

I'd like to raise some concerns about the documents produced by the class-size taskforce which are up for discussion today.

I have four basic issues I'd like to bring to the attention of the senate. Each pertains to the respective purviews of the Senate and AFA, specifically as these are expressed in the precise charge of the class size taskforce.

1. The document, "Guidelines for Review" lists four paragraphs from 32.03.B, yet only the 4th paragraph is relevant to the purview of the class-size taskforce. This specifies that the taskforce's charge is limited to the development of "mutually agreeable pedagogical parameters" for determining appropriate maximum class-size limits. The second paragraph in the cited contract language of the document cites "instructor workload as well as the financial constraints of the District" as a consideration in developing appropriate maximum class sizes. It is important to note that the latter considerations are not within the purview of the class-size taskforce, but are instead within the purview of collective bargaining between AFA and the District, and so should play no role in the recommendations produced by this group.
2. The second concern is related to the first. Under the "Evidence" section of the "Guidelines for Review" document, item 5 reads "Class sizes at other community colleges in California, as appropriate." But, such evidence would necessarily entail a final result of negotiations that consider both pedagogical and financial concerns at the referenced districts ~~in question~~ and so would distort the intended charge of the taskforce which should focus on pedagogy alone.
3. The recommendations of the taskforce may entail class sizes that are lower than what the district can afford. In that case, it would be the responsibility of AFA and the district to find a reasonable compromise that respects the respective purviews of each constituent in the process. If this compromise is implicit in the recommendations of the class size taskforce, this will corrupt or otherwise distort how class size limits are addressed when considering faculty workload and working conditions.
4. Finally, the process reflects no provision for bringing the results back to the negotiation table for final review of workload and working conditions

In light of this, I would respectfully propose that the Senate consider amending the document to list only those citations from the contract that are relevant to the precise charge of the taskforce, listing only 32.03.B.4 and removing from the "evidence" portion of that document reference to comparisons with class sizes of like courses at other districts. I would also propose adding a step in the process where the results are subject to review by AFA and the District for any impact on faculty workload, working conditions, and financial constraints of the district.