990

Resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the position that the ratio of full-time faculty in noncredit programs be substantially increased.

6.01 Program Review
Spring 1992

Resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to develop a model program review policy for consideration at a future session, and

Resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct that the following issues, among others, be considered for inclusion within that model: a. Class size and its effect on instructional quality; b. The appropriate mix among transfer, vocational, basic skills, and noncredit courses; c. Considerations of the quality of instruction as well as issues of productivity; d. Facilities considerations; e. Connecting the outcomes of program review with the college and district budgets; f. Contribution to the community based on student success in job placement.
6.01 Noncredit Curricular Standards

Fall 1993

Whereas AB 1725 recognizes the noncredit programs as part of the mission and goals of the California Community Colleges, and

Whereas while the course offerings to the noncredit student do differ, they often parallel the college's credit offerings, and

Whereas it is in the best interest of the student, the college, and the State of California to assure that the noncredit courses include consideration of Title 5 standards of integrity and success, and

Whereas presently Title 5 language, Section 55002 is not specific and leaves doubt that it includes noncredit courses,

Resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges reaffirm its position that noncredit programs are appropriately placed in the community college system and are an integral and important part of the mission, and

Resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges affirm that AB 1725 recognition of faculty’s responsibility for curricular development and Title S’s educational standards such as faculty-student interaction, integrity in student assessment, critical thinking and writing standards also applies to noncredit course offerings as well as to credit courses, and

Resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates, where noncredit programs exist, to ensure the intent of AB 1725 by including noncredit faculty and courses in the local curriculum process.

17.04 Data Collection of Noncredit Students

Spring 1994

Whereas data on noncredit students and on student services for noncredit students are not being collected statewide, and

Whereas noncredit programs are serving a growing population in our state, and
Whereas noncredit students in many districts have historically been excluded from student service programs which improve successful matriculation to further educational pursuits,

Resolved that the Academic Senate request the Chancellor’s Office to include noncredit students and faculty in all data which is collected regarding student services, and

Resolved that the Academic Senate ask the Chancellor’s Office to revise their forms to include data on noncredit students in the nine apportionment program categories to facilitate the movement of students from noncredit to credit courses,

Resolved that the Academic Senate recommend to the Chancellor’s Office that when plans vital to the success and access of students are proposed (such as the Student Equity Plan) and when major sources of funding for student services are proposed (such as matriculation funds) these plans and funding apply to noncredit students as well.

17.05 Noncredit Student Services
Spring 1994

Resolved that the Academic Senate reaffirm Resolution 6.01 (F93) which states the importance of the noncredit programs within the California Community Colleges, and

Resolved that the Academic Senate direct the Executive Committee to prepare a paper on student services available to noncredit students within the community colleges, and

Resolved that the Academic Senate direct the Executive Committee to include in the paper, a report on the progress made addressing the matriculation issues asked for by the adoption of Resolution 10.01 (F91).

8.02 Role of Counseling Faculty in Noncredit Programs
Fall 1994

Resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates that when the role (knowledge. competencies. skills) of counseling faculty in the California community college system is referred to or discussed, that role is inclusive of counseling faculty in noncredit programs.
**19.04 75:25 Survey**

Fall 1994

Whereas the spirit of 75:25 full-time/part-time faculty ratio for credit instruction goal implied district support for a core of full-time faculty, and

Whereas the full-time/part-time noncredit ratio of instruction throughout the state is currently not known,

Resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to initiate a survey of current full-time/part-time faculty ratios, both credit and noncredit of each community college, including division and departments, and the results be presented at a future session.

**5.01 Noncredit Funding**

Fall 1997

Whereas California community colleges are facing a funding problem that affects our instructional programs in noncredit and impacts our students every day, and

Whereas the current noncredit FTES allocation of $1,786 is inadequate to address the needs of noncredit students, and

Whereas the current ADA allocation for adult education is $1,924, and

Whereas there is currently an opportunity to solve this problem in the Governor’s budget for next year,

Resolved that the Academic Senate urge the Governor and the legislature to increase California Community Colleges’ noncredit FTES funding rate to equal adult education in order to meet the educational needs of noncredit students.

**9.12 Noncredit Courses, Programs, and Awards**

Fall 1997

Whereas all noncredit courses must currently be approved by the Chancellor’s Office in addition to the local review and approval process, and

Whereas no Title 5 Regulation provisions currently exist to establish noncredit programs, and
Whereas the importance of serving students through noncredit programs has been growing in addressing the educational needs of California Work for Opportunity and Responsibility for Kids (CalWORKs) recipients, the immigrant population, and many others,

Resolved that the Academic Senate urge the Board of Governors to authorize that noncredit courses and programs be reviewed and approved following the local curriculum process and without the need for the Chancellor’s Office approval.

18.01 Noncredit Matriculation
Fall 1997

Whereas the Legislature has appropriated $10 million for noncredit matriculation for 1997-98, and the Chancellor’s Office has asked for another $12 million for 1998-99, and

Whereas such appropriations represent the first time that noncredit matriculation has been funded and, indeed, the 1997-98 funding was not based on a proposal by the community college system and thus no plans exist for its expenditure, and

Whereas the Academic Senate has long been committed to matriculation services and quality noncredit programs,

Resolved that the Academic Senate request of the Chancellor’s Office full participation by the Academic Senate in the development of the noncredit matriculation program and funding guidelines, and

Resolved that the Academic Senate urge the Board of Governors to modify its 1998-99 noncredit matriculation budget change proposal (BCP) from a 1:3 state: district match to a 1:1 match in line with the 1997-98 legislative budget language, and

Resolved that the Academic Senate urge the Board of Governors to include in its requirements for expenditure of noncredit matriculation funds that districts be prohibited from supplanting existing funds and be required to report how both the state appropriation and district match are spent, and

Resolved that the Academic Senate urge the Board of Governors to include a requirement for adequate support of counseling faculty positions, of
which 75% should be full-time, in the requirements for district noncredit matriculation programs.

5.02 Increase in Noncredit Funding
Fall 2004

Whereas, There currently exists a funding disparity between noncredit and credit funding, as the current rate of apportionment funding for noncredit is approximately 56% of the credit rate and does not provide adequate funding for program elements that are critical to the success of noncredit students, such as full-time faculty, general support costs, office hours, libraries, learning resources centers, and tutors;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges support efforts to remedy the disparity between non-credit and credit funding without taking away from the current level of credit funding.

5.04 Full-time Faculty for Noncredit
Fall 1998

Whereas ten percent of California community colleges’ FTES is provided through noncredit courses, and

Whereas there is currently a $40 million Budget Change Proposal for hiring full-time faculty in credit programs for 1999-2000, and

Whereas there is a plan for the California Community Colleges to continue to request a Budget Change Proposal of $40 million in each of the next 5 years to hire full-time credit faculty for a total of $200 million,

Resolved that the Academic Senate request that the Board of Governors include a $4 million Budget Change Proposal for the fiscal year 1999 - 2000 in the system proposal to fund the hiring of noncredit full-time faculty, and

Resolved that the Academic Senate continue to request a $4 million Budget Change Proposal for each of the following 4 years for a total of $20 million directed towards the hiring of full-time noncredit faculty.
5.02 Concerns about Unequal Funding

Spring 2006

Whereas, Both credit and noncredit programs and courses play a crucial role in offering a full spectrum of educational opportunities to address the needs of a state population that is diverse, aging, under-prepared, under-educated, and under-employed;

Whereas, Although the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges supports efforts to remedy the disparity in funding between credit and noncredit courses and programs (5.02 F04) and recognizes that increasing noncredit funding to parity may need to be done in steps, the unequal noncredit funding proposal incorporated into SB361 may have an adverse effect on lower-funded noncredit program areas by reducing support for those areas, thereby reducing the diversity of programs and courses needed by current and future populations; and

Whereas, The proposed inequality of funding within noncredit sets a troubling precedent for further divisions of funding among our educational systems;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges affirm that both credit and noncredit students need comprehensive, diverse, wide-reaching, and accessible educational programs and courses in order to meet the needs of a current and future student population that is increasingly diverse, aging, under-prepared, under-employed, and under-educated; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges communicate its philosophical concern to appropriate government bodies (such as the Board of Governors, Consultation Council, the Legislature, etc.) about the potential adverse effects of unequal funding within and between credit and noncredit courses and programs on student access, student educational needs fulfillment, and student educational opportunities.
Appendix B. Regulations Pertaining to Noncredit

Note: Minimum qualifications for counseling and library faculty are the same for both credit and noncredit.

§53412. Minimum Qualifications for Instructors of Noncredit Courses.

Except as provided elsewhere in this article, the minimum qualifications for service as a faculty member teaching a noncredit course shall be the same as the minimum qualifications for credit instruction in the appropriate discipline, or as follows:

(a) For an interdisciplinary noncredit basic skills course, a bachelor’s in any social science, humanities, mathematics, or natural science discipline or in liberal studies, as appropriate for the course.

(b) For a noncredit basic skills course in mathematics, a bachelor’s in mathematics.

(c) For a noncredit basic skills course in reading and/or writing, either: a bachelor’s degree in English, literature, comparative literature, composition, linguistics, speech, creative writing, or journalism; or a bachelor’s degree in any discipline and twelve semester units of coursework in teaching reading.

(d) For a noncredit course in citizenship, a bachelor’s degree in any discipline, and six semester units in American history and institutions.

(e) For a noncredit course in English as a second language (ESL), any one of the following:

(1) A bachelor’s degree in teaching English as a second language, or teaching English to speakers of other languages.

(2) A bachelor’s degree in education, English, linguistics, applied linguistics, any foreign language, composition, bilingual/bicultural studies, reading, or speech; and a certificate in teaching English as a second language, which may be completed concurrently during the first year of employment as a noncredit instructor.

(3) A bachelor’s degree with any of the majors specified in subparagraph (2) above; and one year of experience teaching ESL in an accredited institution; and a certificate in teaching English as a second language, which may be completed concurrently during the first two years of employment as a noncredit instructor.

(4) Possession of a full-time, clear California Designated Subjects Adult Education Teaching Credential authorizing instruction in ESL.
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(f) For a noncredit course in health and safety, a bachelor's degree in health science, health education, biology, nursing, dietetics, or nutrition; or an associate degree in any of those subjects, and four years of professional experience related to the subject of the course taught.

(g) For a noncredit course in home economics, a bachelor's degree in home economics, life management, family and consumer studies, dietetics, food management interior design, or clothing and textiles; or an associated degree in any of those subjects, and four years of professional experience related to the subject of the course taught.

(h) For a noncredit course intended for older adults, either pattern (1) or pattern (2) following:

(1) A bachelor’s degree with a major related to the subject of the course taught, and either (A) or (B) below:

   (A) Thirty hours or two semester units of course work or class work in understanding the needs of the older adult taken at an accredited institution of higher education or approved by the district. This requirement may be completed concurrently during the first year of employment as a noncredit instructor.

   (B) One year of professional experience working with older adults. (2) An associate degree with a major related to the subject of the course taught; and two years of occupational experience related to the subject of the course taught; and sixty hours or four semester units of coursework or classwork in understanding the needs of the older adult, taken at an accredited institution of higher education or approved by the district. This last requirement may be completed concurrently during the first year of employment as a noncredit instructor.

(i) For a noncredit course in parent education, a bachelor’s degree in child development, early childhood education, human development, family and consumer studies with a specialization in child development or early childhood education, educational psychology with a specialization in child development, elementary education, psychology, or family life studies; and two years of professional experience in early childhood programs or parenting education.

(j) For a short-term noncredit vocational course, any one of the following: (1) A bachelor’s degree; and two years of occupational experience related to the subject of the course taught. (2) An associate degree; and six years of occupational experience related to the subject of the course taught. (3) Possession of a full-time, clear California Designated Subjects Adult Education Teaching Credential authorizing instruction in the subject matter. (4) For courses in an occupation for
which the district offers or has offered apprenticeship instruction, the minimum qualifications for noncredit apprenticeship instructors in that occupation, as specified in Section 53413.


§53413. Minimum Qualifications for Apprenticeship Instructors.

(a) Until July 1, 1995, the minimum qualifications for service as a community college faculty member teaching credit or noncredit apprenticeship courses shall be satisfied by meeting both of the following requirements:

(1) Six years of occupational experience in an apprenticeable trade, including at least two years at the journeyman level; and

(2) Sixty clock hours or four semester units of instruction in materials, methods, and evaluation of instruction. This requirement may be satisfied concurrently during the first year of employment as an apprenticeship instructor.

(b) On or after July 1, 1995, the minimum qualifications for service as a community college faculty member teaching credit apprenticeship courses shall be satisfied by meeting one of the following two requirements:

(1) Possession of an associate degree, plus four years of occupational experience in the subject matter area to be taught; or

(2) Six years of occupational experience, a journeyman’s certificate in the subject matter area to be taught, and completion of at least eighteen (18) semester units of degree applicable college level course work, in addition to apprenticeship credits.

(c) On or after July 1, 1995, the minimum qualifications for service as a community college faculty member teaching noncredit apprenticeship courses shall be either of the following:

(1) The minimum qualifications for credit apprenticeship instruction as set forth in this section, or

(2) A high school diploma; and six years of occupational experience in the occupation to be taught including at least two years at the journeyman level; and sixty clock hours or four semester units in materials, methods, and evaluation of instruction. This last requirement may be satisfied concurrently during the first year of employment as an apprenticeship instructor.

§53414. Minimum Qualifications for Disabled Students Programs and Services Employees.

(a) The minimum qualifications for service as a community college counselor of students with disabilities shall be satisfied by meeting one of the following requirements:

(1) Possession of a master’s degree, or equivalent foreign degree, in rehabilitation counseling, or

(2) Possession of a master’s degree, or equivalent foreign degree, in special education, and twenty-four or more semester units in upper division or graduate level course work in counseling, guidance, student personnel, psychology, or social work; or

(3) A master’s degree in counseling, guidance, student personnel, psychology, career development, or social welfare; and either twelve or more semester units in upper division or graduate level course work specifically in counseling or rehabilitation of individuals with disabilities, or two years of full-time experience, or the equivalent, in one or more of the following:

(A) Counseling or guidance for students with disabilities; or

(B) Counseling and/or guidance in industry, government, public agencies, military or private social welfare organizations in which the responsibilities of the position were predominantly or exclusively for persons with disabilities.

(b) The minimum requirements for service as a community college faculty member teaching a credit course in adapted physical education shall be the minimum qualifications for an instructor of credit physical education, and fifteen semester units of upper division or graduate study in adapted physical education.

(c) The minimum requirements for service to work with students with speech and language disabilities shall be satisfied by meeting the following requirements:

(1) Possession of a master’s degree, or equivalent foreign degree, in speech pathology and audiology, or in communication disorders; and

(2) Licensure or eligibility for licensure as a speech pathologist or audiologist by the Medical Board of California.

(d) Except as provided in Subsections (a) through (c) above, the minimum requirements for service as a community college faculty member to provide credit specialized instruction for students with disabilities shall be satisfied by meeting the following requirements:

(1) Possession of a master’s degree, or equivalent foreign degree, in the category of disability, special education, education, psychology, educational psychology, or rehabilitation counseling; and
(2) Fifteen semester units of upper division or graduate study in the area of disability, to include, but not be limited to:

(A) Learning disabilities;
(B) Developmental disabilities;
(C) Deaf and hearing impaired;
(D) Physical disabilities; or
(E) Adapted computer technology.

(e) The minimum qualifications for service as a faculty member to provide noncredit specialized instruction for students with disabilities shall be any one of the following:

(1) The minimum qualifications for providing credit specialized instruction for students with disabilities as specified in this section.

(2) A bachelor’s degree with any of the following majors: education of students with specific or multiple disabilities; special education; psychology; physical education with an emphasis in adaptive physical education; communicative disorders; rehabilitation; computer-based education; other computer-related majors which include course work on adapted or assistive computer technology for students with disabilities; other majors related to providing specialized instruction or services to persons with disabilities.

(3) An associate degree with one of the majors specified in subparagraph (2) above; and four years of experience providing specialized instruction or services to persons in the disability category or categories being served.

(4) For noncredit vocational courses, an associate degree or certificate of training; and four years of occupational experience related to the subject of the course taught; and two years of experience providing specialized instruction or services to persons in the disability category being served.


§55002. Standards and Criteria for Courses and Classes.

(c) Noncredit Course. A noncredit course is a course which, at a minimum, is recommended by the college and/or district curriculum committee (the committee described and established under subdivision (a)(1) of this section) and approved by the district governing board as a course meeting the needs of enrolled students.
(1) Standards for Approval. The college and/or district curriculum committee shall recommend approval of the course if the course treats subject matter and uses resource materials, teaching methods, and standards of attendance and achievement that the committee deems appropriate for the enrolled students. In order to be eligible for state apportionment, such courses are limited to the categories of instruction listed in Education Code section 84757 and must be approved by the Chancellor’s Office pursuant to section 55150.

(2) Course Outline of Record. The course is described in a course outline of record that shall be maintained in the official college files and made available to each instructor. The course outline of record shall specify the scope, objectives, contents, instructional methodology, and methods of evaluation for determining whether the stated objectives have been met.

(3) Conduct of Course. All sections of the course are to be taught by a qualified instructor in accordance with the set of objectives and other specifications defined in the course outline of record.

Appendix C. Academic Senate Noncredit Program Survey

1. Is noncredit instruction specifically mentioned in your college/district mission statement(s)?
   If yes, please provide the statement(s).

2. Is noncredit included in your college/district strategic plan(s)?
   If yes, what was your faculty senate’s role in making sure that noncredit was included in the plan(s)?

3. Do you collect data on matriculation of noncredit students into credit programs?
   a. No
   b. Yes (If yes, indicate number/percentages) ______________________________

4. Do you collect other types of data on noncredit students?
   a. No
   b. Yes (Describe types of data collected) ______________________________
   c. Describe how this data is used ______________________________

5. How are noncredit programs and courses developed?
   a. primarily by managers
   b. primarily by faculty
   c. by both managers and faculty working together
   d. other (Describe) ______________________________

6. How is program review of your noncredit programs handled? (Indicate all that apply)
   a. similar to that for credit programs
   b. specifically tailored to noncredit
   c. formally approved by faculty
   d. other (Describe) ______________________________
7. What is the role of the faculty senate and/or curriculum committee in noncredit program and course development and program review?

8. Which factors influence program development? (Indicate all that apply)
   a. local community needs
   b. demographics
   c. business/vocational development needs/trends
   d. credit division needs/requirements
   e. other (Describe) ________________________________

9. Is your noncredit curriculum development and approval process the same as for credit? If not, please explain: ________________________________

10. Which student support services are offered/available to noncredit students? How are support services handled at off-campus sites?
    a. matriculation
    b. counseling
    c. services for students with disabilities (DSPS)
    d. financial aid
    e. library/learning resource center
    f. tutoring
    g. other (Describe) ________________________________

11. Are student support services for noncredit students reviewed as a part of your regular student services review?

12. Please indicate the composition of the faculty in your noncredit program:
    a. number of full-time faculty
    b. number of part-time faculty

13. Do you have faculty that teach in both noncredit and credit programs/classes?
    a. No
    b. Yes (Please indicate approximate number)
14. What is the full-time workload for a noncredit faculty member?
   a. 10 hours/week
   b. 15 hours/week
   c. 20 hours/week
   d. 25 hours/week
   e. 30 hours/week
   f. other (Please specify) ________________________________

   If the college has no full-time faculty in noncredit, skip to Question 17.

15. Are FT noncredit faculty required to maintain regular office hours?
   a. No
   b. Yes
   If yes, how many hours per week? ________________________________

16. Do FT noncredit faculty have offices or shared faculty office/work area on campus?
   a. Yes
   b. No

17. Are PT noncredit faculty required to maintain regular office hours?
   a. No
   b. Yes
   If yes, how are office hours assigned?

18. Do PT faculty have faculty offices or a shared faculty office/work area?
   a. Yes
   a. No

19. Are noncredit faculty supported by your college’s faculty development program?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. My college currently has no faculty development program
20. Which apply to the noncredit faculty pay scale?
   a. noncredit FT same as credit FT
   b. noncredit FT higher than credit FT
   c. noncredit FT lower than credit FT
   d. noncredit PT same as credit PT
   e. noncredit PT higher than credit PT
   f. noncredit PT lower than credit PT

21. Describe union representation of your noncredit faculty
   a. all faculty (FT & PT) in credit and noncredit represented by same bargaining unit
   b. all FT faculty (credit & noncredit) represented by one bargaining unit AND all PT faculty (credit & noncredit) represented by another bargaining unit
   c. Credit division faculty represented by one bargaining group AND noncredit faculty represented by another bargaining unit
   d. Credit division faculty represented by a bargaining group, but noncredit faculty is not represented by any bargaining group
   e. other (Describe) __________________________________________________________

22. How is accreditation for your noncredit program handled? (Indicate all that apply)
   a. noncredit program not formally accredited
   b. parts of noncredit programs have separate subject specific accreditations (i.e. vocational areas)
   c. in conjunction with accreditation for credit program
   d. separately from credit program
   e. through ACCJC
   f. through WASC

23. Which minimum qualifications do you use for hiring noncredit faculty?
   a. the same as for credit faculty, where applicable
   b. the minimum qualifications specifically for noncredit faculty (usually BA only; no MA required)
   c. other (Describe) __________________________________________________________
24. If you offer short-term noncredit vocational programs, could you provide the major areas in which you offer courses?

25. What is the relationship between your noncredit program and local adult education (K-12) program? (Indicate all that apply)
   a. We follow a delineation of function agreement.
   b. We articulate between adult education and noncredit.
   c. The community college is the primary provider of noncredit adult education.
   d. The K-12 system is the primary provider of (noncredit) adult education.
   e. The community college and K-12 system share pretty much equally the provision of (noncredit) adult education.

26. What unmet needs do you have in your noncredit program?

27. Describe how your noncredit program is integrated/articulated with your credit program.

28. If noncredit received a rate enhancement, even if limited to basic skills, ESL and workforce preparation, or received funding equal to the rate for credit courses, do you think your college/district would expand or change the noncredit program? What kinds of changes would you foresee?

29. What other concerns or comments would you like to share about noncredit issues?
Colleges Surveyed

Note: College selection was based on MIS data available on the Datamart. It has since come to the Committee’s attention that use of 320 reports and corrected MIS data would produce a slightly different list of colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marin CCD</td>
<td>Marin Continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Orange CCD</td>
<td>North Orange Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santiago CCD</td>
<td>Santiago Canyon and Santa Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego CCD</td>
<td>San Diego Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco CCD</td>
<td>San Francisco Ctrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara CCD</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Cont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast CCD</td>
<td>Coastline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey CCD</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. San Antonio CCD</td>
<td>Mt San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma CCD</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced CCD</td>
<td>Merced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale CCD</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte CCD</td>
<td>Butte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossmont CCD</td>
<td>Cuyamaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiraCosta CCD</td>
<td>MiraCosta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde CCD</td>
<td>Palo Verde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles CCD</td>
<td>LA Swest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Hancock CCD</td>
<td>Allan Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa CCD</td>
<td>Napa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavilan CCD</td>
<td>Gavilan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus CCD</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles CCD</td>
<td>LA City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena CCD</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar CCD</td>
<td>Palomar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Orange Co CCD</td>
<td>Saddleback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach CCD</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>