

Student “Success” Task Force Proposals Would STILL Devastate Noncredit

- *In Recommendation 2.1, we would be forced to assess and place our students based on one-size-fits-all centralized testing dictated by Sacramento. This does not make sense when our curriculum is developed locally to meet our students’ needs and our tests need to continue to match our curriculum and local students’ needs.*
- *In Recommendation 3.1 by prioritizing “core mission of transfer, career technical education and basic skills development,” they are explicitly pushing us outside the core mission. Noncredit curriculum will not be a priority. How will that affect the balance of credit and noncredit statewide and here at CCSF? We can be a significant feeder program around the state into degree programs---helping those to become more diverse--- but these recommendations are not structured to facilitate that.*
- *Recommendation 3.3 pushes full time student status. Let’s get real. The statewide and CCSF data show that most cc students do NOT attend full time. This is a signal encouraging full time enrollment and high debt, and shifting the focus to 18-24 year olds who attend full time. Our students tend to be older, tend to be part time, and tend to be working. If they transition to credit, this focus on younger full time students would hurt them. Even if they don’t ever become credit students, having a strongly centralized ccc system (as proposed) fixated on this student profile is still harmful to them because incentives will be built in to encourage the profile they are going for and discourage the one they disapprove of = the non-traditional part time student who is currently our mainstay. That is especially true in noncredit but also in credit.*
- *Recommendation 4.1 to fund and schedule courses based on a student’s program of study is pretty ridiculous for credit, and completely unfeasible for noncredit. There is no money even for restoring normal matriculation activities in noncredit, let alone to provide an education plan for every student. Instead, one of our priorities should be restoration of full noncredit matriculation services and increasing the availability of those for more noncredit students. Also, needed sections cut during the state’s crisis should be restored as soon as feasible. For all students to have declared programs of study would be nice, but at this time, that is fiscally unrealistic. Our students’ greater need is for excellent placement and orientation services initially. Then they need personal counseling to solve personal crises that often keep them from continuing their education.*
- *Scheduling of noncredit classes cannot be based on students’ non-existent educational plans. You cannot ignore full time teachers’ assignment factors, program need, or facilities utilization needs. We cannot afford to keep buildings closed and unutilized in the afternoon, on weekends or in summer just because demand is somewhat higher at other times.*
- *Recommendation 5.1 would lead us down a pathway of including tutors and other non-professionals included as part of the 50% rule. Conservatives want to do away with the 50% rule as a way to spend less on education. Their idea in the long term is to use fewer teachers and attempt to replace them with computers, tutors, and paraprofessionals. This is what they mean by increasing productivity. It is a common misperception that anyone who speaks English is fully*

qualified to teach it. Or that anyone who can add 2+2 can teach basic math competently. Not so. This is also part of an agenda for the state to tell us how we should be teaching and to direct our professional development from Sacramento.

- Recommendation 5.2 about developing a strategy to serve all, including in ESL, may have a nice ring to it but it's deceptive. What it means is for the state to decide if it's K12 adult ed who is going to employ us or the community colleges. If the latter, all teachers will probably benefit. The problem is that the Task Force doesn't take a position on which system should offer the classes; it only pushes for consolidation! If CCC faculty are put under an expanded K12 Adult ed, that will be devastating to our wages, working conditions, and job security. And noncredit CCC faculty currently work under a post secondary model that promotes more shared governance, more teacher control of curriculum and materials used, and less top-down management.
- Recommendation 6.1 and 6.2 are two recs that involve Sacramento, not our department, determining what kind of professional development activities are mandatory for us to attend. This would definitely affect nc faculty quite a lot because it eliminates a lot of our local discretion including dept. discretion about how we want to spend our professional development money, limited as it is.
- Recommendation 7.1 is a huge concern. Funding to establish a new large CCC bureaucracy would come right out of Prop. 98, which means out of our course offerings. Top heavy, distant administration is not provided for free. We would have to follow state guidance on everything and it would remove local control. Our goals would be set at the state level and we would be required to teach according to what they consider "best practices." How do they know what works best for your students and you? They will not understand noncredit. It will be one size fits all. No more listening to our community. This power grab definitely affects nc.
- Recommendation 7.4 would track students and monitor their progress from elementary school until the time of their eventual employment. Wow, talk about "this will go on your permanent record!" How does this relate to k12 adult ed, where our students sometimes receive services? And tracking "into the workplace" would be great in some ways but also intrusive. And how exactly does that work if someone works for a small business or a family? How does this centralized computerized tracking for a lifetime work to benefit the undocumented? Or would it be a Big Brother effort that would hurt them? Protecting security of records is not addressed.
- Recommendation 8.3 to establish an alternative funding model for basic skills would hurt ESL since ESL does get basic skills money. We could opt out but then suffer because the size of the funding pie is limited and especially so if we opt out of other funding. We would only get the alternative funding if we 1) are judged to have innovated enough and 2) our students make it to "college level."