**Adopted at the AFT 2121 Delegate Assembly meeting 5/14/2019**

**Vote of no confidence in community college chancellor**

**Whereas**, the principle of participatory governance in the California Community Colleges has been established and codified in law (AB 1725); and

**Whereas**, participatory governance only functions when it is practiced at all levels of the administration and faculty governing bodies; and

**Whereas**, confidence in the leadership of the chief executive of a college system is integral to the effective administration of the California Community College mission; and

**Whereas**, the faculty of the Los Rios College Federation of Teachers, AFT Local 2279, recognize that participatory governance has ceased to function at the state level where the state Chancellor’s Office has closed the normal channels of communication with the faculty organizations such as the Academic Senate, the Community College Council of the California Federation of Teachers, the Community College Association of the California Teachers Association, the California Community College Independents, and the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges; and

**Whereas**, the state Chancellor’s Office has demonstrated a lack of transparency and collegial consultations which includes, but is not limited to:

* Failing to consult with any stakeholders before the introduction of the new funding formula in the governor’s budget in January 2018. There were virtually no simulations run to test the viability of such a funding formula or to determine unintended consequences. The Chancellor’s Office convened a task force of chief executive officers to seek alternative proposals from which faculty were excluded;
* Introducing legislation and state budget for Guided Pathways;
* Introducing language into AB 19 that requires districts and colleges participate in Guided Pathways in order to receive funding;
* Reducing the meetings to consult with stakeholders on the budget change proposal and legislation to a single meeting;
* Making Consultation Council a reporting of state Chancellor’s Office activities rather than a forum where consensus can be achieved on critical issues facing community colleges;
* Failing to engage in consultation and consensus building with stakeholders concerning AB 705. There was a lack of discussion and preparation of the college districts for the changes required in AB 705. There was a lack of funding for the workload required for the mandated activity for AB 705 and none has been planned in the future. There has been no discussion on the unintended consequences of AB705 implementation. The state Chancellor’s Office has announced that reading programs will be eliminated based on AB 705 even though the bill contains no language to that effect;
* Failing to consult with any stakeholders before the introduction of the online college in the governor’s budget in January 2018. Alterations in the online college proposal have been made when testifying before the budget and higher education committees without consultation with faculty. New programs such as medical coding have been proposed by the state chancellor without a functioning local Academic Senate (no faculty have been hired yet) and as a consequence no participatory governance. In addition, an online medical coding program will directly compete with the current program at Cosumnes River College. The online college will be subscription-based and competency-based without discussion with a local Academic Senate and another example of a lack of participatory governance. These academic and professional matters could have been at least discussed and possibly resolved with the State Academic Senate, but that did not occur. The new faculty for the online college will not be represented by a union, will not have a collectively bargained contract, and will be on a meet-and-confer basis. The state chancellor has not engaged with the faculty unions about the parameters of contract for the online college faculty;

**Whereas,** these and other examples have illustrated that the state chancellor has demonstrated a lack of transparency and collegial consultation with the faculty organizations, has actively blocked faculty leadership access to meetings in which decisions have been made, and exhibits a general lack of acknowledgement of the concerns of faculty;

**Therefore, be it resolved**, that AFT 2121 has no confidence in the California Community College Chancellor, Eloy Ortiz Oakley, and;

**Be it further resolved**, that AFT 2121 send this resolution with a letter stating our vote of no confidence to the California Community College Board of Governors and to Gov. Gavin Newsom.