



Associated Students
Office of the ASPCC President

MEMORANDUM

To: PCC President's Executive Committee
From: Simon Fraser, President, ASPCC
Subject: Request for Statement on Issues RE: Fall 2013 Transfer

I have been directed by the ASPCC Executive Board to send the following memorandum and formal request for statement on outstanding issues relating to Fall 2013 transfer students and "Summer 1" classes, before scheduled discussion and possible action, potentially including censure and no confidence in PCC administration, comes before the board again on February 27, 2013.

At the past two meetings of ASPCC's Executive Board, deep concern has been expressed over the considerable issues that our transition from our previous calendar to the current "Student Calendar" has caused for students wishing to transfer to a four-year institution for Fall 2013. Despite assurances of the administration during Board of Trustees meetings on August 15 and August 29, and assurances given during meetings between the Superintendent/President and/or the Vice President for Academic Affairs and myself with the PACCD Student Trustee, we have indeed found the following problems arise:

- CSU and UC campuses are accepting only students who complete coursework by Spring, regardless of when Spring ends;*
- Communication between PCC and four year transfer institutions had not taken place prior to the calendar change to ensure that the change would not affect Fall '13 transfer applicants;†
- After the above problems were raised to the Assistant Superintendent for Academic and Student Services, Superintendent/President and the Board of Trustees, no recorded communication occurred with four year institutions in any attempt to mitigate the impacts on Fall '13 students;‡
- Recorded communication can only be verified coming from PCC to four year institutions after a student transferring to Humboldt State University (a CSU institution) raised concerns via email;
- The only recorded successful communication with a four year institution on accepting Fall '13 transfers with Summer 1 classes occurred by direct communication between HSU and ASPCC, not PCC §; and
- The suggested resolution to this issue (conversion of Summer 1 classes to Late Spring) was only confirmed on February 13, 2013, after ASPCC had taken this issue up, already too late for students to submit updated information to four year institutions reflecting that what they had indicated would be Summer 1 classes would now be Spring classes.
- Students negatively impacted by these changes have already begun to receive rejections and even notices that colleges would not even consider their applications without indicated Spring completion.

We have already taken, by formal vote, the stance that ASPCC will no longer rely on college administration to solve these issues for students. To that end, we have started contacting universities and systems ourselves to make them aware of the change and its impacts on transfer students, will be following up to ensure that colleges are aware and attempt to extract a written confirmation that they will consider Summer 1/Late Spring classes timely for transfer, and **will no longer refer students experiencing difficulties with Fall '13 transfer to any PCC office other than our own.**

During this discussion, many students, and ASPCC board members, have suggested that we should take the position that ASPCC has no confidence in college administration, and specifically that we have no confidence in the ability of the college to make this calendar transition while holding students harmless in the process.

Both a motion to censure the college for the calendar change and its impacts, and a vote of no confidence in administration, are scheduled for ASPCC's meeting on February 27, 2013, for discussion and possible action. Our intention is not to severely damage or sever relationships with the college administration, and so my hope is that a substantive and implemented response to this memo will perhaps allay those votes from occurring. ASPCC requests the Executive Committee, and the Superintendent/President, provide a statement that addresses the following:

- Why the calendar change was not put through a substantive shared governance consultation process before it was made**;
- Why the decision was made more than a month before necessary to meet the date of operational necessity, given the agreeability of the Academic Senate and ASPCC at the Board Meeting that they would be able to complete further review by September 5, 2012;††
- Why negotiations with the PCC Faculty Association required a different student calendar if the action was outside of the purview of negotiations;‡‡
- Why the response by PCC to budget concerns prior to the November election was radically different from the response of other colleges with a comparable calendar to our prior one;
- How the college intends to work in an attempt, however impossible, to make sure that the promise of students being still able to transfer on time will be fulfilled;
- When administration stated that approving the calendar change on August 29th would give the college more time to prepare and adjust to the new calendar, given the problems we are now facing in adjustment to the calendar, what did administration do in the period of August 30th – December 17th to adjust and prepare the college for this calendar change;
- What actual investigation did administration undertake regarding potential impediments to graduation or transfer before making the recommendation, and why the impediments now identified were not identified prior to the Board of Trustees' approval of the proposal;
- How the college intends to ensure that the shared governance process is fully respected - including the requirement that the student shared governance representatives participate in the "joint development of recommendations" to the board for action;
- How the college can ensure that any action going before the PACCD board that falls into the student's "9+1"^{§§} of shared governance is given full consideration by the PACCD board, by being **included as part** of any recommendation that comes before them, rather than being interjected from a sedentary position by an ASPCC representative;

- How the college intends to undertake an analysis of the calendar structure at PCC that truly examines the pedagogical and student-oriented view, which it has been demonstrated falls outside of the current shared governance calendar committee;
- What the college admits would have been done differently given the situation Fall 13 students now face in hindsight, and how the college will ensure such problems do not arise again.
- Whether or not the administration believes that the considerable diversion of resources from regular college operations to PCC's technology upgrades has contributed to the issues that transfer students are now currently facing.

ASPCC will meet again to discuss the above on February 27, 2013, and we request both a written response and a representative of the PCC Executive Committee to attend our meeting who is authorized to speak and represent the viewpoint and position of the college administration as a whole. Again, while our goal has always been to maintain collegial working relationships, we have a higher responsibility to ensure that not only are students well represented by ASPCC, but that ASPCC have a full and respected place within the shared governance system. It has been my experience that while collegial personal relationships between individual ASPCC and administrative representatives do exist, until this point institutional relationships between ASPCC and the shared governance system, and administration, have been perceived as one way.

I look forward to hearing from the Executive Committee on the above and presenting the same to ASPCC at the February 27th meeting.

Sincerely,



Simon Fraser
President,
Associated Students of Pasadena City College

* It was indicated that, provided classes were completed by June 30th, the configuration of the calendar would not matter. This did not take into account, at the time, when grades would be due, submitted and transcribed, and whether or not UC/CSU systems considered coursework timely by semester completion or by date. PCC has since agreed to ensure that all classes completed by the end of the six week term will have grades due the following week, and not at the end of the Summer semester as is standard practice, after ASPCC raised this issue.

† It had been previously indicated that communication with the UCs and CSUs had taken place, and was taking place, and that this communication had informed the understanding that Summer 1 2013 would suffice just as easily as Winter 2013 would have.

‡ Several deadlines were placed for administration to provide to ASPCC written confirmation from the UCs and CSUs that they were, at a minimum, aware of the calendar change at PCC and, ideally, would accept Summer 1 classes as being timely for Fall 2013 transfer. ASPCC has asked for a record of communication sent from PCC to those institutions and has, so far, only received communication sent via email during February 2013 from the VP for Instruction's office, after a student had complained that his transfer institution would not accept Summer 1 classes for Fall '13 transfer.

§ After a student sent an email complaining about his inability to transfer to Humboldt State University on February 8, 2013, ASPCC intervened on the student's behalf and made representation directly to HSU's admissions director

to ask for a review of the circumstances and consider Summer 1 coursework timely for PCC students attempting to transfer in Fall 2013. HSU was not aware that any calendar change had occurred at PCC. ASPCC's request was granted on February 12, 2013, allowing 48 students attempting to transfer to HSU the opportunity of both Spring and Summer 1 to complete their requirements and be considered for transfer for Fall '13.

** While Superintendent/President Dr. Mark Rocha had made it clear for a considerable length of time beyond the life of this ASPCC Executive Board's term that he believed our calendar should be changed, at **no point** was there any shared governance consultation – certainly no formal consultative process including students or student representatives – to discuss the impacts of a calendar change or the pedagogical, student-oriented and success minded reasons to change the academic calendar. Attempts to refer this to the Calendar committee resulted in general rejection on the basis that the purview of the Calendar committee was to set the academic calendar within the realm of negotiated union agreements (of which students take no part) and not to discuss the configuration of the calendar. The August 29th adopted calendar was clearly entitled a “STUDENT CALENDAR” – on which no formal student consultative process occurred, and was intended to circumvent the negotiated union agreements on the basis that only ‘working conditions’ would need to be subsequently negotiated. At no point have students had the opportunity to participate in the joint formulation of a recommendation on the academic calendar. ASPCC argues that, of anything, a “STUDENT CALENDAR” falls under ASPCC's shared governance rights and responsibilities.

** Board of Trustees Meeting, August 29th, 2012, time index ~2:04:00, President Hanvey states that Academic Senate could meet to discuss and consider the trimester calendar proposal.

** Board of Trustees Meeting, August 29th, 2012, time index ~02:10:27 Dr. Rocha explains that the action is tentative. Negotiation of impacts still needed to occur. This decision was explicitly being used as leverage in the negotiation process with the PCCFA. How did the decision to take action on the night of August 29th impact the ability of administration to engage in a lengthier process of negotiations?

^{§§} ASPCC refers here to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, §51023.7 (Education / Div 6. California Community Colleges / Chapter 2. Community College Standards / Subchapter 1. Minimum Conditions / Students) which is attached hereto. It is ASPCC's position that a “STUDENT CALENDAR” falls at minimum under elements 5, 6, 7 and 10 of the 9 + 1 areas enumerated by subsection (b) of the same section.

Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, § 51023.7 – “Students”

(a) The governing board of a community college district shall adopt policies and procedures that provide students the opportunity to participate effectively in district and college governance. Among other matters, said policies and procedures shall include the following:

(1) Students shall be provided an opportunity to participate in formulation and development of district and college policies and procedures that have or will have a significant effect on students. This right includes the opportunity to participate in processes for jointly developing recommendations to the governing board regarding such policies and procedures.

(2) Except in unforeseeable, emergency situations, the governing board shall not take action on a matter having a significant effect on students until it has provided students with an opportunity to participate in the formulation of the policy or procedure or the joint development of recommendations regarding the action.

(3) Governing board procedures shall ensure that at the district and college levels, recommendations and positions developed by students are given every reasonable consideration.

(4) For the purpose of this Section, the governing board shall recognize each associated student organization or its equivalent within the district as provided by Education Code Section 76060, as the representative body of the students to offer opinions and to make recommendations to the administration of a college and to the governing board of a district with regard to district and college policies and procedures that have or will have a significant effect on students. The selection of student representatives to serve on college or district committees, task forces, or other governance groups shall be made, after consultation with designated parties, by the appropriate officially recognized associated student organization(s) within the district.

(b) For the purposes of this Section, district and college policies and procedures that have or will have a “significant effect on students” includes the following:

- (1) grading policies;
- (2) codes of student conduct;
- (3) academic disciplinary policies;
- (4) curriculum development;
- (5) courses or programs which should be initiated or discontinued;
- (6) processes for institutional planning and budget development;
- (7) standards and policies regarding student preparation and success;
- (8) student services planning and development;
- (9) student fees within the authority of the district to adopt; and
- (10) any other district and college policy, procedure, or related matter that the district governing board determines will have a significant effect on students.

(c) The governing board shall give reasonable consideration to recommendations and positions developed by students regarding district and college policies and procedures pertaining to the hiring and evaluation of faculty, administration, and staff.

(d) Nothing in this Section shall be construed to impinge upon the due process rights of faculty, nor to detract from any negotiations or negotiated agreements between collective bargaining agents and district governing boards. It is the intent of the Board of Governors to respect agreements between academic senates and collective bargaining agents as to how they will consult, collaborate, share or delegate among themselves the responsibilities that are or may be delegated to academic senates pursuant to the regulations on academic senates contained in Sections 53200-53206.

(e) The governing board of a community college district shall comply substantially with policies and procedures adopted in accordance with this Section.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700 and 70901(b)(1)(E), Education Code. Reference: Sections 70901 (b)(1)(E), 70902(b)(7) and 76060, Education Code.