

## Summary of ASCCC Positions on the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success Draft Recommendations

This document summarizes the ASCCC positions that pertain to the draft recommendations of the CCC Task Force on Student Success (dated September 30, 2011). Formal ASCCC positions are adopted by resolution. Resolutions are referenced by the term (F = fall, S = spring) and year of adoption, and a number (XX.XX). Complete resolutions are available at [www.asccc.org](http://www.asccc.org).

### The following positions relate to the recommendations in general terms:

**F11 13.07** Implementation of Student Success Task Force Recommendations: **Support a phased approach to any implementation** of the SSTF recommendations that controls for multiple variables and leads to validated conclusions about the effectiveness of the recommendations.

\***F11 13.13** Reporting of How Feedback on Student Success Task Force Draft Recommendations was Addressed: **ASCCC requests that the SSTF formally communicate to the field how the feedback received through the vetting process on the recommendations has been addressed.**

### **F11 13. 15 Endorse CCCI Response to Student Success Task Force Recommendations**

\***F11 13. 18** Objection to the Language of the Student Success Task Force Report: **ASCCC urges the SSTF to use language that acknowledges and respects the expertise and experience of community college faculty in planning for curriculum and instruction** based on our students' best interests and characteristics.

\***F11 19.04** Full-Time Faculty and Student Success: SSTF **should include a recommendation to increase the number of full time faculty.**

\***Adopted by acclamation.**

## ***Chapter 1. Increase College and Career Readiness***

1.1. Collaborate with K-12 to jointly develop common core standards for college and career readiness.

Comments: Current HS graduation standards are currently well-below college readiness standards. It is uncertain what role K-12 assessments will play in the future. Faculty primacy must guide the establishment of standards.

**F11 15.01** Faculty Primacy in Alignment of Standards with K-12: calls to study the common core standards and insists on faculty primacy in determining standards.

## **Chapter 2. Strengthen Support for Entering Students**

2.1. Develop and implement common centralized diagnostic assessments.

The ASCCC supports the development of a centralized assessment option with locally established multiple measures and cut scores.

**F11 13.03** Support Centralized Assessment Instrument with Local Cut Scores for Placement: **ASCCC maintains the importance of faculty primacy with respect to the use of assessment for placement scores and the application of multiple measures, supports the establishment of a centralized standard assessment as an option provided there is a local determination of cut scores for placement, and encourages local academic senates to support selection of this assessment option for local use.**

2.2. Require students to participate in diagnostic assessment, orientation and the development of an educational plan.

While existing positions support this in concept, they note the challenge of providing such services without adequate funding to do so.

S11 5.02 Incentives to Encourage Student Behaviors for Success: **data indicate that participating in such incentives as educational planning, early assessment, and attending college full time can positively affect success**

**F11 8.02** Faculty Advisors: **ASCCC will investigate existing programs in California community colleges in which counseling faculty train faculty hired in other discipline areas as faculty advisors** and report by the Fall 2012 Plenary Session on the potential of such programs to help meet the needs of California community college students.

2.3 Develop and use technology applications to better guide students in educational process.

ASCCC supports E-Transcripts and the use of degree audits, but expresses concern regarding the impact of centralized technology projects and asserts the role of the Academic Senate (especially counseling faculty) in determinations to be made about matriculation-related technological applications.

F00 11.08 **No support for centralized technology projects until reviewed for educational policy implications** and effects on students.

**11.01 F11** Consultation Regarding Technology Tools Impacting Student Services: “**..oppose implementing any centralized electronic education plans, degree audits, or other technological tools, without the direct involvement of the Academic Senate, with a specific reliance on counseling faculty, to determine the appropriateness and utility of the system.**”

2.4 Require students showing a lack of college readiness to participate in support resources.

ASCCC supports providing student success courses for all who can benefit.

2.5 Require students to declare a program of study early in their academic careers

ASCCC has no formal position on the declaration of a “program of study”. There is, however, concern about the “high stakes” nature of declaring a program of study and/or establishing an education plan as established in the draft recommendations.

### **Chapter 3. Incentivize Successful Student Behaviors**

3.1. Adopt system wide enrollment priorities reflecting core mission of community colleges.

ASCCC opposes this recommendation until it has been determined that the proposed enrollment priorities will not have a negative disproportionate impact.

**F11 13.11 Student Success Task Force Recommendations: Priority Enrollment: Request that recommendation 3.1 of the SSTF not move forward until the potential impact on traditionally underserved and under-performing populations has been thoroughly researched and it has been determined that there will be no disproportionate negative impact on these populations.**

**F11 13.14 Earned-Unit Limitations for Registration Priority Concerns: “urge colleges and policy-makers to ensure that community college students who are legitimately engaged in programs or coursework appropriate to the California community college mission are able to maintain registration priority without undue burden”.**

3.2. Require students receiving Board of Governors fee waivers to meet various conditions and requirements.

ASCCC has some concerns about this recommendation, but could support it provided there are appropriate protections in place.

**F10 6.01 Evaluation and Revision of Financial Aid Systems: urge state and federal officials to evaluate and revise the current financial aid system in order to incentivize more productive and academically sound behavior by students**

**F11 7.02 Modification to the Requirements of the Board of Governors (BOG) Fee Waiver: work with the CCCCO to define appropriate conditions that would allow students to continue receiving a BOG waiver based on satisfactory academic progress.**

**F11 7.05** Implementation of Potential Board of Governors Waiver Change: “**prior to deeming students ineligible to receive a Board of Governors fee waiver the college will implement an intervention plan to allow the student to meet satisfactory progress standards within a reasonable time.**” Colleges should have an intervention plan & sufficient funding for intervention.

3.3. Provide students opportunity to consider attending full time.

ASCCC has no direct position, but does support incentivizing successful student behaviors.

3.4. Require students to begin addressing Basic Skills deficiencies in their first year.

While ASCCC does not have positions directly related to this topic, our established support for incentivizing effective student behaviors would suggest that we would favor this in concept. The impact of adjusting course offerings to accomplish this is a given. Colleges that are revisiting their use of prerequisites may already be, effectively, implementing this recommendation.

#### ***Chapter 4. Align Course Offering to Meet Student Needs***

4.1. Focus course offerings and schedules on needs of students.

While student educational plans may provide useful information when determining a college’s course offerings, the concept of a “high stakes” educational plan and a classroom of students who are and are not “state-supported” is strongly opposed (although it is supported when the class is a mix of state-supported credit students and fee-supported community service students who do not earn credit). It was noted that this creates a system where students who have the resources can take whatever courses they want, while those who do not will be limited to the courses delineated in an ed plan. In addition, ASCCC opposes the elimination of non-CDCP noncredit courses. ASCCC does support a determination of what courses should and should not be credit, in addition to fully funding the CDCP noncredit areas. **ASCCC urges the SSTF to include the March 2005 Board of Governors’ noncredit funding proposal in their recommendations.**

**9.02 F11** Defining Credit and Noncredit Basic Skills and Basic Skills Apportionment: ASCCC will **explore the appropriate division of credit and noncredit basic skills classes, supports funding noncredit CDCP classes at apportionment rates commensurate with the March 2005 Board of Governors’ recommendations;** and **urges the SSTF to include the March 2005 Board of Governors’ noncredit funding proposal in their recommendations.**

**F11 13.04** Course Development and Enrollment Priorities: “**urge local academic senates to ensure that course development and enrollment management are appropriately determined by documented educational need and further refined by fiscal considerations.**”

## **Chapter 5. Improve the Education of Basic Skills Students**

5.1. Support the development of alternatives to traditional basic skills curriculum.

ASCCC has always supported curricular innovation including alternatives to traditional pedagogy. Colleges are using basic skills funding already to improve basic skills instruction – it is not clear how this differs from the status quo. It is also not clear how BSI dollars would both be used here – and as a part of 8.1/8.2.

5.2. Develop comprehensive strategy for addressing basic skills education in California.

ASCCC supports assigning all of adult education to the CCCs, “but only if sufficient funding to address this mission is provided.” **(F11 6.03)** Furthermore, it is ASCCC’s position that input from ESL faculty is needed.

**F11 6.04** Removal of ESL Students from Student Success Task Force Recommendations: Seek ESL faculty input & inform SSTF of differences between ESL & basic skills.

## **Chapter 6. Revitalize and ReEnvision Professional Development**

6.1. Create a continuum of mandatory professional development opportunities.

Professional development is within the purview of the academic senate and faculty are best equipped to make any determination with respect to the appropriateness of professional development activities.

**F11 19.03** Uphold Local Control of Professional Development Activities

6.2. Direct professional development resources toward improving basic skills instruction and support services. (Also see 6.1)

Faculty are open to reviewing the Title 5 regulations regarding the use of professional development as a means of improving basic skills instruction.

**F11 19.07** Review of Title 5 Regulations Pertaining to Professional Development: “**develop a definition of faculty professional development and clarify the types of activities that would satisfy faculty professional development** and bring this definition back for approval at Fall Plenary 2012”, **support the use of faculty professional development as a means of improving instruction, particularly with respect to meeting the needs of basic skills students, and assert the primacy of faculty in determining what faculty professional development activities are most appropriate**”.

## **Chapter 7. Enable Efficient Statewide Leadership & Increase Coordination Among Colleges**

7.1. Develop and support a strong community college system office.

The ability of the CO to “promulgate Title 5 regulations without first obtaining approval from the Department of Finance” is problematic and ASCCC opposes the proposed funding revisions for the CO. (F11 5.02).

7.2. Set local student success goals consistent with statewide goals.

7.3. Implement student success score card.

ASCCC supports accountability but opposes the use of simplistic accountability measures of student success (F10 6.05).

7.4. Develop and support a longitudinal student record system.

## **Chapter 8. Align Resources with Student Success Recommendations**

8.1. Consolidate select categorical programs.

ASCCC has always opposed categorical consolidation.

8.2. Invest in the new Student Success Initiative fund.

Although ASCCC supports common assessment, we could not support the Student Success Initiative (SSI) as currently proposed due to its ties to common assessment and the “score card”. If these ties were removed and the SSI were, effectively, a fund to restore categorical programs, ASCCC could support it.. ASCCC has a position supporting the use of new dollars to be dedicated to categoricals.

8.3. Promote flexibility and innovation in basic skills through alternative funding mechanism.

The ASCCC opposes this recommendation. Recommendation 8.3 is as form of performance-based funding, presumes common curriculum statewide, and creates problematic incentives.

8.4. Do not implement outcome-based funding.

ASCCC opposes any form of outcome-based funding.