

CFT COMMUNITY COLLEGE COUNCIL RESPONSE TO THE STUDENT SUCCESS TASK FORCE

We want to acknowledge the efforts of the Student Success Task Force in producing a comprehensive document on such short notice. Many of the suggestions are far reaching and have produced considerable concern from the faculty groups. This document will comment on some of the specific recommendations, make some general comments, and offer a strategic plan in how the CCC will approach the recommendations.

COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 2.2

Require all incoming community college students to: (1) participate in (a) diagnostic assessment and (b) orientation, and (2) develop an education plan.

By requiring students to participate in these core services, the community college system will insure that students have the foundational tools necessary to make informed choices about their education.

Please note: The Task Force recognizes that implementation of this recommendation requires:

- (1) a substantial reallocation of existing local resources;**
- (2) additional resources, and**
- (3) new modes of service delivery in order to make these required services available to all incoming students.**

We agree that having all students go through an assessment, orientation, and development of an Education Plan will be helpful for students to be successful. However, such a plan would require a significant increase in staff and counselors. The current student to counselor ratio is completely inadequate to accomplish this goal with existing resources. A critical concern is that the legislature could move on this recommendation without additional resources. That would mean a severe reallocation of existing funds to add more staff and counselors. However, that could directly conflict with the 50% Law. Faculty groups and Administration groups have had numerous conflicts about the 50% Law, with districts seeking exemptions, and others have advocated to repeal the 50% Law. In addition, a timeline of how such a proposal can be implemented has not been presented, and there has been no discussion in how to balance the redirection of current funds or new funding between the need for these student services versus others within a district. Would such decisions be within the district or at the state Chancellor's Office?

Recommendation 2.4

Require students whose diagnostic assessments show a lack of readiness for college to participate in a support resource, such as a student success course, provided by the college for new students.

The primary difficulty we find is that we have been reducing classes the past few years, so it is difficult to understand how these new classes could be implemented. In addition, these classes are usually done by counseling faculty who do not have the time to redirect their efforts.

Recommendation 3.1

The Community Colleges will adopt system-wide enrollment priorities that: (1) reflect the core mission of transfer, career technical education and basic skills development; (2) encourage students to identify their educational objective and follow a prescribed path most likely to lead to success; (3) ensure access and the opportunity for success for new students; and (4) incentivize students to make progress toward their educational goal.

One of the great values of community colleges is that students have the opportunity to explore and find their interest in education and potentially their lifelong career. Many of our students do not have a plan or know their program of study....especially at 17 or 18 years of age. Returning students often times are not aware of the different programs available before they attend a college. While statistics show that students with a defined Ed Plan are more successful.....that is a self selective group and association....it does not mean that by forcing to make an Ed Plan will make them any more successful. It also means that you get to eliminate those not making progress in a plan that they had no interest or investment in choosing in the first place.

Recommendation 3.2

Require students receiving Board of Governors (BOG) fee waivers to meet various conditions and requirements, as specified below.

(A) Require students receiving a BOG fee waiver to identify a degree, certificate, transfer or career advancement goal.

(B) Require students to meet institutional satisfactory progress standards to be eligible for the fee waiver renewal.

(C) Limit the number of units covered under a BOG fee waiver to 110 units.

We believe that a system of punishment by taking away a BOG Waiver is a strategically flawed approach for encouraging student success. What this

encourages is for those students with the most needs (e.g. economically disadvantaged, students of color) to drop out of community colleges. So, while it will improve our statistics for student success, it will have an overall negative impact on the community.

We were given the rationale from the legislature and the community college system that increased student fees did not matter since students who needed financial help would be able to get BOG waivers. But, by rationing BOG waivers those students with the greatest need will be preferentially dropped out of the system. What programs such as MESA show is that by encouraging those students with greatest need with focused support, that they can be successful. This recommendation takes the opposite approach.

We have not been aware of any pressure from the legislature to reduce funding for BOG waivers, but this recommendation provides the perfect excuse for a budget cut. In addition, it is recommended that the money saved by restricting BOG waivers from our students will be used to increase funding for the community college system. We would hope that the system can see the impression it has projected to the students....increase student fees to fund community colleges, and restrict BOG Waivers to fund community colleges, which primarily affects our students who can least afford it.

Recommendation 4.1

Community Colleges will use the requirements for a student to complete a program of study, along with state and local data, including enrollment trends and labor market demand to develop course schedules and determine course offerings.

This recommendation states that the student's Education Plans will be used to determine what classes are offered and the schedule of classes at a college. While the recommendation was most likely meant to be advisory, it is still a very flawed approach for determining program curriculum and developing new programs. Courses will be determined by popularity rather than what is academically appropriate. In addition, new programs or new courses will no longer be offered since they could not be part of any student Education Plan.

We completely disagree with recommended fee differentials where a student would pay full cost for courses not within a student's Education Plan. Under this recommendation, students having the course in their education plan would pay the credit enrollment fee, while students not having the course in their education plan would pay a fee covering the full cost of instruction. This means that students within the same class could be paying differing fees. A similar approach to differing student fees was in SB 515 (Brownley) which was vigorously opposed by CCC.

Adopt Recommendation 7.1 to increase the statutory authority of the CCC Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) thus allowing for oversight regarding course offerings as well as dissemination of enrollment management best practices for establishing community education programs that respond to community needs while also providing a source of income to the campus.

BOG would need to adopt new Title 5 regulations to provide districts with the necessary guidance concerning the setting of the fees and calculation of proportionate cost.

Amend statute to limit the scope of allowable non-credit classes to only those identified as Career Development or College Preparation (CDCP.)

This recommendation suggests that the Chancellor's Office could determine for your college what will be allocated as credit versus noncredit, decide which programs are funded or not funded. We believe that the best oversight to determine community needs and course offering are the local Board of Trustees. .

Recommendation 5.1

Community Colleges will support the development of alternatives to traditional basic skills curriculum and incentivize colleges to take to scale model programs for delivering basic skills instruction.

Authorize the reallocation of Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) dollars in the annual Budget Act.

• Chancellor's Office will adopt amended guidelines to redistribute the BSI funding to:

Target a fixed portion of the money to specifically incentivize faculty redesign of curriculum and support innovations in basic skills instruction.

Develop clear curricular pathways from basic skills into collegiate level coursework.

This has been modified in the latest draft, but the concern of ESL faculty remain. The Chancellor's Office recommends funding of all ESL classes that are 2 levels below transfer at the noncredit rate. This is a gigantic change in funding allocation and policy direction without discussion. Several districts have a large ESL credit program, this change would mean that many ESL faculty would not make load or be paid at the noncredit rate. There has been no discussion of what this change might do to the success of students in current ESL programs. There has been no discussion in when such a change might be implemented.

In addition, a comprehensive of the community college role in basic skills versus higher education is needed. Unfortunately, we believe there has been no strategic plan except to offer those classes that will fill and provide funding versus offering a broad comprehensive program of higher education.

Amend statute and Title 5 regulations to authorize the Chancellor's Office and/or Board of Governors to mandate the use of professional development to address state objectives, thus requiring that colleges link mandatory professional development activities to a set of statewide objectives and then measure movement towards those objectives.

- **Amend Title 5 regulations to authorize the Chancellor's Office and/or Board of Governors to mandate specific professional development purposes for flex day(s).**
- **Amend Title 5 regulations to ensure that professional development is also equally focused on part-time faculty.**
- **The Chancellor's Office should explore the use of myriad approaches to providing professional development, including regional efforts and expansion of the use of technology.**

FLEX day programs should be left to the district and not controlled by the Chancellor's Office.

Recommendation 7.1

The state should develop and support a strong community college system office with commensurate authority, appropriate staffing, and adequate resources to provide leadership, oversight, technical assistance and dissemination of best practices. Further, the state should grant the Community College Chancellor's Office the authority to implement policy, consistent with state law.

Amend statute to grant the Board of Governor's authority to appoint vice-chancellors and deans.

Amend statute to move the Chancellor's Office out of the Executive Branch.

Amend statute (Education Code 70901.5) to allow the Chancellor's Office to promulgate Title 5 regulations without first obtaining approval from Department of Finance.

Revise funding for the Chancellors Office by financing the office through alternative means, possibly through the use of ongoing Proposition 98 funding, to be taken from the community colleges share of the Proposition 98 guarantee, or a fee-based system..

We do not believe these recommendations concerning the State Chancellor's Office directly affect student success and should be eliminated.

Recommendation 7.3 Implement a student success score card.

The Chancellor's Office will implement robust accountability reporting (via a publicly understandable "score card" per recommendation 7.3), which will include progress made on intermediate measures of student success as well as ultimate outcomes. Implementation of this recommendation will focus on which additional data elements are needed to support the goal setting function as well as which data elements can be retired to offset the new reporting requirements.

The scorecard is the first step towards performance based funding.

Recommendation 8.1

Consolidate select categorical programs.

To ensure that money was available to support the needs of part-time faculty (Part-Time faculty health insurance, Part-Time Faculty Office Hours and Part-Time Faculty Compensation);

Block granting is the worst way to keep these part time programs viable. If a district decides to defund their part time office hour program...leaving a dollar in it. Should they continue to be appropriated a full share of the Part Time Office Hour funds??? In this model they will continue to receive the full appropriation. Currently, districts apply for the Part Time Office Hour and Part Time Health funds to reimburse a percentage of their actual costs.....districts that do not have a program get nothing... and that portion is reallocated to increase reimbursement to existing programs. There is a high potential for abuse in this proposal.