

ASCCC Plenary

Nov 1, 2, 3, 2018

Eric Thompson, Academic Senate President, SRJC

Irvine, CA

General Session 1

Thurs 9:30-10:30

“Student Centered Funding Formula”

Christian Osmeña, Vice Chancellor, CCCCCO; John Stankas, ASCCC President

See Power Point

Vice Chancellor Osmeña rapid-fired through very wordy Power Point slides with print too small to be legible in the second row of the auditorium. His discourse was aimed primarily at answering frequently asked questions. Highlights included:

- What percentage of funding is assigned to each of the three components of the formula—base, supplemental, completion. The answer: Though the legislation doesn't specify this, the CCCCCO understanding is that it should, over the long term, be 60/20/20—60 % base, 20 % supplemental, 20 % completion.
- Why ADT on top? (At 4 points in the completion component vs 3 points for AS/A and 1.5 for transfer). Answer: The chancellor wants to establish ADT as the preferred path to transfer.
- On the requirement for each District to adopt and certify goals aligned with *The Vision* by Jan 1, 2019. Answer: The amended requirement is that Districts acknowledge the requirement, and commit to it by January 1, then the process will occur over spring 2019.
- On the criticism that it will incentivize low quality education, e.g. hastily put together certificate programs to get more money, the answer: we'll watch it, and deal as it comes up.

*In the Q & A afterward, I spoke first and asked: Given that students in the Liberal Arts and Sciences often transfer without a degree because they don't need an associate's degree of any kind for their goals, and often getting the ADT or AA/S means staying longer and taking more units, **why** does the chancellor want to make the ADT the preferred transfer path, and **how** is this scheme “student centered” rather than “data reporting centered”?*

Another Vice Chancellor in the room answered my question, but didn't give me any more satisfactory answer than others I have heard to the same question. She said that motivated and guided students who transfer without an associate's degree still are supported, but we support unmotivated students who need to be pushed and guided more because they need it more. Other faculty followed up with similar questions and a discussion ensued that ended up not being very helpful. Someone from San Diego described ADTs as tickets to nowhere, since they don't guarantee transfer to any particular CSU, but to whatever CSU has space for them anywhere in the state. If the student isn't able to relocate to a distant CSU, as opposed

to the nearest one to them, then they can't use it. I had conversations with two Vice Chancellors after the session and didn't get any further. The funding formula

Breakout 1

Thurs 10:45-12:00

“Evaluating ASCCC Mission and Values”

Anna Bruzzese, ASCCC South Rep; Rebecca Eikey, ASCCC Area C Rep
Kim Perigo, San Diego Meza College

In this sparsely attended breakout we did brainstorming exercises focused on forming values, goals and needs of academic senate leadership. We ended by looking at and evaluating the ASCCC mission statement, deciding that it was uninspiring and devoid of heart. We agreed that it needs to be revised. Particularly we noted that it lacked a reference to students.

General Session 2 (Lunch)

Thurs 12:15-2:15

Guided Pathways . . . Here and Now!

Carrie Roberson, ASCCC North Rep & GP Chair; Dolores Davidson, ASCCC VP
Rob Rundquist, Senior Executive—Guided Pathways, CCCCCO

Chancellor Oakley quoted as saying, “Guided Pathways is not what we’re doing, it is what we’re becoming.” Gavin Newsom quoted as saying, “Higher ed in California is to be from cradle to career.” CCCCCO representative Rob Rundquist foregrounded the following in the Vision for Success: not just the six goals but the seven commitments are what the Vision is all about. It emphasizes career training and social mobility. He averred that viewing the CCC system from a system lens makes the Vision make sense, and that is why criticisms that identify feared harm to certain districts or classes of students is beside the point because it is about the system as a whole. If the Vision fails the whole system fails. He countered that, on the other hand, with, “We are seeking unity, but unity is not uniformity,” meaning local definition is still important and still respected.

I talked to Rob Rundquist after the session. I expressed my disagreements with the Vision and shared those of many of my colleagues. He sought to make a case for the Vision that answered my points, but we agreed that we needed to continue the conversation. He is committed to flexibility, that it is a living document and living concept that must respond to pushback. Rob sent me an email a few days after plenary offering to have the conversation about Guided Pathways with us in Santa Rosa long before we are faced with the decision to sign on for the second year. I said we’d take him up on that and I plan to arrange a visit from him to have conversations with our GP workgroup and with our Academic Senate.

Breakout 2

Thurs 2:30-3:45

“Guided Pathways and the Iterative Nature of Everything”

Julie Bruno, ASCCC Past President; Jeff Burdick, Clovis

Ginni May, ASCCC Treasurer; Carrie Roberson, ASCCC North Rep

In this breakout, the “iterative nature of everything” was explained as a process by which a new thing is introduced, problems are found, it circles back for corrections and amendments, sent out again and so on. Like an Apple Watch. Ginni May began with a spiel about interpreting data, and how tricky it can be and how often it is done incorrectly. After several comments were made about the “fact” that all 114 California Community Colleges had “committed to implementing Guided Pathways” I pointed out that at Santa Rosa we had only committed to inquiry and asking the question about whether we want to implement Guided Pathways. Much of the rest of the session was devoted to holding Santa Rosa up as a model of how to have the conversation. Ginni May, a presenter here, was one of the ASCCC exec members who visited us last January for our special Board Meeting and special senate meeting on Guided Pathways. She described our discussion to the assembled group as a model of extended discourse of a diverse, cross-functional representation, all welcome, and open, transparent and democratic. Sorry to toot our own horn here, but there I am doing it.

Breakout 3

Thurs 4:00-5:15

“Collegial Processes at the State Level”

John Stankas, Dolores Davidson, Ginni May

In this breakout we got to hear the ASCCC president, and two other exec members describe in intimate detail their relationship with the Chancellor, the Chancellor’s Office, the Board of Governors, and the Legislature—the good, the bad, and the ugly. It was very enlightening. We learned about the flow chart of collegial consultation with the senate at the state level, what it is supposed to look like and how well it actually functions. We learned about the membership and functioning of the Consultation Council, and about faculty union input. It was the most informative thing I sat through this plenary.

General Session 3

Breakfast Friday 8:15-9:15

“Presentation: AB 705—Getting Ready for Fall 2019”

Laura Hope, Executive Vice Chancellor, Ginni May, ASCCC, Craig Rutan, ASCCC Secretary

This was a presentation with no Q and A, on the nuts and bolts of AB 705, limits and stipulations, etc. Everything I presented here I have heard at least six times before, and if anyone is still in the dark about AB 705, see me, and I’ll tell you or send you to an expert who will.

Breakout 4

Friday 9:30-10:45

“Untangling the Knots—Minimum Qualifications, Placing Courses in Disciplines, and Other Fun Stuff.”

Michael Berke, San Jose City College, Rebecca Eikey, Sam Foster, Area D Rep

Again, because I came to this session with some burning questions about our own local issues, I posed a problem to the presenters in the first five minutes that we spent a lot of time talking about. Many other colleges have similar problems. We talked about Minimum Quals, "Interdisciplinary" as a discipline, MQ's in for credit developmental math, English and ESL, and many related things. We will be talking about some of these issues as a senate soon.

Area Meetings

Friday 11:00-12:15

As usual, as an Area, we read through the resolutions and discussed amendments we wanted to make to them.

General Session 4

Lunch (Eloy Oakley came for this) Friday 12:30-2:15

"Presentation: Faculty Diversification—The Role of the Academic Senate and Senate Presidents"

Ned Doffoney, Chancellor Emeritus, North Orange CCD; Daisy Gonzales, Deputy Chancellor, CCCC; John Stankas, President ASCCC, Cindy Vyskocil, Association of Chief Human Resources Officers; Lori Adrian, President Coastline College.

This panel, representing administration and (a little) faculty, also representing forms of diversity (African American, Latin American, Gay Male, Gay Female, and Hetero Female respectively) in turn gave a personal perspective about barriers they've experienced and the urgent need to support the diversification of our faculty structurally as a system. John Stankas urged Academic Senate presidents to have this conversation on local campuses in spite of the fact that it is uncomfortable for many. It was a very rich session. One example here: Of the populations on our college campuses—students, classified staff, administration, full time faculty, and adjunct faculty, the greatest diversity is among students, second classified staff, third place alternates between administrators and full time faculty, and (by far) the whitest population is adjunct faculty. (This is true both state-wide and at SRJC.) This puts two things in tension. Some districts have instituted policies to give adjunct faculty preference in full time hiring, which is a practice that is not conducive to increasing faculty diversity. We will be having conversations about his important issue.

General Session 5

Friday 2:30-4:00

"CTE Minimum Qualifications: Thinking Differently about Equivalency"

This very important general session was primarily a working session. At our respective tables, we were asked to push every envelop and think outside every box to come up with ideas for Equivalency to the Associate's Degree. We took the CSU GE pattern category by category and shared ideas for what kinds of jobs or other activities would provide equivalent training and education in, for example, the scientific method, behavioral science style research methods, quantitative reasoning, etc. It was the beginnings of a conversation. The

thing that is different today compared to yesterday, is that before there was an understanding that there was no such thing as equivalence to the associate's degree, and now we think their might be.

Breakout 5

Friday 4:15-5:30

“Support Gender, Ethnicity, and Racial Diversity on your Campus”

Silvester Henderson, ASCCC rep, Mayra Cruz, ASCCC rep, Nathaniel Donahue, Santa Monica College.

This final breakout was a follow-up to the general session. The presenters shared things they do in the classroom and in meetings on campus to promote diversity and raise awareness where diversity fails to be recognized; they asked the attendees to share. I mentioned our survey which is currently open as a way for us to attempt to gather data about where we are in welcoming diverse people.

Resolutions

Saturday of plenary is devoted to voting on resolutions. The final version of the resolutions being considered is published late Friday night, debated and voted on Saturday. During the course of debate, resolutions are changed depending on how proposed amendments come out in the voting. The resolutions committee makes the final edit on all the resolutions that passed and publishes it as soon as it is ready, which should be in maybe another week. The link to the pdf was sent to senators during the plenary and until the final edit is done, there is no other version. As soon as it is ready I will provide it.

During the meeting I will share the resolution passed regarding the Chancellor and shared governance.