

RECEIVED AND PLACED ON FILE

– BOARD OF TRUSTEES

COMMUNITY COLLEGE

DISTRICT NO. 508

OCTOBER 1, 2026

Faculty Council Report
Thursday, October 1st, 2026

Pre-address Remarks: Thank you to Chief Advisor Bonnie Phillips, Senior Assistant Board Liaison Emma Mims, and Assistant Board Liaison Avery Walls for their continued high-level operations that ensure the board reports are accessible to the CCC community and the city of Chicago that we feel grateful to serve.

FC4 President's Address for CCC Board of Trustees Meeting:

Chairperson Nuques, Board of Trustees, Chancellor Salgado, Provost Potter, Student Trustee Damian Wright, officers of the district, faculty, staff, students, community members, and beyond, greetings.

During September 2026, faculty councils across the City Colleges of Chicago continued to carry out shared-governance work concerning curriculum, committee representation, accessibility, communications with college and district administration, and other academic operations' policies, processes, and procedures. The following summarizes college-level activity reflected in submitted reports, meeting records, and related council communications, followed by a summary of various FC4 work. AI has been used for clarity as urged in the new CCC "AI-enabled workplace" efforts.

Richard J. Daley College Faculty Council met with faculty and college leadership throughout the reporting period to address academic operations, student support concerns, facilities and safety, administrative roles, faculty council participation in search committees, and communication across the college. The council also received Committee A and PACC updates on Daley programs and courses, discussed curriculum review processes and course assignments' impact on course scheduling complications (e.g., passing periods not being enough time to get to class, bathroom, etc.), clarified the council's distinct shared governance role, and communicated FC4 meetings and calls for faculty concerns to the college.

Harold Washington Faculty Council continued addressing local shared governance issues, including faculty concerns related to campus academic resources, curriculum, and faculty participation in institutional decisions. The council is also working to maintain continuity in Committee A representation.

Kennedy-King Faculty Council met and continued committee-based shared governance work related to curriculum, assessment, online learning, and the academic affairs layers of professional development. The council also addressed Committee A continuity, district curriculum processes, and credentialing.

Malcolm X College did not hold a Faculty Council meeting with faculty. As a result, faculty may benefit from additional communication about FC4 participation opportunities from the established internal FC processes—from regular updates on college-level shared governance activity to correspondence from FC4 about district-wide faculty governance opportunities (e.g., FC4 subcommittee opportunities).

Olive-Harvey College Faculty Council met during the reporting period and continued faculty-led shared governance work on academic affairs, facilities remediation (e.g., roof and pot hole repairs), campus safety protocols, curriculum processes, assessment, and faculty committee engagement. The council also met with college administration through its executive leadership, maintained continuity in Committee A through the return of its chair and collaboration with the college curriculum facilitator, and clarified its FC4 representation for the district webpage.

Harry S. Truman Faculty Council met with administration and continued shared governance work on updating its constitution, bylaws, and FC officer role descriptions; increasing administrative transparency; and advancing unresolved (1) Education and Human Development and Family Studies department and (2) Elementary and Secondary Education department matters. The council also

addressed learning space and facilities conditions, including roof-related water intrusion, damaged instructional equipment, and pest concerns; supported continuity in Committee A while trying to find a Committee A chair replacement; and monitored faculty representation in the Truman faculty council.

Wilbur Wright College Faculty Council met and addressed districtwide and college-level issues affecting instruction, student access, campus safety, technology, facilities, accessibility, and faculty communication with administration. The council also conducted faculty outreach, advanced curriculum work through Committee A, and identified several matters requiring administrative follow-up.

Regarding the district-level faculty council (FC4), FC4 convened its September executive meeting with faculty council representatives, administrative counterparts, college Committee A representatives, and the districtwide JCDC curriculum facilitator. The meeting centered on district curriculum governance, the PACC process, credentialing, professional development, English language learner and literacy policy discussions, and clarification of Committee A's positionality to faculty council.

A principal discussion concerned the PACC process and the timing of board reports for proposed programs. Faculty representatives reaffirmed their reading of the June 2014 board-approved PACC process and the Academic and Student Policy Manual: faculty expressed concern that board reports for new programs have sometimes appeared before faculty at the relevant college had been notified or before the internal curriculum review steps had occurred. Faculty emphasized that premature board reporting can create pressure to accelerate curriculum work, reduce meaningful local consultation, and undermine the intended sequence of faculty review, internal endorsement, and external approval. Faculty also noted concern that some proposals that had already progressed through established review steps remained delayed while newer proposals advanced to the board earlier in the process. Administration stated that board action has historically been used to establish feasibility, labor market demand, risk management review, and institutional authorization before full program development. Administration acknowledged that colleges should not be surprised by proposals that they are expected to shepherd and agreed that stronger communication and iterative review of the process are needed. FC4 emphasized that any future revisions to the process should occur collaboratively and in alignment with the established policy structure.

FC4 further addressed the role of Committee A. District administration reaffirmed the understanding that Committee A is a faculty council committee at each college and that its faculty representatives are selected through faculty governance rather than appointed as administrative curriculum facilitators. FC4's district Committee A co-chairs were identified as responsible for convening Committee A meetings and reporting Committee A recommendations to FC4. The discussion underscored the importance of consistent local understanding of Committee A's role, especially because Committee A provides a necessary faculty governance structure for college-level curriculum review as part of the larger shared governance structure.

The September FC4 meetings also addressed English language learner, ESL, and literacy-related policy questions. FC4 distinguished between the immediate policy concern involving student placement and options between English 096 and ESL Integrated 099, and the broader literacy work involving reading, digital literacy, and related academic supports. Administration indicated that a proposed policy update would be deferred from November to March in order to allow fuller discussion and review of relevant data. FC4 requested that the appropriate ELL/ESL faculty be included and that sufficient time be reserved for substantive discussion rather than an abbreviated agenda item.

The meeting also considered discipline-level participation in curriculum review and the relationship among subject codes, disciplines, credentials, and faculty expertise. FC4 discussed the need to ensure that the appropriately credentialed faculty are included in curriculum conversations

while recognizing that some disciplines and multidisciplinary areas require case-specific complexities. Faculty raised particular concern that credentialing guidelines and curriculum-related decisions should be developed transparently and with faculty participation, rather than communicated after the fact. Administration affirmed that faculty involvement is intended at the outset of credential-guideline development and that vice presidents approve the resulting guidelines.

The districtwide discussion of credentialing, discipline participation, and transparent shared governance processes affirmed a need for further clarification regarding Education faculty qualifications and the role of the Education Discipline in credentialing decisions. In response, FC4, in support of the Education Discipline, prepared the memorandum in the appendix below dated September 28, 2026, for Academic Leadership and relevant district and college administrators; it is included in full.

Faculty also discussed concerns at the intersection of FC4's academic affairs work and union matters. Through the FC4U Bridge—an established referral process between the two bodies—these matters have been directed appropriately so that FC4 addresses the faculty governance dimensions and the union addresses contractual or representational issues. To illustrate, faculty had concerns about administrative participation in faculty voting at tenure-track checkpoint stages. Faculty questioned why such intervention would be necessary where there are qualified faculty in the same discipline at the same college—those teaching the same courses—could remain housed within the same department and participate in a transparent, discipline-informed evaluation process that may support a colleague's advancement toward tenure. Under the Illinois Public Community College Act, the CCC Board of Trustees retains the statutory authority to issue or decline a tenure contract; the act does not establish an administrator as a substitute for the departmental faculty recommendation. CCC's Academic and Student Policy Manual separately provides that the faculty member's department reviews the tenure portfolio, conducts the departmental vote, and communicates the result through the department chair's letter to the college president, while college administration conducts its own evaluation and recommendation for board consideration. Faculty therefore seek consistent adherence to the distinction between a departmental faculty vote—one conducted by faculty rather than by an administrator serving in the place of faculty—and a separate administrative recommendation. This distinction is particularly important where organizational decisions separate faculty within the same discipline, limiting discipline-informed participation in tenure review, curriculum development, program review, as well as scheduling and enrollment planning.

For questions about a particular FC4 agenda item, please reach out to FC4 President Vicky Alexandersson who can provide more details upon request within the parameters of FC4 disclosure and privacy permissions.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicky Alexandersson on behalf of the Faculty Council of City Colleges of Chicago

Appendix A: Memorandum on Education Faculty Credentialing

MEMO

To: Academic Leadership and Relevant District and College Administrators

From: FC4 in collaboration with the Education Discipline

Date: September 28, 2026

Subject: Affirming an equitable, discipline-led articulation for Education faculty credentialing district-wide

We write as FC4 in collaboration with the Education Discipline to express serious concerns regarding the current administrative framing of credentialing for Education courses. We support rigorous, transparent, consistent, and pedagogically sound credentialing. At the same time, we do not agree with an approach that treats possession of a specific license, subsequent endorsement or prescribed work history as a blanket condition for college faculty eligibility to teach Education coursework.

The issue before us is not whether specialized coursework should be taught by faculty with appropriate expertise. It should. The issue is how that expertise is defined, evaluated, and governed. Credentialing must be anchored in graduate academic preparation, applied consistently, and developed in meaningful consultation with the discipline—not through categorical requirements that are disconnected from the academic work of college teaching or that unnecessarily exclude qualified faculty.

Areas of disagreement

We do not agree with a credentialing framework that:

- Requires a Professional Educator License or a particular Illinois endorsement as a universal prerequisite for teaching college-level Education courses.
- Treats an endorsement as equivalent to, or more determinative than, relevant graduate academic preparation.
- Applies course-by-course restrictions as the default rather than recognizing faculty qualification within an academic discipline, except where a course is demonstrably specialized.
- Adds teaching, administrative, or work-experience requirements as barriers to academic credentialing without a clear and governing academic basis.
- Treats prior K–12 classroom experience as a required substitute for graduate academic preparation, or as a categorical additional requirement where a faculty member otherwise meets the academic credential standard.
- Relies on undefined categories such as “primary teaching area” or “secondary teaching area” to narrow faculty eligibility.
- Establishes or applies credentialing standards without transparent documentation, clear authority, and substantive discipline consultation.
- Attributes requirements to the Illinois State Board of Education without identifying a specific, applicable ISBE rule, statute, licensure regulation, or other authoritative source.

Clarifying ISBE requirements

The administrative claim that Illinois State Board of Education requirements mandate a PEL or a particular endorsement for faculty teaching college-level Education coursework appears to conflate two distinct systems: professional educator licensure/subsequent endorsements and higher-education faculty credentialing.

ISBE regulates educator licensure and endorsements for individuals who teach or serve in designated roles in Illinois public schools. ISBE itself describes its licensure requirements as applying to individuals who teach or supervise in Illinois public schools. Endorsements are added to a PEL and establish eligibility for particular public-school assignments; they are not, by themselves, a general credential for teaching at an institution of higher education. Illinois university guidance on subsequent endorsements likewise describes them as credentials attached to a current Illinois teacher license that may be endorsed.

Accordingly, a claim that ISBE requires every instructor of college-level Education coursework—including faculty teaching introductory, foundational, transfer-oriented, methods, or subsequent-endorsement courses—to personally possess the same PEL or endorsement being pursued by students requires a specific citation. To date, no such authority has been identified.

The distinction matters. A person may be academically qualified to teach college-level Education coursework through graduate study in Education, curriculum and instruction, teaching and learning, educational leadership, early childhood, special education, higher education, or a closely related field without holding an Illinois public-school credential. This is particularly important for educators who have developed substantial expertise in private, parochial, Montessori, higher-education, nonprofit, community-based, or other educational settings where a PEL or state endorsement may not be required.

A blanket endorsement requirement therefore risks improperly blurring different credentials. The teacher education license is important and a high-quality credential in education. However, it should not be conflated with graduate education that allows faculty to teach higher education in accordance with the stipulations of Ill. Admin. Code tit. 23, § 1030.30. That conflation narrows the pool of qualified instructors, disregards relevant graduate academic preparation, and creates inequitable exclusions for faculty whose educational expertise was developed outside Illinois public-school employment.

Clarifying academic qualifications

The administrative approach also appears to place undue weight on professional experience and endorsement status while minimizing graduate academic preparation. That approach is inconsistent with the basic distinction between academic qualifications and other forms of professional evidence.

Higher-education credentialing frameworks ordinarily begin with faculty members' academic credentials and relevant graduate coursework. The Higher Learning Commission's current Assumed Practices require institutions to maintain policies and procedures for determining faculty qualifications and recognize that an institution may consider academic credentials, progress toward academic credentials, equivalent experience, or a combination of factors. This does not establish a blanket requirement that an instructor hold a particular state license or endorsement. Nor does it support treating years of teaching or administrative work as a universal prerequisite where the faculty member already meets the relevant academic standard.

Professional experience can be valuable contextual evidence, particularly in applied or specialized fields. However, it should not be used selectively to disqualify faculty who meet the academic credential standard. It should also not be used to impose requirements that have not been approved by the discipline, documented in institutional policy, or tied to a specific governing authority.

We are also concerned by the use of “primary teaching area” and “secondary teaching area” as grounds for restricting faculty eligibility. These categories must not be invoked without a clear definition, consistent documentation, and an identified basis in institutional policy, contractual language, or a discipline-approved credentialing framework. Undefined classifications invite

inconsistent application and may permit credentialing decisions to be made through informal or shifting criteria rather than transparent academic standards.

Our affirmative framework

We affirm the following discipline-led approach to Education credentialing.

Credentialing required to teach undergraduate coursework in the education discipline at CCC

“Master’s degree or higher in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Higher Education Administration, Special Education, Curriculum and Instruction or related field (e.g. Master’s in Teaching and Learning, Educational Leadership, etc.) OR Masters degree or higher AND 30 hours of graduate level coursework in the education discipline.”

Credentialing required if the course is part of a track that leads to a subsequent endorsement at CCC

“Specialized graduate coursework in the endorsement content area; when the content area is education, faculty must meet the education discipline credentials outlined above.”

1. Education-discipline qualification

A faculty member should be qualified to teach Education coursework when the faculty member holds either a *master’s degree or higher in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Higher Education Administration, Special Education, Curriculum and Instruction or degree in related field (e.g. Master’s in Teaching and Learning, Educational Leadership, etc.) OR Masters degree or higher and 30 hours of graduate level coursework in the education discipline.*

This framework appropriately recognizes both completed graduate degrees and substantial graduate academic study. It also provides room for transcript-informed review of related graduate programs whose coursework demonstrates sustained preparation in teaching, learning, curriculum, educational foundations, educational policy, student development, or related educational inquiry.

The framework recognizes that a faculty member’s bachelor’s degree alone should not control college-faculty credentialing where the faculty member has subsequently completed a relevant graduate degree or has accumulated the requisite graduate coursework. It also recognizes that completion of a particular degree title is not the only legitimate evidence of qualification when a faculty member has completed 30 or more graduate credit hours in the discipline.

2. Specialized Education coursework

For courses that are genuinely specialized—including coursework connected to a subsequent endorsement (e.g. ESL/BIL endorsement courses)—faculty should demonstrate relevant specialized graduate academic coursework in the area of the course or endorsement, in addition to meeting the Education-discipline qualification described above.

The appropriate question is not simply whether a faculty member holds the identical endorsement that students may be pursuing. The appropriate question is whether the faculty member possesses sufficient relevant graduate academic preparation to teach the specific college-level course well. That determination should be made through a holistic review of transcripts, degree-program content, scholarly preparation, and the relationship between the faculty member’s preparation and the course.

For example, it may be appropriate for a faculty member teaching a specialized diagnostic-assessment or content-specific methods course to demonstrate graduate coursework

directly relevant to that specialization. However, requiring that faculty member to possess the identical public-school endorsement sought by students is neither the only nor necessarily the best measure of qualification. Graduate academic preparation in the relevant content area, grade-band pedagogy, curriculum, assessment, or instructional methodology may provide more direct evidence of qualification to teach the college course.

A PEL, endorsement, or relevant professional experience may be considered as contextual evidence of preparation where appropriate. None should operate as an automatic, exclusive, or substitute requirement for the graduate academic expertise that is central to higher-education faculty credentialing.

3. Faculty and discipline governance

The Education Discipline must be meaningfully involved in identifying which courses are specialized, articulating appropriate qualifications, reviewing emerging curricular needs, and revising credentialing language. Discipline expertise is necessary to distinguish, for example, broad Education coursework from a specialized diagnostic assessment, content-specific methods course, or subsequent-endorsement course. These distinctions should be pedagogically grounded and consistently applied.

The discipline's role is particularly necessary where the curriculum includes courses that intersect with other content areas, such as mathematics education, literacy education, science education, health education, etc. Course titles or subject codes alone should not determine qualification. Credentialing should instead reflect the course's actual learning outcomes, the faculty member's graduate preparation, and the discipline's informed judgment about the knowledge and expertise necessary to teach the course.

Requested actions

We respectfully request that Academic Leadership:

- Suspend use of blanket license or endorsement requirements for Education faculty credentialing unless a specific, written, and applicable authority requires them.
- Identify, in writing, the exact ISBE rule, statute, regulation, institutional policy, accreditor requirement, or other authority that administration believes requires an Education faculty member to possess a PEL or a specific endorsement in order to teach a particular college-level course.
- Provide the Education Discipline and FC4 with the written source, policy, regulation, or approved institutional standard supporting any asserted endorsement, experience, primary-area, or secondary-area requirement.
- Use the Education Discipline's approved credentialing language as the primary basis for evaluating Education faculty eligibility.
- Ensure that credentialing determinations and denials are communicated in writing by administration to affected faculty, with a clear rationale, the governing standard, the evidence considered, and information about the credentialing appeal process.
- Revisit prior and pending credentialing decisions that may have been narrowed or denied based solely or primarily on endorsement or experience requirements rather than a full review of graduate academic preparation as soon as possible.
- Refrain from using undefined classifications, informal practices, or newly imposed conditions to limit faculty teaching opportunities unless those conditions have been transparently reviewed and approved through the appropriate shared-governance process.

- Reaffirm a transparent process for future revisions to credentialing standards, including discipline-approved credentialing language and meaningful faculty consultation before administration implements new restrictions.

Closing

We share the institution's obligation to ensure that students learn from faculty with strong, relevant expertise. That obligation is best met through an equitable credentialing process that recognizes graduate academic preparation, values the breadth of educational practice, protects faculty from arbitrary or inconsistent restrictions, and gives the Education Discipline an authentic role in defining the qualifications appropriate to its curriculum.

We welcome a meeting to review the proposed framework, clarify any disputed standards, identify the authority for any asserted licensure or endorsement requirement, and establish a transparent process that protects academic quality, faculty equity, and institutional accountability.