

Christina Yanuaria, ESL Faculty, City College of San Francisco

In continuing the conversation, it's important to understand the scope of what equity means, but also the nuance of equity. FACCC has indeed taken an equity perspective, and has provided a much more nuanced account of the impact of AB 1705.

While AB1705 has a laudable goal, the means to achieve that goal continues to represent the historic pendulum swings from one extreme to another in education.

Furthermore, it's incredibly frustrating to continue see Black and Hispanic student populations be tokenized in these conversations to push a particular reform. Mandating one extreme over another is not a responsible or equitably nuanced course of action to remediate what was lost over a centuries long educational opportunity gap.

Here are a list of those concerns not adequately addressed by AB 1705 in its current form:

- **It is true that many of our previous placement practices created lengthy remedial pathways that were a barrier to students.** (Attempting to undo AB 705, which is the law, while discussing this new bill AB 1705 is unlikely to be effective.) This extreme was wrong.
- **Most first-time students with a goal of transfer are already placed directly into transfer-level math and English.** Data from 2019-20 indicates 78% of students are placed directly into transfer-level math and 96% of students into transfer-level English. **Source:** *CCCCO Transfer Level Gateway Completion Dashboard & PPIC's A New Era of Student Access at California's Community Colleges, Technical Addendum*
- **Not all programs lead to transfer.** The amended version of this bill has some carve outs for CTE Programs but only if the math and English requirements are recommended by an Advisory Board or accrediting body.
- **Demand the bill explicitly allow districts to offer pre-transfer in our mission without data requirement.** Colleges should not eliminate pre-transfer level courses as a whole to address any issues regarding placement.
- **The success of AB 705 should be measured by more than "throughput". Successful course complete rate is declining.** (see [Math](#) [English](#) graphs)
- **Eliminating access to pre-transfer courses can negatively affect student success particularly in the STEM pathway.** Pre-transfer should be independent courses, not just co-requisites
- **Emphasize student access:** Students should have access to the courses that best meet their academic needs and educational program goals;

## FACCC's Suggested Amendments

### 1. Student Access

Placement and enrollment of students in a transfer-level English or Mathematics course should not prevent students from enrolling in a pre-transfer level English or Mathematics course when a *student determines* a course fulfills their academic needs based on the desire to

1. Complete a certificate or CTE program.
2. Make up for learning loss from the Covid pandemic or break in education.
3. Build skills or reskill
4. Fulfill a lifelong learning priority in written communication and quantitative reasoning courses.

AB 1705 shall not prohibit nor deny a student the opportunity to enroll in any pre-transfer level English or Mathematics courses based on students' right to determine for themselves their academic needs.

2. **Remove excess program requirements for CTE Certificates**  
Exempt CTE programs from this legislation. Legislative action should not add program requirements to short-term CTE certificates that lead to high-paying jobs. Amendments improve this section of the bill, but are still prescriptive.
3. **Support/Resources for faculty** to do this work:
  - Mandate smaller class sizes - the ratio of instructor to student should not exceed 1:10
  - Professional development (compensated particularly for PT faculty)
  - Embedded faculty tutors in the classrooms
  - Update the classroom environment to accommodate small groups
4. **Require** new data in AB 1805 templates to include “enrollment before census”
5. **Definition of “pre-transfer” should not include non-credit**

Finally, I read John Fox's story, and I couldn't help but think of my own story. I took AP classes in high school, but was placed into remedial English at Solano Community College. I didn't need remediation, and I'm going to argue that at the heart of this issue- neither did John- what we both needed was *choice*. *With choice, we would have BOTH been able to access the education we WANTED and NEEDED.*

But AB1705 in its current form robs students of this most critical equitable value: choice. In a state where still, a majority of white men and white women continue to problematize, discuss, and decide "what's best" for Black and Hispanic students at community colleges, the singularly most equitable thing we can do is empower our students with information and choices, and not treat them as a monolith and funnel them through to fulfill to well-intentioned agendas of throughput.

My experience is but one story- but I'm willing to wager that if you ask any student to choose between "you have no choice, but trust me this is good for you" and "you have a choice, here's how each can harm or help your specific situation," that they would choose to be empowered with the option access information and not continue to be subjected to the paternalistic tendencies of mandates like these.