

President's Report

April 18, 2018

Plenary:

ASCCC Plenary was held at the San Mateo Marriott, April 12, 13, 14, attended by Eric Thompson, Mike Starkey, and Nancy Persons. Nancy and Mike will be giving their own reports.

Some highlights:

- In the first General Session, as well as in Breakouts, I learned a lot about **AB 705** (Irwin 2017).

The Academic Senate (both statewide and locally), as well as faculty across the state particularly in math, English and ESL, are struggling mightily with two things: 1) managing and mitigating the potential damage of AB 705 to their disciplines, and 2) understanding what it even means. The ASCCC has requested from the Chancellor a legal interpretation of key terms in the bill, and that request has so far been refused. One point of contention: since the legislation specifies that colleges must maximize the probability of students completing college level math and English in one year, the definition of a year is a question. The Chancellor's definition of a year, for the purposes of implementing AB 705 is "two semesters (three quarters for 3/114 colleges)." If a student starts college in the summer term, in the interpretation of the Chancellor's Office, the clock starts ticking. The deadline, therefore, for that student would be the end of the fall semester. The bill also requires that students be placed in English 1A unless the college can prove that the probability of their not succeeding is very great. The combination of the burden of proof and ambiguous criteria makes this practically impossible. **The position of the ASCCC is that we should not delete our developmental courses, as students still have the right to take them. *Student self-placement in math or English below collegiate level is still their right; neither the legislature nor the Chancellor can control student choice.***

- In the second General Session, three Vice Chancellors formed a panel to make remarks and answer questions. They were
Theresa Tena, Institutional Effectiveness
Laura Hope, Educational Services (addressed AB 705 and Guided Pathways)
Van Ton-Quinlivan, Workforce and Digital Futures (addressed the proposed Fully Online College)

This session was remarkable, and talked about for the next two days and an example of the acrimony and disconnection between the state administration and the state faculty. Theresa Tena was gentle and innocuous, but Laura Hope and Van Ton-Quinlivan were combative, insulting and disrespectful to faculty interlocutors giving comments and asking questions from the floor. Laura Hope spoke of Guided Pathways and AB 705. She said that AB 705 was the foundation of Guided Pathways, and that Guided Pathways was the solution to the problem that we, CCC faculty, have been failing students all this time because only 47 % complete in 6 years. Vice Chancellor Ton-Quinlivan spoke on, and in defense of, the **proposed fully online 115th College**, now called, affectionately by faculty leaders **FOCC** (Fully online community college) and its advocate we call **FOCCers**. Among the criticisms of the proposed FOCC are:

- It will not be accredited; it will grant badges, not degrees
- It will take students away from established colleges, and harm especially small, rural CCCs
- Its target population, older working adults, are not likely to benefit from it; the profile of the target student population in mind is the same profile as of those students least likely to succeed in an online environment

- **Resolutions**

Several resolutions addressed **AB 705**, and related issues, for example

7.05 S 18 Which calls for a legal interpretation of AB 705 to determine if the law allows students to be placed below transfer-level courses if, “local faculty determine, based on local research, that these students would be best served by such placement” (such a legal opinion has been asked for by the ASCCC from the Chancellor, and the Chancellor’s office has refused so far to give it).

7.06 and 7.07 S 18 address similar issues on the ESL side, asserting the right of students to choose courses below their placement, and the right of local colleges to continue to use placement tests as one among many multiple measures.

9.02 S 18 Which supports multiple pathways for students to achieve transfer-level competency in math and quantitative reasoning, and endorses the CCC Math and Quantitative Reasoning Task Force recommendations as an aspect of the implementation of 705 (I spoke and voted for this as requested by math colleagues)

Resolutions were passed **opposing**

The consolidation of Categorical Program Funding (**6.01 S 18**) (after some debate, passed)

The FOCC (**6.02 S 18**) (By acclamation)

The new funding formula (**6.03 S 18**; this resolution opposed the Governor’s performance based funding formula by supporting AB 2767 [Medina as of April 4, 2018])

And one resolution that proposes to “Reduce Course Enrollment Maximums as Needed to Satisfy New State Directives” (**17.03 S 18**). The passed by acclamation.

The resolutions have not received their final editing. When they are ready, they will be available for all at asccc.org. Note that “S 18” is Spring 18; resolutions are published in numerical order by semester.

Follow-Up to the Resolution of No Confidence;

Vice President of Academic Affairs:

The search for the replacement for the Vice President of Academic Affairs is on hold. Jane Saldana-Talley will be taking the majority of Mary Kay’s duties until she retires and thereafter as interim for an as yet unspecified period of time.

Vice President of Business and Finance:

Kate Jolley is the interim Budget Director. Kate and I have met, and are actively collaborating to remake the Budget Advisory Committee.

Dr. Chong

Has been meeting with faculty leaders a lot. The PCC (President’s Consultation Council) now meets every week, and Dr. Chong has been quite responsive to arguments and suggestions from faculty and other constituent groups. He has also met with the Department Chairs Council, with individual departments by invitation, and came on Monday to the FLC (Faculty Leadership Council). Dialogue has been robust and, to me, seems promising, toward the goal of improving faculty voice and shared governance.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Thompson