

Senate **Rostrum**

CELEBRATING OUR

50TH
Anniversary
1969 - 2019

50 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE

Reform Act of
1986 Dies **p3**

Valuing
Diversity **p25**

Full Table of
Contents
Back Cover

From the President

(October 1984)

by Carmen Decker, ASCCC President 1984 - 1985

The 1984-85 academic year has opened with an unusual number of surprises and the usual number of unanswered questions, both of which promise to make this year an interesting and challenging one.

During the Open Forum session of the Board of Governors in September, Chancellor Leslie Koltai (Los Angeles) spoke eloquently for funding for faculty professional development at all community colleges, referring to a Carnegie Foundation Study underway at UCLA studying the professional preparation and involvement of faculty in the activities of their disciplines at the two-year and four-year colleges. The office of Assemblyman Leonard (Chair Pro-Tem, Assembly Ways and Means Committee) has produced a document comparing the average faculty salaries and workload at the community colleges and CSU. Our salaries are nearly the same (CSU, \$32,628; CCC's, \$32,647), but their workload is only 13.4 contact hours, as compared to our 17.67 hours. The document asks whether the salaries are too low or too high, concluding that answers are necessary "to determine future salary levels" for CSU and the community colleges.

These issues are valid ones. But the scrutiny of the community colleges is not limited to those questions. Governor Deukmejian increased the level of funding for community colleges for this year, but he refused fully to fund SB 851 until a review of the Master Plan and the mission of the community colleges has been initiated.

The atmosphere of scrutiny is being exacerbated by the actions of the other segments of higher education, which have pursued their own self-interest by recruiting students who have traditionally enrolled at community colleges.

However, the strongest scrutiny comes from the Hispanic legislators, educators, and lobbyists, who are disturbed by the low rate of transfers of minority students. For example, ACR 83 (Chacon) recommends stronger support activities and articulation so that, by 1990, "the income and ethnic composition of students completing vocational technical programs or transferring from community colleges into four-year institutions is at least equal to the income and ethnic composition of students enrolling in community colleges".

I would like to suggest several avenues that I believe can lead to an improvement in the quality and the public perception of our community colleges. 1) Demanding fair, stable, and adequate funding for all colleges. 2) Securing passage and funding of the Seymour-Campbell Matriculation Act. 3) Developing a more successful transfer program through greater involvement of teaching faculty, counselors, and administrators. 4) Demonstrating the integrity of our degrees through mutually beneficial discussions with UC and CSU faculty. 5) Actively recruiting the best and the brightest of our high school graduates. 6) Publicizing through the media the professional activities and accomplishments of our students and faculty.

We know the commitment that our faculty have to the success of our students. It is time to let others know that community college faculty are committed to excellence in the teaching profession.

From the President

Carmen Decker

The 1984-85 academic year has opened with an unusual number of surprises and the usual number of unanswered questions, both of which promise to make this year an interesting and challenging one.

During the Open Forum session of the Board of Governors in September, Chancellor Leslie Koltai (Los Angeles) spoke eloquently for funding for faculty professional development at all community colleges, referring to a Carnegie Foundation Study underway at UCLA studying the professional preparation and involvement of faculty in the activities of their disciplines at the two-year and four-year colleges. The office of Assemblyman Leonard (Chair Pro-Tem, Assembly Ways and Means Committee) has produced a document comparing the average faculty salaries and workload at the community colleges and UC's. Our salaries are nearly the same (CSU, \$32,628; CCC's, \$32,647), but their workload is only 13.4 contact hours, as compared to our 17.67 hours. The document asks whether the salaries are too low or too high, concluding that answers are necessary "to determine future salary levels" for CSU and the community colleges.

These issues are valid ones. But the scrutiny of the community colleges is not limited to those questions. Governor Deukmejian increased the level of funding for community colleges for this year, but he refused fully to fund SB 851 until a review of the Master Plan and the mission of the community colleges has been initiated.

The atmosphere of scrutiny is being exacerbated by the actions of the other segments of higher education, which have pursued their own self-interest by recruiting students who have traditionally enrolled at community colleges.

However, the strongest scrutiny comes from the Hispanic legislators, educators, and lobbyists, who are disturbed by the low rate of transfers of minority students. For example, ACR 83 (Chacon) recommends stronger support activities and articulation so that, by 1990, "the income and ethnic composition of students completing vocational technical programs or transferring from community colleges into four-year institutions is at least equal to the income and ethnic composition of students enrolling in com-

munity colleges."

I would like to suggest several avenues that I believe can lead to an improvement in the quality and the public perception of our community colleges. 1) Demanding fair, stable, and adequate funding for all colleges. 2) Securing passage and funding of the Seymour-Campbell Matriculation Act. 3) Developing a more successful transfer program through greater involvement of teaching faculty, counselors, and administrators. 4) Demonstrating the integrity of our degrees through mutually beneficial discussions with UC and CSU faculty. 5) Actively recruiting the best and the brightest of our high school graduates. 6) Publicizing through the media the professional activities and accomplishments of our students and faculty.

We know the commitment that our faculty have to the success of our students. It is time to let others know that community college faculty are committed to excellence in the teaching profession.



Great teachers enjoying a great time include Janice Alpert (on the diving board) sharing ideas and a barbecue with Susan Quatre, Janice Kelley, and Jim Proeger.

They were among the sixty participants this year in the Great Teachers Seminar, held August 5 through 10 at La Casa de Maria near Santa Barbara and co-sponsored by the Academic Senate and the California Association of Community Colleges.

In addition to exchanging teaching philosophies and strategies in a professional atmosphere, participants developed warm friendships. Perhaps the poem "Defining the Great Teacher," written by one of the groups at the conclusion of the seminar, best demonstrates the cohesive, supportive atmosphere which resulted. It concludes:

To all you Great Teachers
We say
"We love you."

Reform Act of 1986 Dies

(November 1986)

by **Mark Edelstein**, ASCCC President 1985 - 1987

Some 500 years ago, in a moment either of great profundity or of sheer absent mindedness, Francois Villon posed the famous question “Ou sont les neiges d’antan?” (Where are the snows of yesteryear?). This question is, of course, very difficult to answer, particularly if your French is as bad as mine and particularly if you have in Southern California, where “les neiges d’antan” have apparently vanished without a trace.

As difficult as it is, however, that question is far easier than the ones being asked this fall by community college faculty: “What has become of the community college reassessment study? Where are the results of all the research, testimony and discussion of the past eighteen months? What has happened to the proposed Community College Reform Act?”

Some things are obvious. The Reform Act of 1986 is dead. But what does that mean in terms of 1987? The community college reassessment is both everywhere and nowhere. There is a great deal going on, but the activity is very fragmented. It remains to be seen whether the will exists to bring it all together.

The Commission for the Review of the Master Plan submitted its report to the Joint Legislative Committee last March and is now studying the community colleges again, this time in the context of all three segments of higher education. Since the Commission was unable to reach a final decision on community college governance in the first phase of its work, the consulting firm of Glenny & Bowen has been employed to study the issue and make recommendations to the Commission by November. Meanwhile, the CEO’s and the Trustees Association have already issued their own report on governance.

The Joint Legislative Committee, lacking a clear consensus from the field on what specific reforms should be enacted and lacking agreement among its members on a number of key issues, was not able to develop a comprehensive community college reform bill before the Legislature adjourned in September. Brian Murphy has drafted a report for the Committee containing 68 recommendations. This report may serve as the basis for legislation in the next session but may be significantly altered as a result of further studies.

The Reform Act of 1986 is dead. But what does that mean in terms of 1987? The community college reassessment is both everywhere and nowhere.

The President's Report

Reform Act Of 1986 Dies



MARK G. EDELSTEIN

Some 500 years ago, in a moment either of great profundity or of sheer absent-mindedness, Francois Villon posed the famous question "Ou sont les neiges d'antan?" (Where are the snows of yesteryear?). This question is, of course, very difficult to answer, particularly if your French is as bad as mine and particularly if you live in Southern California, where "les neiges d'antan" have apparently vanished without a trace.

firm of Glenny & Bowen has been employed to study the issue and make recommendations to the Commission by November. Meanwhile, the CEO's and the Trustees Association have already issued their own report on governance.

The Joint Legislative Committee, lacking a clear consensus from the field on what specific reforms should be enacted and lacking agreement among its members on a number of key issues, was not able to develop a comprehensive community college reform bill before the Legislature adjourned in September. Brian Murphy has drafted a report for the Committee containing 68 recommendations. This report may serve as the basis for legislation in the next session but may be significantly altered as a result of further studies.

In an effort to keep the issue of community college reform alive for the next session, the Legislature approved a bill (AB 3409, Hayden) calling for two additional studies, one on differential funding and another on staff issues. These studies will be accomplished by task forces which will report to the Legislature by March. The conclusions of these task forces along with the findings of an independent study on staff development being done by CPEC and an independent study on part-time faculty being done by the Chancellor's Office, will

sensus, one which would both revitalize the colleges internally and help to guarantee the external support necessary to ensure the quality of our programs.

It is disappointing that this did not occur, but both the need and the promise still exist, and it is critical that the faculty continue to advocate the kinds of changes that will propel the community colleges into the next phase of their development, a phase characterized by increased responsibility for the faculty, by improved coherence and consistency in educational offerings, and by greater attention to the success of individual students.

CACC Convention Features Chisholm

Shirley Chisholm will be the featured speaker at the Saturday luncheon, Nov. 15, at the Anaheim Marriott Hotel.

Chisholm, the first black woman elected to congress, will participate in a book-signing ceremony for convention attendees

In an effort to keep the issue of community college reform alive for the next session, the Legislature approved a bill (AB 3409, Hayden) calling for two additional studies, one on differential funding and another on staff issues. These studies will be accomplished by task forces which will report to the Legislature by March. The conclusions of these task forces along with the findings of an independent study on staff development being done by CPEC and an independent study on part-time faculty being done by the Chancellor's Office, will undoubtedly have an impact on any legislation which may be developed.

Of course all of this is complicated by the fact that the current funding mechanism sunsets in June of '87 and the fee law sunsets in January of '88. Moreover, even if the issues of finance, fees, governance, access and mission can all be resolved, a reform package could easily cost more than \$100 million, and the state may have less money available for the community colleges next year than it did this year.

Certainly, all of these difficulties and complexities create a strong desire to crawl off into a dark corner and ponder the snows of yesteryear. But there is simply too much at stake.

When the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan sent its report to the Joint Legislative Committee last spring, many people hoped that comprehensive legislation would soon be forthcoming. Such legislation could resolve many of the recurring questions about the community colleges and serve as a catalyst for a new consensus, one which would both revitalize the colleges internally and help to guarantee the external support necessary to ensure the quality of our programs.

It is disappointing that this did not occur, but both the need and the promise still exist, and it is critical that the faculty continue to advocate the kinds of change; that will propel the community colleges into the next phase of their development, a phase characterized by increased responsibility for the faculty, by improved coherence and consistency in educational offerings, and by greater attention to the success of individual students.

Reform Becomes Reality

(Summer 1989)

by Karen Sue Grosz, ASCCC President 1987 - 1989

This has been an exciting, exhausting year for the California Community Colleges. The landmark reform legislation signed by Governor Deukemejian in September of 1988 became law on January 1, 1989. While some of those reforms, staff diversity funds and staff development funds, for example, have already gone into effect, the major reforms await adequate funding. Not wanting to be caught as K-12 was with its major reform legislation, asked to implement major changes at far less than the projected costs, community college representatives wisely tied reform to funding.

As some of you may know, intense negotiations have transpired over the past several months between K-12 and community college representatives concerning the appropriate “split” of funds made available through CTA’s active support and sponsorship of Proposition 98. The community colleges may yet reap the benefit of that proposition enough to trigger the first set of major reforms, including the abolishment of credentials, and establishment of hiring policies, practices, and standards through joint agreement between local senates and representatives of their board of trustees.

The Academic Senate has worked assiduously over the past eight months in an attempt to have ready the lists of disciplines, reasonably related disciplines, and disciplines not requiring a master’s degree as a minimum qualification for hire. Through the combined efforts of the Educational Policies and Executive Committees, under the leadership of Michael Anker, Norbert Bischof, and Susan Petit, the Senate assembled a list which, for months at a time, seemed to undergo change almost daily as we received feedback from faculty and administrators statewide. This task is

momentous in at least two ways. First, the Senate has attempted to hear from faculty in all disciplines from all colleges, a gargantuan effort.

In a second fashion this project is also momentous, for it is the first which, by law, recognizes the faculty as responsible members of the community college community, and we will take that responsibility very seriously. Thus, we felt that we had to make every effort to meet the July 1, 1989, deadline for the lists of disciplines, and not begin this responsibility with an immediate demand for additional time. Our effort to produce a reasonable list for plenary session review resulted in a unanimous vote by representatives of 100 colleges.

On behalf of all the members of the Educational Policies and Executive Committees, I want to take note of the fact that the lists of disciplines have probably received wider faculty review than any other item any of us could name. Several times, as faculty members have stopped me to implore that the Executive Committee slow the process, I have reflected upon the fact that this project has received more attention than if it had been handled by any other agency. But, more important, the very fact that some want more time is also heartening, as it reflects the care with which this particular project was approached. I need also to note that, while some urged us to slow down and try to reach everyone, others, equally insistent, have urged us to hold to the deadline, on our own decision as an Executive Committee, and recognize the futility of attempting to touch base with more than a handful of active faculty members at each institution. It has been clear all along that we will not please everyone. But it was also clear all along that the statewide delegate body, not an elected group of 14 individuals, had to determine what went forward and when.

If handled well, and it is within our control to ensure that the lists are handled well, the disciplines material should be viewed as a living, flexible document, constantly responding to recognition for needed change. The lists presented to the Board of Governors are not perfect. Perfection is impossible, especially in light of the fact that academic and vocational disciplines continually emerge, fade, or change their names over time. Only if faculty remain alert to that fact and remind others of that fact will the lists of disciplines reflect a changing reality. Inflexibility and the struggle for perfection in the best bureaucratic sense has been a major problem with credentials. We can do better.

The Board of Governors set May 25 as the date for a special Board hearing on disciplines, and members of the Board received testimony on the material at that time. In addition to looking at the lists from the standpoint of appropriate relation between disciplines and related disciplines, the

Board was asked to consider larger issues such as what effect the minimum qualifications, as determined by the list, will have on the pool of available candidates. With a mandated goal of 30% increase in the hiring of ethnic minorities, the colleges will not be well served by minimum standards which effectively shut out the very individuals the colleges want to hire. The Board will also be concerned about the effect of the minimum qualifications on small colleges in

Page 2

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

by Karen S. Gross

REFORM BECOMES REALITY

This has been an exciting, exhausting year for the California Community Colleges. The landmark reform legislation signed by Governor Deukmejian in September of 1988 became law on January 1, 1989. While some of those reforms, staff diversity funds and staff development funds, for example, have already gone into effect, the major reforms await adequate funding. Not wanting to be caught as K-12 was with its major reform legislation, asked to implement major changes at far less than the projected costs, community college representatives wisely tied reform to funding.

As some of you may know, intense negotiations have transpired over the past several months between K-12 and community college representatives concerning the appropriate "split" of funds made available through CTA's active support and sponsorship of Proposition 98. The community colleges may yet reap the benefit of that proposition enough to trigger the first set of major reforms, including the abolishment of credentials, and establishment of hiring policies, practices, and standards through joint agreement between local senates and representatives of their board of trustees.

The Academic Senate has worked assiduously over the past eight months in an attempt to have ready the lists of disciplines, reasonably related disciplines, and disciplines not requiring a master's degree as a minimum qualification for hire. Through the combined efforts of the Educational Policies and Executive Committees, under the leadership of Michael Anker, Norbert Bischof, and Susan Petit, the Senate assembled a list which, for months at a time, seemed to undergo change almost daily as we received feedback from faculty and administrators statewide. This task is momentous in at least two ways. First, the Senate has attempted to hear from faculty in all disciplines from all colleges, a gargantuan effort.

In a second fashion this project is also momentous, for it is the first which, by law, recognizes the faculty as responsible members of the community college community, and we all take that responsibility very seriously. Thus, we felt that we had to make every effort to meet the July 1, 1989, deadline for the lists of disciplines, and not begin this responsibility with an immediate demand for additional time. Our effort to produce a reasonable list for plenary session review resulted in a unanimous vote by representatives of 100 colleges.

On behalf of all the members of the Educational Policies and Executive Committees, I want to take note of the fact that the lists of disciplines have probably received wider faculty review than any other item any of us could name. Several times, as faculty members have stopped me to implore that the Executive Committee slow the process, I have reflected upon the fact that this project has received more attention than if it had been handled by any other agency. But, more important, the very fact that some want more time is also heartening, as it reflects the care with which this particular project was approached. I need also to note that, while some urg-



ed us to slow down and try to reach everyone, others, equally insistent, have urged us to hold to the deadline, on our own decision as an Executive Committee base with more than a handful of active faculty members at each institution. It has been clear all also clear all along that the statewide delegate body, not an elected group of 14 individuals, had to determine what went forward—and when.

If handled well, and it is within our control to ensure that the lists are handled well, the disciplines material should be viewed as a living, flexible document, constantly responding to recognition for needed change. The lists presented to the Board of Governors are not perfect. Perfection is impossible, especially in light of the fact that academic and vocational disciplines continually emerge, fade, or change their names over time. Only if faculty remain alert to that fact and remind others of that fact will the lists of disciplines reflect a changing reality. Inflexibility and the struggle for perfection in the best bureaucratic sense has been a major problem with credentials. We can do better.

The Board of Governors set May 25 as the date for a special Board hearing on disciplines, and material at that time. In addition to looking at the lists from the standpoint of appropriate relation between disciplines and related disciplines, the Board was asked to consider larger issues such as what the list, will have on the pool of available candidates. With a mandated goal of 30% increase in the hiring of ethnic minorities, the colleges will not be well served by minimum standards which effectively shut out the very individuals the colleges want to hire. The Board will also be concerned about the effect of the minimum qualifications on small colleges in which one faculty member may have to teach in several disciplines. Not many of us collect multiple master's degrees. Finally, we all recognize that the minimum standards may become maximum standards, and we must continue to review the lists and focus on quality.

This development of the lists of disciplines has been an exciting task, the first of several phases in developing a new hiring mechanism for community college faculty. With the help of thousands of faculty and administrators statewide, the Senate has been

able to meet its deadlines and begin the process of making reform reality.

Finally, I want to be a little more contemplative, and mention how much I have enjoyed these past two years as president of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Mark Edelstein advised me at the outset that the Senate presidency holds a lot of excitement, a wealth of knowledge, a world of adventure, and very little power, and I was interested to discover for myself the truth of his remark. The Executive Committee actively advises the president, so very few decisions are the president's alone. But, more important, the voting delegates advise the Executive Committee through the resolutions adopted at each statewide session. With this firm support, the Senate wields tremendous power, but no small group and no single individual is the Academic Senate.

However, I have also learned this year that when anything goes awry, the president must shoulder the blame and must become the vehicle through which the Executive Committee and Senate at large can learn from that mistake. I was fascinated to read recently, as I prepared for a speech on leadership, that a leader who never fails, never makes a mistake, is not a leader. Well, I have concluded, in reviewing my mistakes as president, that I must be one hell of a leader! Who else would schedule a workshop on the day before Easter Sunday? Yes, I have certainly learned, and I thank the members of the Executive Committee for all we have been able to accomplish.

Another special contributor to Senate success this year has been our secretary, Joan Rives, who single handedly staffs an exceptionally busy office in Sacramento. I personally want to attest to the validity of the adage that behind any successful organization stands a competent, efficient secretary. Joan has served us well in the past year and deserves far more recognition than we have been able to give her.

In closing, I want to share with you one symbol of my extreme pride in the accomplishments of our Senate. In early April, I attended a national Symposium for Faculty Senates, a meeting of both 2-year and 4-year Senate leaders from around the country. Imagine my pride when one of the organizers of the symposium announced to the entire group that our California Community College Senate is one of the richest in the country in terms of its organization and structure as reflected in the Senate Resource Book. My discussions with faculty from Washington, D.C., Peoria, Illinois, and Alfred, New York, only reinforced my belief that we are among the best Senates in the country. Our resolution process for letting faculty statewide set the Senate work agenda, our open discussion of potentially divisive issues and willingness to take direction from faculty statewide sets us apart as a model to be imitated elsewhere. Robert Birnbaum writes in *How Colleges Work*, that "governance is just a process that permits people to work together. . . . If people see some sense in what they are doing, if they are excited, if they believe they are making a difference, their governance system is serving its purpose." The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, by this definition, has an effective governance system only because of faculty willingness to give direction. With additional funding in the year ahead, our Senate will continue to serve as a model for imitation, accomplishing more and serving faculty needs ever more effectively.

which one faculty member may have to teach in several disciplines. Not many of us collect multiple master's degrees. Finally, we all recognize that the minimum standards may become maximum standards, and we must continue to review the lists and focus on quality.

This development of the lists of disciplines has been an exciting task, the first of several phases in developing a new hiring mechanism for community college faculty. With the help of thousands of faculty and administrators statewide, the Senate has been able to meet its deadlines and begin the process of making reform reality.

Finally, I want to be a little more contemplative and mention how much I have enjoyed these past two years as president of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Mark Edelstein advised me at the outset that the Senate presidency holds a lot of excitement, a wealth of knowledge, a world of adventure, and very little power, and I was interested to discover for myself the truth of his remark. The Executive Committee actively advises the president, so very few decisions are the president's alone. But, more important, the voting delegates advise the Executive Committee through the resolutions adopted at each statewide session. With this firm support, the Senate wields tremendous power, but no small group and no single individual is the Academic Senate.

However, I have also learned this year that when anything goes awry, the president must shoulder the blame and must become the vehicle through which the Executive Committee and Senate at large can learn from that mistake. I was fascinated to read recently, as I prepared for a speech on leadership, that a leader who never fails, never makes a mistake, is not a leader. Well, I have concluded, in reviewing my mistakes as president, that I must be one hell of a leader! Who else would schedule a workshop on the day before Easter Sunday? Yes, I have certainly learned, and I thank the members of the Executive Committee for all we have been able to accomplish.

Another special contributor to Senate success this year has been our secretary, Joan Rives, who single handedly staffs an exceptionally busy office in Sacramento I personally want to attest to the validity of the adage that behind any successful organization stands a competent, efficient secretary. Joan has served us well in the past year and deserves far more recognition than we have been able to give her.

In closing, I want to share with you one symbol of my extreme pride in the accomplishments of our Senate. In early April, I attended a national Symposium for Faculty Senates, a meeting of both 2-year and 4-year Senate leaders from around the country. Imagine my pride when one of the organizers of the symposium announced to the entire group that our California Community College Senate is one of the richest in the country in terms of its organization and structure as reflected in the Senate Resource Book. My discussions with faculty from Washington, D.C., Peoria, Illinois, and Alfred, New York, only reinforced my belief that we are among the best Senates in the country. Our resolution process for letting faculty statewide set the Senate work agenda, our open discussion of potentially divisive issues and willingness to take direction from faculty statewide sets us apart as a model to be imitated elsewhere. Robert Birnbaum writes in *How Colleges Work*, that "governance is just a process that permits people to work together.... If people see some sense in what they are doing, if they are excited, if they believe they are making a difference, their governance system is serving its purpose." The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, by this definition, has an effective governance system only because of faculty willingness to give direction. With additional funding in the year ahead, our Senate will continue to serve as a model for imitation, accomplishing more and serving faculty needs ever more effectively.

An In-depth Look at the Mertes 'No Confidence' Vote

(June 1994)

by [Regina Stanback-Stroud](#), President 1993 - 1995

It is not surprising that the years of frustration by the faculty combined with the Chancellor's disengagement with the faculty culminated in a vote of no confidence at the spring 1994 Plenary Session. A similar resolution arose at the Fall 1993 Session, but didn't reach the Session floor due to a technicality one of the seconders hadn't registered as a delegate. Although Chancellor Mertes was informed that such a resolution almost came to the floor, he did nothing to address his alienated relationship with the faculty.

Our Plenary Session processes invite the delegates as elected by their local faculty to come together as a legislative body to act on resolutions generated before and during the session. At the Spring 1994 Session, 70 new resolutions were generated, in addition to the 39 pre-session resolutions. The "no confidence" resolution was handed in before the Friday 5 p.m. resolution submission deadline. The proposed amendments and substitutions which would have softened the statement were repeatedly and overwhelmingly rejected.

The issues raised in the arguments for the resolution included the consultation process, matriculation site visits, 75% full time / 25% part time faculty ratio, the attack on the gains made by faculty with the reform legislation, the chancellor's leadership skills, his "look the other way" method of compliance monitoring and the absence of an opportunity for faculty and other groups to evaluate the chancellor. Frustrations have also resulted from Mertes' handling of the differential fee and the Commission on innovation issues.

In my written notification of the "no confidence" vote to the chancellor, I made several recommendations, including looking at some of the issues to determine if common ground exists; reinstating the mandatory matriculation site visits; making a significant commitment to 75/25 ratio; reviewing the consultation process; utilizing leadership skills to empower and bring the groups together; respecting faculty for their expertise; expanding his communication and association with the Academic Senate; embracing the concept of a formal written evaluation; and evaluating his commitment to the reform legislation.

The chancellor immediately faxed out a memo to most of the district and college CEOs, attempting to implicate the two faculty Board of Governors members. However, one of the members is the president of the Board! This behavior showed that the chancellor has so much disrespect and disregard for the faculty that he felt comfortable in attacking the president of the Board of Governors. This attack probably would not have taken place if the president were not a faculty member.

The memo and/or resolution generated support from every administrative council (three of the six consultation councils). Individual CEOs expressed support and concern for Mertes as a victim of the Academic Senate. What Chancellor Mertes and all of the CEOs and administrative groups that support him must ultimately realize is that the faculty have spoken by resolution. All the administrative support in the system will not change the fact that the faculty of the system have no confidence in his leadership.

In support of the Academic Senate's action, the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges and the Community College Association of California Teachers Association both voted "no confidence" in the chancellor. The Community College Council of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO wrote a letter concurring with the Academic Senate's calling for a formal evaluation of the chancellor. Mike Anker, a former president of the State Senate, also wrote a letter supporting the Academic Senate, citing Mertes' handling of the student equity issue.

To date no Board of Governors written policy or process for the evaluation of the chancellor exists. The Board of Governors is, however, currently revising the evaluation process. Thus far the chancellor has resisted any formal written evaluation which would include input from others outside of the Board of Governors. In a meeting between the chancellor, members of his cabinet, members of the Executive Committee and myself, the chancellor again stated that he would not support any evaluation effort which

included groups or individuals which did not "buy into the objectives set by the Board of Governors." This is of particular interest because presently no formal objectives exist for the chancellor outside of the Board of Governor's Basic Agenda.

Following passage of the resolution, Dr. Larry Toy, president of the Board of Governors, wrote me a letter indicating his preference that the concerns be communicated directly to him (before the vote). He also said that he respects the right of the Senate and expects the chancellor to work with the Senate to resolve the issues. The letter acknowledged that the chancellor has the full authority for California Community Colleges.

At the May Board of Governors meeting, Dr. Toy discussed the evaluation process, and Chancellor Mertes acknowledging "misunderstandings" in the consultation process. No public testimony was received on the item. The Academic Senate or any other group or individual chose to speak to the item at the public forum. The Board of Governors did not take a vote of confidence in the chancellor.

Perhaps most importantly, the concurrence by faculty organizations and the support for Mertes by the administrative organizations simply exemplify the environment of division in which we work. In the League document of pros and cons, in the CIO meeting, in individual CEO's letters, and in individual conversations, administrators are concerned that the vote of "no confidence" by the State Senate may serve as a model to local faculty. The Academic Senate recognizes that local faculty have always had and will always have the opportunity to determine if they have confidence in their district leadership.

For the past five years outgoing State Senate presidents have recommended to incoming Senate presidents that a vote of "no confidence" be considered. Each new president attempted to work through the issues first. When I became Senate president I received that same recommendation. Having served for the year 1993-94, I understand the basis of those recommendations.

SenateRostrum

The Newsletter of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

President's Report Regina Stanback-Stroud



An in-depth look at the Mertes "no confidence" vote

It is not surprising that the years of frustration by the faculty combined with the Chancellor's disengagement with the faculty culminated in a vote of no confidence at the Spring 1994 Plenary Session. A similar resolution arose at the Fall 1993 Session, but didn't reach the Session floor due to a technicality—one of the seconders hadn't registered as a delegate. Although Chancellor Mertes was informed that such a resolution almost came to the floor, he did nothing to address his alienated relationship with the faculty. Our Plenary Session processes invite the delegates as elected by their local faculty to come together as a legislative body to act on resolutions generated before and during the session. At the Spring 1994 Session, 70 new resolutions were generated, in addition to the 39 presentation resolutions. The "no confidence" resolution was

handed in before the Friday 5 p.m. resolution submission deadline. The proposed amendments and substitutions which would have softened the statement were repeatedly and overwhelmingly rejected.

The issues raised in the arguments for the resolution included the consultation process, matriculation site visits, 75% full time / 25% part time faculty ratio, the attack on the gains made by faculty with the reform legislation, the chancellor's leadership skills, his "look the other way" method of compliance monitoring and the absence of an opportunity for faculty and other groups to evaluate the chancellor. Frustrations have also resulted from Mertes' handling of the differential fee and the Commission on Innovation Issues.

In my written notification of the "no confidence" vote to the chancellor, I made several recommendations, including looking at some of the issues to determine if common

ground exists; reinstating the mandatory matriculation site visits; making a significant commitment to 75/25 ratio; reviewing the consultation process; utilizing leadership skills to empower and bring the groups together; respecting faculty for their expertise; expanding his communication and association with the Academic Senate; and embracing the concept of a formal written evaluation; and evaluating his commitment to the reform legislation.

The chancellor immediately faxed out a memo to most of the district and college CEOs, attempting to implicate the two faculty Boards of Governors members. However, one of the members is the president of the Board! This behavior showed that the chancellor has so much disrespect and disregard for the faculty that he felt comfortable in attacking the president of the Board of Governors. This attack probably would not have taken place if the president were not a faculty member.

The memo and/or resolution generated support from every admini-



The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Regina Stanback-Stroud, President; Jeanne Rhison Germond, Vice-Pres.; Leahyn Polk, Secretary; Barbara Perez, Treasurer; Jim Locke, Past-President

The Rostrum, June 1994. The Rostrum is published four times each school year by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 1102 North St., Sacramento, CA 95814. The Rostrum is distributed to all faculty through college academic senate presidents and by individual mailing, letters and uncollected articles by faculty members are not used. For deadline information, call (916) 445-4752. Editor: Sherry Winters.

Overuse and Undercompensation of Part-Time Faculty in the California Community Colleges (October 1998)

by **Bill Scroggins**, ASCCC President 1997 - 1999

The overuse and undercompensation of part-time faculty in the California Community Colleges continues to be one of the major challenges the system faces in its efforts to provide quality education to the residents of the state. In California 65.6% of faculty are part-time,¹ and full-time faculty teach just 58.7% of the total equivalent instructional load.² Nationally, full-time faculty teach 62.0% of the total load.³ In California part-time faculty are generally paid only for direct classroom contact hours at an average rate of \$35.82 per hour.⁴ If CCC full-time faculty were paid just for direct classroom contact hours (which they are not—full-time compensation covers a wide range of duties, as we shall point out), average hourly values would range from \$61.91 (entry level Masters degree) to \$127.28 (highest doctorate).⁵ Nationally, part-time faculty are compensated at the rate of \$60.42 per

hour.⁶ This problem has literally exploded in the last few years. Over the last twenty-five years the growth in part-time faculty has been five times that of full-time: 49% increase in full-time positions but 266% increase in part-time.⁷ The factors listed below show the extent of the problem.

This system which pays part-time faculty low wages based only on classroom hours encourages colleges to overuse part-time faculty to balance their budgets. While reasonable use of part-time faculty adds much to the college, including current experience in the profession, specific expertise that may not be available from full-time staff, and direct contact with employers, budgetary savings MUST NOT be the driving force for the use of part-time faculty.

Because part-time faculty are generally compensated only for direct classroom contact hours, the many other duties of a professional faculty member are either left to the full-time faculty or performed by the part-time faculty member without compensation. It is extremely important to realize that these problems are the result of a system which overuses, undercompensates, and recognizes only classroom duties rather than being attributable to deficiencies in part-time faculty

1 "Report on Staffing and Salaries - Fall 1996." Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, October 1997. Table B1: 15,342 FTF; 29,230 PTF.

2 "Report on Staffing and Salaries - Fall 1996." Table B2: 14,006 Full-Time Equivalent Faculty; 9,860 Part-Time Equivalent Faculty.

3 "National Profile of Community Colleges: Trends & Statistics 1997-1998." American Association of Community Colleges, 1997. Table 5.7. Original source data provided by AACCC editor Kent Phillippe via e-mail (kphillippe@aacc.nche.edu) on 8/28/98.

4 "Community College Compensation Report -1996/97 Selected Salaries for Full Time and Part-time faculty in California." Community College Association/CTA/NEA, September, 1997. Value quoted is the median of the average hourly wages paid by the 71 districts.

5 "Community College Compensation Report." Median values are reported.

6 "National Profile of Community Colleges." Table 5.10: Reported value is \$1450 per month. Assuming 2 classes (the national average) equates to 24 hours per month, the hourly rate is \$60.42.

7 "The Vanishing Professor." American Federation of Teachers, Summer 1998. (www.aft.org/higheduc/professor).

themselves. Full-time faculty can do much by reaching out to involve part-time faculty in professional activities, but a fundamental change in the system is needed for lasting improvements.

- *Productivity.* Nationally, part-time faculty average 2 classes per term with a class size of about 20 and work a total of 30 hours per week in and out of the classroom. Full-time faculty teach 4 classes averaging 25 students each (25% more proportionally) and work 47 hours (20% less proportionally).⁸
- *Office Hours.* Student learning demands the opportunity to work directly with the instructor in an individualized learning environment. Nationally, part-time faculty devote 1½ office hours per class while full-time faculty hold almost 2½.⁸
- *Informal Contact.* Formal office hour contact accounts for only about two-thirds of the time community college instructors spend with students outside of class. Full-time faculty spend almost 25% more time informally with students.⁸
- *Preparation and Experience.* In California, all community college faculty must meet minimum qualifications to be employed, generally a master's degree in academic disciplines and an AA with six years experience, or a BA plus two years, in occupational disciplines. Nationally, only 66.8% of part-time community college faculty have a master's degree or greater compared with 83.3% of full-time faculty.⁸ Full-time faculty have almost twice the teaching experience of part-time faculty, 6.5 years to 11.6 years, by the national average.⁹
- *Program Advising and Follow-Up.* Working with students to select classes in the major taught by the faculty member and providing follow-up services like letters of recommendation is a task borne primarily by full-time faculty.
- *Curriculum Development.* "Permanent faculty members must be present in sufficient numbers to develop courses, research new trends, set requirements, and design courses and programs."⁹ The complexity of curriculum reforms for CalWORKs, emerging industries, and applications of technology spurred by such developments as the California Virtual University have increased the pace of curriculum reform tremendously.
- *Program Review, Accreditation, and Accountability.* Providing external accountability for the quality and productivity of programs is a responsibility that is carried predominantly by full-time faculty.
- *Hiring and Evaluation.* The selection of new faculty, both full and part-time, as well as evaluation of all faculty, is done primarily by full-time faculty in partnership with supervising administrators.
- *Involvement in College Governance.* Part-time status "usually means being outside the structure of faculty governance."¹⁰ Thus lending the expertise of the faculty on academic and professional matters usually falls to full-timers. Additionally, only 10% of part-time faculty are protected by collective bargaining.¹⁰
- *Professional Development.* Many hours are needed for faculty members to keep current in their field of expertise and in contemporary methods of teaching. Generally, full-time faculty devote more time to this activity than do part-time faculty.
- *Articulation.* The transferability of courses requires communication with the faculty in related departments at four-year colleges and universities. Smooth transition of students from high school to college requires curriculum alignment between feeder high schools and regional community colleges. This work is carried out by the full-time faculty along with the professional articulation staff of the college.
- *Employer Relations.* Vocational faculty work directly with employers in their field from the community. This assures current and relevant curriculum and provides direct contacts for student job placement. While many part-time faculty are employed full-time in the industry, regular working relationship with the full range of employers in the college's service area is usually handled by the full-time faculty.
- *Community Relations.* Many faculty have strong ties to the community. Service in the name of the college is generally provided by full-time rather than part-time faculty.
- *Student Activities.* Extracurricular activities are an important facet of college life. Studies have shown that students with these types of ties to the college have better retention rates and greater goal completion. Typically, full-time faculty serve as advisors to such student organizations.

⁸ "National Profile of Community Colleges." Table 5.10.

⁹ "Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty." American Association of University Professors, September 1997.

¹⁰ "The Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty." American Association of University Professors, June 1993. Data is for two and four-year faculty.

Some assert that movements to obtain more funding for full-time faculty and to improve the lot of part-time faculty are a scam to put more money in the pockets of faculty or that hiring more full-time faculty and providing equitable pay to part-time faculty will push the cost of education through the roof. In reality, instructor's salaries make up only 52.54% of the current expense of education.¹¹ Furthermore, CCC faculty work harder than is typical throughout the country and our colleges receive less funding per student. In 1993-94 California Community College class sizes averaged 32 in contrast to about 20 for the nation, and apportionment per full-time equivalent student was just \$3554 compared to a national average of \$6022.¹² We are proud of the work we do in our system of education and would seek to improve what we do by having more full-time faculty to provide the above services to students and by compensating part-time faculty equitably so that they can have the resources to be full professionals in serving students. Here are a few things of which we are proud and would like to do even better:

- *California Community Colleges have a tremendous impact on wages.* Vocational program completers show an 85.6% wage gain in three years.¹³

11 "Fiscal Data Abstract 1996-97." Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, March 1998. Table VI.

12 "2005. A Report of the Task Force for the Chancellor's Consultation Council. Chancellor's Consultation Council, California Community Colleges, September 1997. Table 3.

13 "The Effectiveness of California Community Colleges on Selected Performance Measures." Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. June 1997. Table 2.86.

**In 1993-94 California
Community College class
sizes averaged 32 in
contrast to about 20 for the
nation, and apportionment
per full-time equivalent
student was just \$3554
compared to a national
average of \$6022**

- *California has the highest access in the nation.* In our state 8.4% of the adult population was served by a community college in 1994-95, highest in the nation which averaged just 4.9%¹⁴
- *Community colleges make California's population one of the best educated in the nation.* 52.2% of Californians have gone to college compared to the national average of 46.6%.¹⁵
- *We educate the state's neediest residents.* In 1992 community college students had an annual family income of \$23,900 compared to the state average of \$37,600. (UC and CSU averages were \$32,800 and \$48,800, respectively.)¹⁶

The 45,000 full and part-time faculty of the California Community Colleges and their representatives in state faculty organizations have worked diligently to address the abuse of part-time faculty. Efforts to increase the number of full-time faculty such as SB 877 (Vasconcellos) and AB 1714 (Wildman) deserve your support as do efforts to provide equitable compensation for part-time faculty such as SB 1848 (Karnette).

The abuse of part-time faculty in the California Community Colleges has been ingrained over many years. It will not be solved easily. Serious solutions require a unified effort by all educators. Divisiveness which pits faculty against administrators or part-time against full-time will only allow this biased and ill-conceived system to continue. Long-suffering and dedicated part-time faculty need our support for fair compensation and professional treatment. Students deserve a learning experience provided by faculty who have adequate resources, access to professional services and advancement, and are full participants in the educational enterprise, whether they choose to do so on a full or part-time basis.

14 "Access to the California Community Colleges. A Technical Paper for the 2005 Task Force of the Chancellor's Consultation Council." Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, November 1997. Chart 12.

15 "Access to the California Community Colleges." Chart 16. In California 27.5% have some college while 24.7% have a BA or more. National figures are 24.3% and 22.3%, respectively.

16 "Trends Important to California Community Colleges. A Technical Paper for the 2005 Task Force of the Chancellor's Consultation Council." Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, November 1997. Page 9 and Figure 12.

President's Message: Leadership in an Educational Environment (June 1999)

by **Bill Scroggins**, ASCCC President 1997 - 1999

For as long as I can remember, there have been those who hold up the business world as an example of how our colleges should be run. The current emphasis on productivity, thinly disguised as accountability, is just the latest example. I submit that leadership in an educational environment is fundamentally different.

Any leader must have a good sense of the direction the organization needs to take, be it the academic senate, the college, or a business. As faculty leaders, we need a clear vision of what we would like to achieve on our watch. Unlike business, our bottom line is not monetary but rather the need to assure that our students achieve their full potential. Not that money isn't important we need adequate resources to serve students well it's just that the almighty dollar doesn't (or at least shouldn't) drive our decisions.

I know, your first reaction is that I'm dreaming. Our day-to-day experiences are so tied up with issues of resources that it seems this is all that matters to our leaders. That's my point exactly. In fact, in my visits to our colleges, it is clear that those who PUT STUDENTS FIRST and have a strong organization built around that goal are the most successful.

Whereas the business environment is competitive, education flourishes best in a climate of trust and collaboration hence the term "collegiality." As educational leaders, that spirit must be one of our primary, if unstated, goals. By the way, one of those

"leadership directions" I mentioned earlier, for my term in office, has been this very goal of building trust. I'm convinced the investment has paid many dividends. (Oops! I slipped into a business metaphor!)

Consider the three benefits of education to society: 1) the acquisition of skills and abilities that lead to earning a livable wage by the individual and provide a needed worker for the economy; 2) the personal and cultural enrichment of the individual that adds both to the enjoyment of life and to the advancement of civilization; and 3) the production of an educated citizenry that makes good decisions politically and participates vigorously in the community. Even the casual observer can detect that today's productivity movement focuses on #1.

So we must go beyond having a sense of direction rooted in serving students and beyond devoting ourselves to building a collegial environment. We must reclaim the high ground in defining what "success" in education really is. Accountable? Yes, I'm accountable. I'm accountable to my students every day to assure their learning. I'm accountable to my colleagues to deliver the curriculum we have designed to the standards we have set. And it is we who must hold ourselves accountable. If we don't, that external business model will surely be what we will face.

It isn't as if we don't know how to hold ourselves accountable. The mechanisms of program review, curriculum approval, and peer review have been part of our lexicon for many years. These are the underpinnings

of that "strong organization" which I mentioned earlier as being built around the goal of serving students. Colleges with strong organizations use these reviews to create institutional plans that then drive budget decisions.

So simple; just two measures. Does the college have effective reviews of programs, curriculum, and peers based on the goal of student learning? Does the college use these reviews in a meaningful way to create plans that drive the allocation of resources? We even have the mechanism to assure the role of faculty: collegial consultation with the academic senate.

Thus I call on the educational leaders at our colleges - yes, that's you, too - to set a firm course for your achievements for the coming year, to maintain student learning as the touchstone of all you do, and to redouble your efforts to assure true accountability by being vigorous participants in review of your programs, courses, and peers and in the planning and budgeting process built on those reviews. Don't settle for anything less. You will profit greatly, as will your students. (There I go again, using those business terms!)

President's Message



Leadership in an Educational Environment

• by Bill Scroggins, President

For as long as I can remember, there have been those who hold up the business world as an example of how our colleges should be run. The current emphasis on productivity, thinly disguised as accountability, is just the latest example. I submit that leadership in an educational environment is fundamentally different.

Any leader must have a good sense of the direction the organization needs to take, be it the academic senate, the college, or a business. As faculty leaders, we need a clear vision of what we would like to achieve on our watch. Unlike business, our bottom line is not monetary but rather the need to assure that our students achieve their full potential. Not that money isn't important—we need adequate resources to serve students well—it's just that the almighty dollar doesn't (or at least shouldn't) drive our decisions.

I know, your first reaction is that I'm dreaming. Our day-to-day experiences are so tied up with

issues of resources that it seems this is all that matters to our leaders. That's my point exactly. In fact, in my visits to our colleges, it is clear that those who PUT STUDENTS FIRST—and have a strong organization built around that goal—are the most successful.

Whereas the business environment is competitive, education flourishes best in a climate of trust and collaboration—hence the term "collegiality." As educational leaders, that spirit must be one of our primary, if unstated, goals. By the way, one of those "leadership directions" I mentioned earlier, for my term in office, has been this very goal of building trust. I'm convinced the investment has paid many dividends. (Oops! I slipped into a business metaphor!)

Consider the three benefits of education to society: 1) the acquisition of skills and abilities that lead to earning a livable wage by the individual and provide a needed worker for the economy; 2) the personal and

cultural enrichment of the individual that adds both to the enjoyment of life and to the advancement of civilization; and 3) the production of an educated citizenry that makes good decisions politically and participates vigorously in the community. Even the casual observer can detect that today's productivity movement focuses on #1.

So we must go beyond having a sense of direction rooted in serving students and beyond devoting ourselves to building a collegial environment. We must reclaim the high ground in defining what "success" in education really is. Accountable? Yes, I'm accountable. I'm accountable to my students every day to assure their learning. I'm accountable to my colleagues to deliver the curriculum we have designed to the standards we have set. And it is we who must hold ourselves accountable. If we don't, that external business model will surely be what we will face.

See "Leadership" on Page 3



The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
Bill Scroggins, President; Lee Haggerty, Vice-President
Linda Collins, Secretary; Dennis Smith, Treasurer; Janis Perry, Past President

Publications Committee:

Hoke Simpson, Chair, Grossmont College
Winston Butler, Los Angeles City College
Carolyn Seefor, Diablo Valley College
Van Dees, Golden West College
Elton Hall, Moorpark College

Editor: Julie Adams, Academic Senate

The Rostrum is a publication of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 910 "K" Street, Ste. 300, Sacramento, CA 95814. The Rostrum is distributed to all faculty through college academic senate presidents and by individual mailing. Letters and unsolicited articles by faculty members are invited. For deadline information, call (916) 445-4753, or email us at asccc@ix.netcom.com

2 SenateRostrum

President's Message: Teaching: A Call for Renewal and Rededication (October 1999)

by **Linda Collins**, ASCCC President 1999 - 2001

The community colleges represent the best hope for legions of Californians whose economic fortunes and personal efficacy will rest on their ability to secure ever increasing levels of sophistication with regard to processing information and applying critical judgment in their work and everyday lives. Beyond that, the community colleges are the space for literate public discourse in a multiplicity of communities across the state. The close of the century presents an opportunity for reflection on the state of the community colleges. As we reflect, we cannot but help register concern, even as we turn hopefully toward the future.

At our Fall 1998 Plenary Session, the adopted paper entitled *The Future of California Community Colleges: A Faculty Perspective* (available on our website, www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us). In the paper, the Academic Senate committed itself to a vision of the colleges as teaching institutions par excellence. Re-embracing our teaching mission means re-embracing the teaching profession, broadly defined, and dedicating ourselves to a higher level of professional service to our students. To accomplish those aims, we need to rebuild. Our institutions and our profession are both in need of repair. The largest system of higher education in the nation emerges from this decade among the most underfunded per student. It is staffed by a growing number of part time, adjunct faculty who do not enjoy the protections of due process or tenure. Full-time

faculty teach higher loads to larger classes than in the rest of the nation, (2005 Task Force Report) and carry increasing responsibilities for institutional maintenance as the part-time ranks swell. The system is under attack by a growing number of outside commissions and special bodies who pronounce it inept or dysfunctional, and the system is expected to expand its activities to include welfare reform and economic development. Our colleges are misunderstood by many who see the transfer mission to the exclusion of serving the vast majority of our students who visit us to shore up their job qualifications, attain a certificate in a particular vocational area, or catch up on educational needs unmet at earlier times in their lives. The rehabilitation of our institutions will require leaders whose starting point is pride in our accomplishments, and who build on that pride to inspire confidence in the public, support in the Legislature, and ongoing aspiration for excellence in the colleges themselves.

Our profession, too, is in need of rehabilitation. If we are to replace the mushrooming retirements and expand as well as diversify our ranks to meet the demands of "Tidal Wave II," we will need to attend to teaching as a profession. If we are to draw more people into the profession to serve the coming generations of Californians, both the spirit and the reality of an honored profession must be established. Norton Grubb of UC Berkeley, in his book *Honored but Invisible: An Inside Look at Teaching in Community Colleges* (New

York: Routledge, 1999), notes that while the community colleges were established as teaching colleges, in too many cases there is not much there for teachers. Based on extensive interviews and classroom observations in community colleges (primarily but not only in California) Grubb concludes that institutional support for teaching is absent in the majority of community colleges.

AB1725 envisioned the basis of faculty expertise as twofold: their knowledge as discipline experts and their experience as classroom teachers. While the reform legislation noted that community college faculty were no less in need of intellectual nourishment than their four year partners, that vision of professional development opportunities for faculty remains stalled. The ongoing increases in professional development funds never materialized and have remained woefully low since the inception of the fund in the late 1980's. With barely enough to cover a conference here or there, little attention has been focused, in recent years, on funding the needs of instructors to maintain currency in their disciplines or recency in occupational developments and technologies. Little material support has been available to encourage vibrancy and creativity in curriculum and program design or to enable faculty to be well schooled in pedagogy and the arts of teaching. Without ongoing resources—and time—for academic renewal and opportunities for engaged dialogue and communities of practice centered on teaching, faculty efforts to improve instruction and related services tend to remain episodic and individual, rather than sustained and systemic.

Funds alone, however, will not do the job. We, as faculty, must take the initiative and let ourselves believe, as perhaps we once did when our careers began, that teaching is not an isolated activity, to be mastered through a process of trial and error. We must commit ourselves to the view that to teach is to belong to a community whose members share a common purpose and where there is an ongoing concern with mutual support in the improvement of instruction and related support services. Only if we create a culture of teaching excellence will increased funding make a difference in the quality of what we do.

As Grubb points out, in all too many colleges, where the culture of instructional improvement is absent, the flexible calendar days envisioned in AB1725

have devolved into mandatory flex days involving meaningless and tedious group sermons on the need to produce more with less or harangues by outside consultants on yet some new project which denigrates teaching. Faculty are frequently told to experiment with new approaches to pedagogy and student learning, but, according to Grubb, are rarely supported when these new approaches require more resources. Creating communities of learners in blocked classes, team teaching in interdisciplinary contexts, case management approaches to counseling and student services linked more directly to instruction, more time on task and reading and writing across the curriculum, greater student faculty interaction—all have been linked to enhanced student achievement and satisfaction in the educational literature. But these have in common an increased resource base—more hours of faculty time with fewer students in richer educational contexts.

It is critical that we take advantage of the current opportunities to advocate for the best educational practices. That advocacy must be at both the local and statewide level. Local academic senates have the tools to insist upon the role of informed educational expertise in planning and budgeting processes, in educational program development, program review, and approaches to student preparation and success. Academic senates are responsible for policies and processes for hiring new faculty and for curriculum development and approval processes. Rebuilding our profession means taking hold of these tools to forge better approaches, honed to the diverse educational needs of students and the communities we serve. It means rediscovering the impetus for teaching, that passion that drew us into our fields and convinced us to make the community colleges our institutional homes.

At the state level, the recent establishment of the Joint Committee to Review the Master Plan for Education, including K-12 as well as higher education, provides an opportunity for faculty to articulate a vision of community college education re-centered on our teaching mission and organized to ensure that excellent teaching is the institutional priority of each college and the system as a whole. Moreover, the recent economic recovery provides the possibility of more funding for public education and a window of opportunity to restore and to improve our colleges.

Faculty can take a leadership role in raising the issues and concerns regarding the direction of our colleges. Our concerns are those of our students and of the state as a whole. How can we foster humane and effective education for our students? Engaged teaching requires engaged advocacy—at both the college and the state level. The community college

movement in California has been about noble ends. It's up to each of us to ensure that movement—and its bright promise of a democratic future for ever more Californians—is kept alive and vibrant.

President's Message



Teaching: A Call for Renewal and Rededication

The community colleges represent the best hope for legions of Californians whose economic fortunes and personal efficacy will rest on their ability to secure ever-increasing levels of sophistication with regard to processing information and applying critical judgment in their work and everyday lives. Beyond that, the community colleges are the space for literate public discourse in a multiplicity of communities across the state. The close of the century presents an opportunity for reflection on the state of the community colleges. As we reflect, we cannot but help register concern, even as we turn hopefully toward the future.

At our Fall 1998 Plenary Session, the adopted paper entitled *The Future of California Community Colleges: A Faculty Perspective* (available on our website, www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us). In the paper, the Academic Senate committed itself to a vision of the colleges as teaching institutions *par excellence*. Re-embracing our teaching mission means re-embracing the teaching profession, broadly defined, and dedicating ourselves to a high-

er level of professional service to our students.

To accomplish those aims, we need to rebuild. Our institutions and our profession are both in need of repair. The largest system of higher education in the nation emerges from this decade among the most underfunded per student. It is staffed by a growing number of part-time, adjunct faculty who do not enjoy the protections of due process or tenure. Full-time faculty teach heavier loads to larger classes than in the rest of the nation. (2005 Task Force Report) and carry increasing responsibilities for institutional maintenance as the part-time ranks swell. The system is under attack by a growing number of outside commissions and special bodies who pronounce it inept or dysfunctional, and the system is expected to expand its activities to include welfare reform and economic development. Our colleges are misunderstood by many who see the transfer mission to the exclusion of serving the vast majority of our students who visit us to shore up their job qualifications, attain a certificate in a particular vocation-

al area, or catch up on educational needs unmet at earlier times in their lives. The rehabilitation of our institutions will require leaders whose starting point is pride in our accomplishments, and who build on that pride to inspire confidence in the public, support in the Legislature, and ongoing aspiration for excellence in the colleges themselves.

Our profession, too, is in need of rehabilitation. If we are to replace the mushrooming retirements and expand as well as diversify our ranks to meet the demands of "Tidal Wave II," we will need to attend to teaching as a profession. If we are to draw more people into the profession to serve the coming generations of Californians, both the spirit and the reality of an honored profession must be established. Norton Grubb of UC Berkeley, in his book *Honored but Invisible: An Inside Look at Teaching in Community Colleges* (New York: Routledge, 1999), notes that while the community colleges were established as teaching colleges, in too many cases there is not much there for teachers. Based

See "Teaching" on next page



The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Linda Collins, President; Hoke Simpson, Vice-President
Ellen Ligons, Secretary; Dennis Smith, Treasurer; Bill Scroggins, Past President

Publications Committee:
Mark Snowwhite, Chair, Crafton Hills College
Elton Hall, Moorpark College
Gary Morgan, Oxnard College
Carolyn Seefter, Diablo Valley College
Hoke Simpson, Grossmont College

Editor: Julie Adams, Executive Director, Academic Senate
The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 910 "K" Street, Ste. 300, Sacramento, CA 95814. Letters and unsolicited articles by faculty members are invited. For deadline information, call (916) 445 4753, or email us at asccc@ix.netcom.com

2SenateRostrum

Why the Master Plan Matters

(April 2001)

by **Hoke Simpson**, ASCCC President 2001 - 2003

California's Master Plan for Higher Education is being revised for the third time since its original adoption over forty years ago. Each revision reawakens the hope that the promise of the original Plan will finally be actualized: a tuition free quality college education for every citizen of the state who might benefit from it. The community colleges are at the heart of that hope, but they have never been able fully to deliver. Elitist attitudes and hierarchical thinking have so far consigned the community colleges to third class status in terms of their funding and support. Although the second review of the Plan, published in 1989, explicitly acknowledged this and recommended corrective action, its recommendations were eclipsed by the economic recession of the nineteen nineties. Unfortunately, the work done so far on the current revision suggests that the elitism of the past, now coupled with a tendency toward social engineering and an infatuation with corporate models of management, might once again serve to undermine the hopes of millions of Californians for a better life. On the other hand, the situation may not be hopeless, and there may be something that we can do.

BACKGROUND

The original Master Plan was drafted in 1960 in anticipation of Tidal Wave I, a huge influx of post-World War II baby boomers. The plan was intended to control the development of the public colleges and universities in such a way as to make good on the promise of a free college education for every California citizen. To this end it was decided to expand the community colleges, assigning them the mission of vocational education and the first two years of undergraduate college preparation.

No new University of California or California State University campus would be built until there were sufficient community colleges to handle the high school graduates in the region. Of these, it was determined that UC would admit the top one-eighth, while CSU took the top one-third. The community colleges would be the gateway to postsecondary education for all those others who did not yet qualify for entry into the four-year systems. This was the context for the remark of Clark Kerr, the president of the UC system and a principal architect of the Master Plan, that, "When I was guiding the development of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California in 1959 and 1960, I considered the vast expansion of the community colleges to be the first line of defense for the University of California as an institution of academic renown."¹ Although it is doubtful that he intended it that way, this is certainly an elitist comment, and suggests that the master planners saw themselves as creating not a tripartite postsecondary system of equal partners, but an educational hierarchy. That this perspective has in fact prevailed is evident in the disparate funding of the three segments.²

In 1971 a joint committee of the Legislature was formed to review the Master Plan. Out of the committee's report, issued in 1973, came recommendations and subsequent implementing legislation that, among other things, created student diversity goals aimed at aligning the student community with the demographics of the state; created the California Postsecondary Education Commission to foster coordination among the three

¹ Clark Kerr, "Higher Education: Paradise Lost?" *Higher Education* 7 (Aug. 1978), 267.

² In 1999, the funding per FTES was approximately: Community Colleges \$4,000; California State University \$10,000; and University of California \$15,000.

segments; and led to faculty and student representation on the governing boards of the segments. While the report essentially reaffirmed many of the tenets of the original Master Plan, it rejected the notion that a single master plan was adequate for current, rapidly changing conditions. The principal function to be performed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission was to be that of ongoing long range planning, a function which was subsequently not fully authorized or funded.

The 1960 Master Plan had diverted 50,000 students from UC and CSU to the community colleges when it set their quotas at one-eighth and one-third of high school graduates respectively. The 1973 report recognized that the community colleges had never been compensated for taking on these additional enrollments, and recommended that their percentage of state funding be raised to 45%. (As these were the days prior to the passage of Proposition 13, the community colleges derived the majority of their funding from local property taxes.) The committee's analysis of the original Master Plan revealed, it said, a number of implicit assumptions, among them the view that "the 'best' students should have the greatest range of educational options and should receive the 'best' education (in terms of dollars spent per student and prestige of the institution)."³ The committee was critical of this assumption, and went on to state, "In the past, high status has too readily and simply been accorded the institutions which admitted only the 'best qualified' learners. Perhaps in the future, the quality of education will be measured instead in terms of 'value added.' This would emphasize the process of education and take into account what happens to the student between entrance and graduation."⁴ Clearly, such a "value added" approach would place the community colleges at the qualitative front of the postsecondary pack. Unfortunately, this conclusion was not to be explicitly drawn for another fifteen years, and has yet to make its way into fiscal policy.

GETTING IT RIGHT

In the 1980s, both a citizen's commission and a joint committee of the Legislature were established to undertake a review of the Master Plan. The commission issued two reports: the first, issued in 1986 and focused

exclusively on the community colleges, was titled "The Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community College." This report subsequently formed the basis of much of AB 1725. The second report covered all three segments and was advisory to the work of the legislative joint committee.

The Joint Committee for the Review of the Master Plan was chaired by then Assembly member John Vasconcellos, and in 1989 published its report, "California Faces. California's Future: Education for Citizenship in a Multicultural Democracy." This document is extraordinary in the loftiness of its prose, in the clarity of its vision, and in its sensitivity to the educational aspirations of California's citizens, especially those who are disadvantaged and "at risk." At its heart is a focus on the remarkable racial and ethnic diversity of Californians and a commitment to achieving true equality of educational opportunity for all of the state's citizens.

Especially heartening for faculty is the report's clear grasp of, and respect for, what faculty do as professionals. This passage is typical: "Educational 'quality' means that men and women have grown and prospered intellectually, morally, spiritually. Every teacher who loves the craft of teaching knows that success is elusive, living in the delicate balance between achievements we can measure and those we cannot. And every good teacher is ceaselessly self-critical, constantly searching for ways of bringing learning more alive." This, in fact, is the opening paragraph of a section on "Assessment, Accountability, and Incentive Funding."⁵ In the current political climate, the passage is unusual, both in its recognition that teaching is a qualitative enterprise, and that good teaching is not a product of external incentives.

Most important for our current purpose is the report's recognition of the third-class status and concomitant underfunding accorded the community colleges. The following passages are long, but worth quoting in their entirety, both for their near-perfect statement of our situation as well as for their grasp of why the situation is wrong and how it should be resolved.

³ "Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education." September, 1973, p. 34.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁵ Joint Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, "California Faces California's Future: Education for Citizenship in a Multicultural Democracy." 1989, p. 124.

At present there is a perception of hierarchy between the missions of the three public systems. We regard this notion of hierarchy to be misleading and wrong. Each “segment” plays a vital role in California’s future, and we must afford equal honor to each.

It should be axiomatic that our California Community Colleges are central to the success of California’s entire educational effort, and to the future economic and social wellbeing of California. With hundreds of thousands of Californians enrolled in community college transfer courses, hundreds of thousands in vocational courses, and tens of thousands more in language and skill courses, the community colleges are an integral and indispensable part of California’s economic and social infrastructure. Sadly, this truth is often honored more in the breach than by strong support. There is a bad irony here: the community colleges reach the students with the least privilege, and the state provides them the least resources with which to do their essential work.

The California Community Colleges are the gateway to equity, providing access to top quality lower division transfer and vocational education. Their role as academic institutions of the highest quality makes them the centerpiece of California’s elaborate system of higher education. And, if we honestly look at the broad needs of our state for a literate and trained population, for job skills retraining, English language instruction, remediation, and for open access to academic and vocational work, our California Community Colleges deserve to be fully equal partners in both status and support.⁶

The substance of equity is the guarantee of opportunity and the provision of programs which facilitate the success of a diverse body of students. That is, California’s educational system is truly equitable only if it offers a fair and plausible chance to persons of promise wherever in the system they find themselves. Differences between the quality of the opportunities afforded persons in different institutions are minimized in an equitable system. This was what was envisaged in the original Master Plan, with the idea that California’s Community Colleges would offer lower division instruction equal in quality to that offered by the “senior” systems.

This notion of equal chances afforded students in different segments is only real if there are adequate faculty and staff supports and facilities, programs and curricula throughout the entire system. We must acknowledge that the provision of these elements of quality education is now unequally distributed, that the three public systems offer very different levels of support for very different students. Put bluntly, California expends per capita the most money on those students who are the most privileged.

We might rationalize the differentials in functional terms if it were simply a question of the provision of research facilities for students in the research university. But the differences go far beyond such “functional” differentials. In the areas of student services and counseling, where the neediest students are in community colleges, the state has not provided funds at all equal to those spent in the other systems. In other student support services and academic support facilities (libraries, audiovisual aids, etc.), the community colleges lag far behind the senior systems. In 1984-85, the California Community Colleges received \$262 per ADA “student” for student services, while the California State University and the University of California received, respectively, \$755 and \$982.⁷

The long-term effects of such topsy-turvy differentials in state support are necessarily bad for our state; they continue to widen, rather than narrow, the gap between persons who are advantaged and those who are not. California must reverse the spending gap in a variety of areas if we are to be serious about providing opportunity for the widest number of our students. The Master Plan Commission acknowledged the importance of providing equally for the different systems when it called for studies which would recommend ways to eliminate differences in funding formulas that are not justified by differences in role and mission, and maintain an equitable allocation of state support between the three segments. (MPC Rec. #27, p. 42.)

The implications of this recommendation are profound, for it means that the state must justify differentials on the basis of the instructional mission of the segments. And on this basis, adequately meeting the need

⁷ Notice that the ratios of the allocations for student services are almost identical to those cited earlier for 1999 funding per FTES to each of the three segments. [HS]

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

among students for counseling and tutoring, transfer information and career advice, would entail making equitable the current system in which the richer institutions are systematically provided the most resources. The issue is, obviously, not resolved by taking needed resources from the universities, but through increasing the funding of community college programs to equitable levels.

Equity begins, then, with the state's commitment to make opportunity a reality, by insuring the provision of adequate resources for all three systems of public education.⁸

This is followed by a recommendation from the Joint Committee that CPEC implement a study to "analyze the effect of the differential provision of educational resources between the three systems of higher education, paying particular attention to the effect of such differentials on the opportunities afforded students for access, achievement, and success."⁹

Many of the Joint Committee's recommendations were implemented through subsequent legislation; it is clear that their call for the equitable provision of adequate fiscal resources was not.

GETTING IT WRONG

As noted earlier, the vision of the remarkable document just cited was eclipsed by the economic recession of the early nineteen nineties. It has been replaced by an insistence that institutions of higher education "do more with less," by calls for greater "accountability," by a demand for greater "efficiency" and "productivity," and by the view that our institutions need to "reinvent" themselves using a corporate model. The visionaries have been replaced by the bean counters.

This attitude has surfaced in a series of documents published since the early nineties. An early example is a draft report from the Assembly Committee on Higher Education entitled, "Master Plan for Higher Education

Equity begins, then, with the state's commitment to make opportunity a reality, by insuring the provision of adequate resources for all three systems of public education.

in Focus."¹⁰ The consultant who prepared the report was Christopher Cabaldon, who is currently a Vice Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

Cabaldon says that his intent is to focus on the Master Plan in the light of the new context of fiscal austerity. "The present state of access and quality," Cabaldon writes, "has drifted so far from the Master Plan's objectives and values that California could hardly have done greater harm had it set out to do so."¹¹ However, the "providers" of education are part of the problem, not the solution, because, for them, "quality is defined in terms of specific, predetermined, immutable inputs (e.g. funding, salaries, library volumes, and faculty/student ratios) and perceived prestige rather than in defined outcomes for students and the broader society."¹² Notice the shift from the "California Faces" document, which began with the premise that assessment and accountability would have to be measured qualitatively as well as quantitatively. In Cabaldon's brave new world, only counting counts. And how foolish of faculty to suppose that a quality education depends in any measure on adequate salaries, libraries, and God forbid!-a hard earned reputation for excellence.

The solution, says Cabaldon, is a "new covenant" in which "our colleges and universities share in the cost containment and bureaucratic downsizing that most large corporations began implementing in the late

⁸ *Joint Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, op. cit., pp. 62-63.*

⁹ *Ibid., p. 63.*

¹⁰ *Assembly Committee on Higher Education, "Master Plan for Higher Education in Focus." April, 1993.*

¹¹ *Ibid., p. 3.*

¹² *Ibid., p. 3.*

1980's. We must reinvent our higher education system, and the people of California [must] reinvest the will and the funding for a new higher education system.”¹³

This is astounding logic: the funding system is broken, so we must fix the educational system. Is the educational system broken? No one has said that it is, yet this is the underlying premise of Cabaldon's work. The unspoken and patently mistaken assumption is that we are not getting the funds because we're not doing a good job. When money is tight, education is an easy target. Perhaps this is a reflection of our cultural ambivalence toward intellectual work. Regardless, there is no evidence to support Cabaldon's implicit notion that funding was a direct reflection of educational quality.

Cabaldon maintains that “California higher education must do better with less.”¹⁴ Unconcerned with the inequitable distribution of resources, he sees this instead as the occasion for heightened efficiency and productivity. “The state,” he writes, “can provide lower division education to 150 students at community colleges for the same investment required to educate 100 students at one of the public universities,”¹⁵ so students should be systematically “redirected” from UC and CSU to the CCs. Forget questions of equity and the promise of equal quality in all the segments. Cabaldon is willing to trade quality for efficiency and productivity at every turn. We should consider, he says, “a more focused baccalaureate degree using a three year, rather than a four-year framework.”¹⁶ And further, “While we do not support a wholesale shift of courses to lecture format with several hundred students in each class, we urge CSU and the community colleges to include in their multiyear capital outlay plans the construction of large lecture halls.”¹⁷

Whereas the earlier Master Plan review exhibits compassion for those students struggling to get an education in the face of Herculean obstacles, and who are frequently forced to drop out of their classes, the Cabaldon document exhibits only impatience. he high attrition rate doubles the cost of producing each

13 *Ibid.*, p. 5.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 34.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

16 *Ibid.*, p. 17.

17 *Ibid.*, p.32.

college graduate, limiting the resources available to provide educational opportunity to more [deserving] Californians.”¹⁸

This insensitivity to the plight of millions of community college students and the public mission of the community colleges is compounded in a more recent report by the Little Hoover Commission, “Open Doors and Open Minds: Improving Access and Quality in California's Community Colleges,” published in April, 2000. The Hoover Commission's report combines a passion for productivity with a strident elitism. For students who drop out and re-enter, or who take courses outside of their “educational plans,” the Hoover Commission recommends penalizing them with higher fees.¹⁹ It recommends restructuring community college curricula around the specific skill sets needed by local industries, giving no attention to whether this would actually benefit students, but focusing only on the obvious benefits to industry, and hence to the state's economy.²⁰ The Commission holds up National University and a similar private school in Colorado as models the community colleges would do well to emulate when structuring their calendars and their course offerings.²¹ Finally, the Commission notes that “Community college representatives frequently criticize the disparity in per student funding between the community colleges, UC and CSU,” and it provides a table showing the disparity.²² The Commission remains silent on the unequal distribution of resources, however, and criticizes the funding system on the ground that it is not tied to performance outcomes and thus provides no financial incentives for the community colleges to provide a quality product.

It is clear that the Little Hoover Commission does not see community college students as deserving of the same level of opportunity as their four-year counterparts, but rather as potential members of a non-mobile workforce,

18 *Ibid.*, p. 13.

19 Little Hoover Commission, “Open Doors and Open Minds: Improving Access and Quality in California's Community Colleges. March, 2000, pp. 49-51, 57, 67.

20 *Ibid.*, pp. xii-xiv, 1, 54-58, 76.

21 *Ibid.*, p.46. *Whatever the reality may be, there is no doubt that NU and similar schools, such as the University of Phoenix, are regarded in “legitimate” academic circles as offering degrees for sale. It is inconceivable that the Little Hoover Commission would make a similar recommendation to the University of California*

22 *Ibid.*, p. 61.

servicing the entry level needs of local industry, and facing a future that has been systematically diminished by a delimited education. Whereas the “California Faces” document emphasized the key role of education in realizing the full human potential of every student, the Little Hoover Commission focuses on using community college students to realize the economic potential of local industries. This is a significant difference of perspective.

The Little Hoover report appears to have had a significant impact on the current efforts of the Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education Kindergarten through University. Senator Dede Alpert is chair of the Joint Committee, and a list of questions sent from the Joint Committee over Senator Alpert’s signature, requesting input from the Academic Senate and other community college faculty organizations, was strongly redolent of the Hoover Commission’s criticisms of the community colleges. Furthermore, the work to date of the Joint Committee staff has exhibited the same bean counting, cookie cutter, punitive approach to dealing with education as found in the Cabaldon and Hoover Commission documents. In its first publication, “Framework to Develop a Master Plan for Education,” the Committee staff calls for “a more cohesive system of education,” which promises an “efficient and responsive delivery” of educational services, and that will “allow clear lines of accountability.” “The state,” they say, “must define the performance levels that comprise a high quality education,” and “.must develop assessments that measure students’ knowledge, pursuant to standards. Assessments must be consolidated,” and “Institutions, educators, and students must be held accountable for successful learning. Incentives should be provided for improvement in student learning, and sanctions should be imposed when learning does not occur.”²³

How different this is from the 1989 Master Plan review, “California Faces,” which tells us that “Educational ‘quality’ means that men and women have grown and prospered intellectually, morally, spiritually.”²⁴ How different also, from the “overarching ideal” expressed in the Academic Senate paper, “The Future

of the Community College: A Faculty Perspective,” that “community colleges should offer the sort of instruction that is maximally productive of humane values and which contributes toward students becoming informed, compassionate and productive members of their communities. The faculty believe,” the Senate paper goes on to say, “.that democracy requires an educated citizenry, literate people who are capable of making informed choices, and that the development of such citizens should be the primary task of a ‘democratic’ educational system.”²⁵ The Senate paper concludes that education “is essentially a process in which human beings are created,” or “in which their potential as human beings is actualized.” “The true quality of the educational experience,” then, “is maximized when what is learned is how to be more fully human.”²⁶

Recently, in an e-mail to prospective participants in a Joint Committee hearing on educational quality, Joint Committee staff framed the upcoming discussion in a document titled “Notes on Defining a High Quality Education for All Students.” There, the staff suggests that a quality education will be defined as “an essential ‘foundational set of knowledge and skills’ that all learners should master.” Determining that these “knowledge and skills sets” have been mastered will of course, be the objective of the “consolidated assessments,” proposed in the Committee’s “Framework” document, and assuring that they are efficiently and responsively delivered will be the goal of appropriate “incentives” and “sanctions.” In sum, it seems not too strong to say that the Joint Committee staff seems somewhat obsessed with the oxymoronic task of defining ‘quality’ quantitatively.

One troubling feature of the Joint Committee’s work so far is that staffers seem already to have made up their minds about the final goals that the Master Plan should adopt. While they are only now beginning to hold hearings, and are forming “citizens’ workgroups” to examine the areas of concern defined in the “Framework,” it appears that the only point of these activities will be to work out the details of implementing the Joint Committee staff’s foregone conclusions. The

23 *The Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education Kindergarten through University, “Framework to Develop a Master Plan for Education.”* August, 2000, pp. 3-5.

24 *Joint Committee for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, op. cit., p. 124.*

25 *The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, “The Future of the Community College: A Faculty Perspective.”* Adopted Fall, 1998, p. 5.

26 *Ibid., p. 17.*

e-mailed “Notes on Defining a High Quality Education for All Students” is an example: rather than an invitation to an open discussion of the meaning of ‘educational quality,’ this document is designed to coerce the discussion into preordained channels, and to preempt voices, such as that of the Academic Senate, which might seek to define ‘quality’ qualitatively. Strong direction from the legislators on the Joint Committee is needed if voices beyond those of the staff are genuinely to be heard. One hopes the legislators are up to the task.

Finally, perhaps the most disturbing feature of the Little Hoover Commission report was its willingness to walk right up to the edge of autocratic social engineering bent on reducing students’ options in order to channel them into occupational paths that serve the interests of industry and “the State.” Unhappily, a similar tendency is evident in the work of the Joint Committee, or of its staff. The truncated, lockstep vision of education that emerges in the “Framework,” coupled with the recommendation that business and industry leaders be invited to help set the research agendas of the public colleges and universities in order to achieve “state priorities;”²⁷ demonstrates a proclivity to view the public system of education, and those it educates, as serving industry and the State. Absent is any recognition that education serves a free society to the degree that it expands human options and facilitates a potential for individuals to grow.

WHAT WE CAN DO

The Academic Senate does not believe that the community college system needs to be “reengineered” to be efficient, productive, and to attain high standards. Rather, it is clear that there has never been a more efficient or productive segment of education than ours, and that the quality of instruction and support offered by California community college faculty is unparalleled. Of course we always strive toward improvement; but monolithic assessment instruments and fiscal incentives and sanctions are not what we require. The only thing lacking in the California community colleges that could empower them to meet the hopes and expectations of the Legislature and of California’s citizens is funding.

²⁷ *The Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education Kindergarten through University, “Framework to Develop a Master Plan for Education.” August, 2000, p. 31.*

We certainly have the will and the skill to become the sorts of institutions that do not allow students to fail. What we lack are adequate financial resources.

Yet the current efforts to create a new Master Plan are focused on “doing more with less.” Christopher Cabaldon is still out there telling the Joint Committee that you can educate 150 students at the community colleges for what it takes to educate 100 students at the four-year schools a boast that seems designed to lock the community colleges into their state of chronic underfunding, in the name of efficiency.

At the 2000 Fall Plenary Session, the Academic Senate adopted a resolution calling on the Joint Committee to acknowledge the community colleges as equal partners in California’s system of postsecondary education, and recommending that we be funded at a level at least equal to that of the other postsecondary segments (Resolution 6.08 F00). At the 2001 Spring Plenary Session, the Executive Committee will sponsor a resolution reaffirming the call for equitable funding and urging the Joint Committee to adopt the 1989 review as a model in its own efforts.

In the meantime, local senates are encouraged to pass their own resolutions urging the Joint Committee in this direction. Use your resolutions to let the legislators know both what you are doing at your college to ensure student success, and what more you could do if full funding were available. Once it has been passed by your senate, e-mail a copy of your resolution to the Senate Office and President Collins will present it to the Joint Committee. If you need help drafting a resolution, contact your representative on the Relations with Local Senates Committee (email addresses are available on the senate’s website).

The Master Plan of 1960 has shaped the destiny of the community colleges in this state for the past forty years. With the current effort, we have the opportunity to move beyond our third-class fiscal status into full partnership with the other postsecondary segments. What is perfectly clear, however, is that this will not happen without concerted effort on our part, and it might not happen even then. But we would be derelict were we not to try. Let your legislators hear from your senate.

Valuing Diversity

(October 2002)

by Hoke Simpson, ASCCC President 2001 - 2003

I will never forget my interview for the job I still hold, 33 years later, as an instructor of philosophy at Grossmont College. I sat in a room with the president and vice president of the college and, for more than two hours, engaged in a heated discussion about teaching.¹ Employing a variation of McLuhan's "medium is the message," I argued that the principal lesson taught in traditional college classes was that students should sit still and do what they're told, that this lesson was the same no matter what the nominal subject matter of the course, and that the primary function of college, therefore, was that of quashing any tendencies to uniqueness and turning out docile citizens who would dependably function within a limited range of social normalcy. Whatever I did in my classes, I assured them, would be designed to undermine and subvert this oppressive tradition. My students might or might not learn much about philosophy, but they would sure as hell learn what college was designed to do to them, and they'd learn a great deal about how to fight it. My interlocutors argued, with equal vehemence, that my attitude was irresponsible both to my discipline and my students.

They hired me the next day.

For the next few years, I engaged in what might be generously characterized as "cutting edge, experimental, non-directive" teaching, until it gradually dawned on me (1) that what my students were learning seemed to be that my classes were an easy 'A' if only they were willing

to show up and emote, and (2) that my own traditional education had not left me feeling or acting particularly oppressed. (I know, we might argue that it was precisely that oppressive tradition that was the cause of my slow epiphany but to go there would only prove, again, that the intellect can be a tool of masochism.) My teaching, as a result, eventually worked its way to within the bounds of the normal. In the meantime, the senior members of my department, to their credit, protected me from subsequent administrations, less sympathetic to my need to experiment.

It was not until 11 or 12 years later that I was asked to serve on a hiring committee myself, and was first exposed to the system that is still with us today. The hire was in the department of Computer Science and Information Systems, in which I was, by then, teaching part of my full-time load. Because of my peripheral role in the department, I was not involved in the paper screening or in the preparation of the interview questions, but was only asked to participate in the interviews themselves. Prior to the first interview, committee members were handed a sheet of prepared questions, it was decided who would read which of them to the candidates, and the interviews began. I found the process appalling. Both interviewers and interviewees were stripped of their humanity and required to engage in a stilted simulacrum of communication. It was as though authenticity had been banned from the room. No one in this process was encouraged to be themselves: the interviewers were required to be "neutral" in their responses; and the candidates were required to pour themselves into the mold constituted by the predictable, insipid, systematically inoffensive questions.

¹ I had already met with the faculty; the "interview" lasted ten minutes. My first year was to be as a sabbatical leave replacement, and they had clearly already determined to offer me the job based on my recommendations from graduate school.

The top finalist was, of course, predictable, insipid, and systematically inoffensive (until she was hired). The best candidate, in my view, was one who was least able to contain herself within this process; she kept verging on breaking out and being herself. In this context, though, she was perceived as “weird” and slightly dangerous which, of course, she was. Each flash of authenticity threatened to explode the process, to reflect it back on itself and reduce it to a heap of embarrassed rubble.

The interviews completed, I went to the dean and expressed my dismay at what had come to pass in our hiring procedures. The contrast, I pointed out, between this recent, Kafkaesque experience and my own hiring interview could not have been more stark. The people interviewing me wanted to know who I was, and genuinely encouraged me to show them what I was made of. And they, in turn, did not hesitate to convey to me their own deeply held convictions. The result was an impassioned dialogue that left me feeling that this place was one where I truly wanted to work. I could not imagine a candidate feeling that way about our college as the result of the interviews we had just conducted. In fact, if I wanted to communicate that our college was a haven for those who were most comfortable when repressing their humanity, seeking others equally at ease with a denial of their personhood a community, in other words, of crazy people I could find no better way to do it than through the process we had just engaged in.

That meeting with the dean was the beginning of what has been a 20 year effort to inject humanity into a process that has become the norm in the California Community College system. I am now convinced that the effort should be abandoned, and with it the process itself.

What has brought me to this point is a series of reflections on the “crisis” in our hiring policy brought about by the Third Appellate Court ruling on Proposition 209 in the Connerly case. By striking down the statutes and regulations governing affirmative action, the court is seen to have struck a blow to efforts to achieve diversity within the community colleges, and to have presented us with the challenge of achieving diversity through other means. To accept that challenge is to seek to identify the obstacles to achieving diversity, and then to find ways to overcome them.

Whatever else Ward Connerly and Proposition 209 have done, they have not robbed us of the tools sufficient to achieving our goal. That much at least is clear from the dismal record of our progress. If we are going to think anew about how to diversify our faculty and staff, then, we need to move beyond the desire for new regulations to replace those struck down, and begin with the as yet unanswered questions: What has kept us from getting there so far? and, once the obstacles are identified, how do we overcome them?

One obvious place to look for the impediments to diversity is at the attitudes of those serving on the hiring committees. Are they pro or con, actively seeking to hire diverse candidates, or actively or passively resisting? My own experience on hiring committees in my district suggests that this is a genuine source of our problems. And my experience as a human being living in America also suggests that these attitudes are heartbreakingly difficult to change. We must continue to try, and we must eventually succeed if we are to succeed as a civilized nation; but we cannot hang our hopes of achieving diversity in our ranks in the short term on changing peoples’ hearts.

We can, however, change the process which seems as though it were designed, however unconsciously, to give comfort to the opponents of diversity and to silence its advocates. The process I have described above, the one we have all employed for decades and which we take for granted in all of our discussions, is one which does just that. I have no doubt that the process was designed by well-intentioned people to promote fairness and to eliminate bias and cronyism in hiring. The process is fatally flawed where diversity is concerned, however, for it identifies “fairness” with “uniformity” or sameness, whereas to celebrate diversity is to embrace variety or difference. From the interviewer’s perspective, even those who might champion diversity are shut down, for this process allows no championing, no overt encouragement nor overt challenge. From the candidate’s perspective, we must recognize that in hiring procedures the medium truly is the message, and our process screams “No variety wanted here!”

So, if we abandon our current way of doing things, identifying it accurately as a major obstacle to the achievement of diversity, what do we do instead? We invite candidates to lunch or to dinner, we sit down

with them and engage them in serious discussion, we challenge them to show us what they're really about, and we let them see who we are as well. And, sure, we have them teach a real class of real students and we don't worry that they aren't the same students for each candidate or that each candidate might teach a different topic. In short we treat candidates and ourselves like human beings interested in discovering if they want to be one another's colleagues for the next thirty years.²

But how can we guarantee fairness in such circumstances or, beyond that, ensure that we don't just choose as colleagues those who are most like ourselves? Short of absolute guarantees, we can, in fact, do a great many things to promote fairness and the championing of diversity. We can ask that every academic senate form a committee on hiring and diversity, and that this committee establish, with the full support of the administration, a training program for all members of hiring committees. We can ask that such programs seek, in the words of a recently adopted Academic Senate paper, to convey a sense of the educational, vocational, and social value to students and the campus community of a rich variety of backgrounds and perspectives among its members; reduce trainees' fear of, and induce a positive appreciation of, cultural differences; communicate clearly that discrimination based on cultural and racial difference is wrong, and illustrate the damage social, socioeconomic, and psychological that has occurred as a result of discriminatory practices; communicate the importance of campuses becoming cultural models for students: that, by providing an environment which honors diversity and is free of prejudice, the college can produce in students attitudes that will contribute to the elimination of bigotry in the larger community; provide trainees with specific strategies and techniques for promoting inclusiveness in job descriptions, advertising, paper screening, and interviews, as well as eliminating unintended exclusiveness; [and] persuade trainees that good hiring practice demands reaching the broadest pool of potential candidates and hiring the candidate who will be the greatest asset to students and

the campus community.³ We can ask, as some colleges already do, that no one be permitted to serve on a hiring committee unless they have undergone training, and that there be a requirement that all potential committee members be "re-certified" on a regular basis. And we can ensure adherence to this policy by having the academic senate make all appointments to hiring committees in consultation with discipline faculty. Our aim would be, in part, that those who are frightened by their own humanity, who, that is, are afraid of difference, would either get over it or self-select themselves out of what they perceived as an onerous process.

We can charge academic senates with the development and oversight of part-time hiring policies that ensure the same level of professional consideration as is accorded to full-time hires.

We can ask academic senates to take the lead in initiating and sustaining internship programs, such as the SDICCCA program in San Diego.

I am not suggesting for a moment that the process under which I was hired 33 years ago be taken for a model. In fact, in almost everything but the interview, that process was deeply flawed. We have indeed come a long way since then in terms of our awareness of the value of diversity and of the factors that contribute to our achieving a more diverse faculty. But we have also made some mistakes, mistakes that I believe impede the achievement of our goal.

In conclusion, the Third Appellate Court ruling did not revoke section 87360 (b) of the California Education Code, the section that makes faculty hiring policies the product of joint agreement between academic senates and their governing boards. Those policies must now be reconstituted in the light of the Connerly decision. I am suggesting that academic senates must take responsibility for realizing the value of diversity in their own ranks, and that this might best be accomplished by first removing the straitjacket that identifies fairness with uniformity, and replacing it with an open process that permits diverse candidates and the champions of diversity among the faculty to affirm the value of human variety and difference.

² *As far as I have been able to determine, there are no legal obstacles to such an "opening up" of our interview procedures. In fact, interviews in the UC system appear to be conducted in much the fashion that I have described. The rigidity of our own procedures seems to be grounded primarily in a fear of lawsuits.*

³ *A Re-examination of Faculty Hiring Processes and Procedures. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, adopted Fall 2000.*

OCTOBER 2002

ROSENSTRUM

ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES NEWSLETTER

Valuing Diversity

by Hoke Simpson, President

I will never forget my interview for the job I still hold, 33 years later, as an instructor of philosophy at Grossmont College. I sat in a room with the president and vice president of the college and, for more than two hours, engaged in a heated discussion about teaching.¹ Employing a variation of McLuhan's "medium is the message," I argued that the principal lesson taught in traditional college classes was that students should sit still and do what they're told, that this lesson was the same no matter what the nominal subject matter of the course, and that the primary function of college, therefore, was that of quashing any tendencies to uniqueness and turning out docile citizens who would dependably function within a limited range of social normalcy. Whatever I did in my classes, I assured them, would be designed to undermine and subvert this oppressive tradition. My students might or might not learn much about philosophy, but they would sure as hell learn what college was designed to do to them, and they'd learn a great deal about how to fight it. My interlocutors argued, with equal vehemence, that my attitude was irresponsible both to my discipline and my students.

¹ I had already met with the faculty; the "interview" lasted ten minutes. My first year was to be as a sabbatical leave replacement, and they had clearly already determined to offer me the job based on my recommendations from graduate school.

They hired me the next day.

For the next few years, I engaged in what might be generously characterized as "cutting-edge, experimental, non-directive" teaching, until it gradually dawned on me (1) that what my students were learning seemed to be that my classes were an easy 'A' if only they were willing to show up and emote, and (2) that my own traditional education had not left me feeling or acting particularly oppressed. (I know, we might argue that it was precisely that oppressive tradition that was the cause of my slow epiphany—but to go there would only prove, again, that the intellect can be a tool of masochism.) My teaching, as a result, eventually worked its way to within the bounds of the normal. In the meantime, the senior members of my department, to their credit, protected me from subsequent administrations, less sympathetic to my need to experiment.

It was not until 11 or 12 years later that I was asked to serve on a hiring committee myself, and was first exposed to the system that is still with us today. The hire was in the department of Computer Science and Information Systems, in which I was, by then, teaching part of my full-time load. Because of my peripheral role in the department, I was not involved in the paper screening or in the preparation of

the interview questions, but was only asked to participate in the interviews themselves. Prior to the first interview, committee members were handed a sheet of prepared questions, it was decided who would read which of them to the candidates, and the interviews began. I found the process appalling. Both interviewers and interviewees were stripped of their humanity and required to engage in a stilted simulacrum of communication. It was as though authenticity had been banned from the room. No one in this process was encouraged to be themselves: the interviewers were required to be

Valuing Diversity	1
French Fries, Funding, and Student Success: Occasions for Unity	2
Information Competency: Moving Ahead Despite	3
If I Have to Explain, You Wouldn't Understand	6
Vigilance and Self-Defense: The Local Senate's Response to Crisis.	10
Vocational Faculty—What's Happening?	12
Local Senates	13
The Accountability Game	14

CONTINUED ON PAGE 4

Integrity of Process: On the One Hand

(December 2004)

by **Kate Clark**, ASCCC President 2003 - 2005

Faculty are perennially perplexed when changes in policies or procedures (or their implementation) suddenly occur. Abrupt changes in administrative hiring practices—mid-hire; newly announced processes for determining a college budget; unilateral changes in educational masterplans without prior discussion among governance groups; radical alterations of organizational structures, whether or not they are deemed to affect faculty roles, without discussion among those being impacted these are all impositions of will or power that cause faculty to take note, to sit up in alarm or furor, to become defensive about the status quo, not necessarily because of their adherence to the familiar but because of a lack of attention to process—due, deliberate, transparent process.

The questions then become, “Do we continue to participate, when the failure to consult has led to abandoning the fair and agreed upon process? Do we contribute to the decimation of process with our participation? Or do we retreat from our responsibilities because it might be seen as acceding to a flawed process? Cooperation or cooption? Collaboration or capitulation?”

While I am not a moral relativist, I also have been very honest with those who directed inquiries to me: circumstances and local cultures of governance may determine how faculty respond. And regardless of my personal views, on behalf of the Academic Senate, I honor the individual decisions of local senates—so long as those determinations were reached after an open, full consultation with effected members and a fidelity to each senate’s own established processes for reaching decisions. Local faculty, however, are not alone; at the

state level, we too grapple with similar process issues on topics from A to Z, or at least A to V. Others seek our cooperation and our collaboration on matters affecting us all, within processes sometimes not of our own making. See for yourselves.

Accountability: Last-minute legislation (AB 1417) requires our community college system—and that includes faculty representatives—to “design a workable structure for the annual evaluation of district-level performance in meeting statewide educational outcome priorities.” This plan is due March 25, 2005. Yet in September, Governor Schwarzenegger vetoed SB 1331 that offered the sort of professional, defensible accountability faculty would consider; that bill had been weighed by intersegmental faculty through the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) and reflected on by Consultation and the Board of Governors. Instead, the Governor’s veto message calls “for outcomes, such as performance based measures, historically associated with accountability systems.”

Nevertheless, the AB 1417 legislation before us now requires a speedy response. Briefly, the Chancellor has directed Vice-Chancellor Patrick Perry to oversee the following phases: (1) the Research and Planning (RP) Group’s Center for Student Success is contracted to suggest a variety of metrics and models for discussion; (2) an oversight committee of five (including two faculty appointed by the Academic Senate) will provide a general framework by which accountability scenarios must be developed and will provide general oversight to the work of the RP contractors; (3) a panel of external experts (called for by the legislation) will also review the RP work and comment upon the suggestions; (4) Constituent feedback through Consultation will

ultimately help shape the final recommendations to be adopted at the Board of Governors' March meeting.

On the one hand: We do not believe that the Legislature, the Administration and the Department of Finance are best positioned to determine appropriate "accountability" measures for our multitude of community colleges and their diverse missions, adopted in response to local needs. Further, we fear that a single "structure" could either become so broad as to be meaningless or too narrow to reflect the diversity of educational missions-which may vary significantly even within a single district. We fear that this legislative demand places faculty, students, and districts atop a very dangerous precipice.

On the other hand: Faculty at both the state and local levels determine "standards regarding student preparation and success" as provided for in Title 5 53200. As with accreditation standards, we must ensure that good practices are recognized, while other districts are ultimately aided-not punished-when measured against any uniform "structure" that provides "for the annual evaluation of districts." While the Academic Senate will no doubt call upon you for timely comment as the RP group's ideas and proposals emerge, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges represents you in these discussions.

Accreditation: This subject is clearly related to the prior topic, wherein external forces seem to dictate "appropriate measurements" of student and institutional success. Your emails, phone calls, and requests for technical assistance confirm that community college faculty continue to wrestle with the 2002 Accreditation Standards. To provide local senates with greater understanding and options, the plenary body this fall adopted a paper, a "toolkit," that offers the context for Academic Senate positions, provides useful information for faculty seizing control of the accreditation process.

In presentations and workshops sponsored by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) and by the community college RP Group (professional researchers' organization), faculty are presented with confounding strategies: quantitative data must drive the learning objectives movement,

but qualitative evidence should not be abandoned; the outcomes movement is a "long-needed corrective to the measurement of `inputs,'" but outcomes should be assessed only if all students have had access to elements that contribute to their success-in other words, the "input" measurements regarding library or tutorial offerings, base funding, full-time faculty ratios, attention to scheduling, part-time faculty availability in compensated office hours, and counselor-to student ratios do matter, if all students are to have access to their own success.

Multiple resolutions adopted at prior plenary sessions propose faculty actions ranging from withdrawing from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, (WASC), to discontinuing active participation on teams or self-studies, to ignoring the contradictory terms used by ACCJC, including "student learning outcomes vs. "learning objectives."

On the one hand: To date, ACCJC has been unresponsive to Academic Senate requests for research supporting their contention that faculty time and energy spent on their required measurements of student learning actually result in improved student learning; faculty continue to withdraw from membership on visiting teams; and new, untenured faculty or seasoned accreditation veterans with little service to their local senates are hand-picked and nominated by their college administrators to serve on visiting teams.

On the other hand: We need caring and knowledgeable faculty who can bring a judicious eye simultaneously to both the standards of excellence a college exhibits and to the accrediting process itself. Faculty are best positioned to resist meaningless measurement mechanisms and define learning objectives. We will

Faculty at both the state
and local levels determine
"standards regarding
student preparation
and success"

continue our efforts to meet with the Executive Director and staff from ACCJC to discuss your residual concerns; the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges represents you in these discussions.

Curriculum: Years of discussions among faculty and vice-presidents of instruction produced visions of a less cumbersome program approval processes. The Agency Review, commissioned by the Chancellor made similar recommendations urging the Chancellor's Office to "evolve from a focus on approval to one of leadership, technical support, and arbitration, when districts and regions need intervention. The Curricular Issues Advisory Committee should identify the issues and suggest timelines in making the transition to a regionally based approach" (Aspirations for Excellence: A Review of the System Office for the California Community Colleges, p. 15, and Appendix D). Such a group is now at work considering mechanisms to fulfill these recommendations; it includes four faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate to represent the broad interests of occupational and transfer faculty, classroom based and technology mediated instruction, as well as urban and rural, large and small institutions.

On the one hand: Faculty decisions and local approval processes have long been second guessed with no ability for appeal to practitioners most likely to understand a program's intention. Districts and colleges are best served by technical assistance, not unilateral denials. Curriculum is a faculty-driven matter. Period.

On the other hand: Moving toward a more localized mechanism requires additional training, funding for travel, and reassigned time for the regional faculty participants. Faculty have often complained about their exclusion from various existing regional consortia, about their inability to teach and meet with the regional deans who at present dominate such groups. I repeat: Curriculum is a faculty-driven matter. Period. Clearly, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges represents you now in these discussions.

Full-time/Part-time Ratios: Marty Hittleman annually presents the Board of Governors with a chart detailing the system's overall (lack of) progress toward the 75:25 ratio. This year, as noted in the November President's Update, Board Member Rich Leib asked, "Why?" In response, the Chancellor is convening a task force to

examine the matter. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges will represent you in these discussions, to be completed by March.

Student Fees: The Board of Governors hopes soon to adopt a policy on "reasonable" student fees. On the one hand: Faculty have long opposed student fees, and our recently adopted paper provides a justification for our pervasive view. Members of the Board may be amenable to "reasonable" fees moving downward rather than upward, but the Academic Senate must broadly share data and arguments in support of 25 years' worth of opposition to fees.

On the other hand: Some sitting board members have called opposition to fees "nave," and "unrealistic." Even student representatives of their organizations proclaim support for student fees, though preferably lowered fees. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges represents your adopted views in these debates.

Testing and Matriculation Assessment: Various legislative forays have asked the system to examine a single assessment/placement/exemption test to be administered to all California high school students. The RP group asked that the system undertake a review of the current matriculation assessment validation process as well as the course prerequisite validation requirements. After a finding that this was an academic and professional matter, the Academic Senate devised a mechanism to respond to this interest. A fact-finding group including representatives of the Vice-Presidents of Instruction, the Vice-Presidents of Student Services, and the Academic Senate has begun its work on the former request; their findings and any recommendations will be shared widely-especially at the Academic Senate's Spring Plenary Session, April 7-9-before the final report is submitted to the Consultation Council in Spring 2005.

On the one hand: In the 18 years since matriculation assessment was integrated into our college offerings for students' success, its efficacy has not been examined; it is certainly an apt moment to do so. It also provides an opportunity to educate others about the function of matriculation assessment.

On the other hand: The use of single, high-stakes tests is at odds with existing Title 5 and good practice. Most advocates of such a test, for use by all segments of

California higher education, do not fully understand the different uses of such examinations such as the CSU-augmented California Standards-Based test, nor the value of multiple measures. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges effectively represents you in these discussions and on the fact-finding team.

Textbooks: Faculty groups have agreed to meet with CalSACC-Student Senate representatives to discuss strategies that might make textbook acquisition more economically feasible. The Educational Policies Committee will soon be presenting us with a paper on related issues concerning textbook selection and, as is reported elsewhere in this Rostrum, is exploring both a range of options and the possible consequences those options would have for our students and our shared scholarly efforts. We seek answers while we continue to assert principles of academic freedom.

On the one hand: We recognize that the cost of books can be prohibitive for attending students, that students' sharing of books may leave some readers unprepared or without access to their books in class or at crucial study times, and that some seemingly obvious solutions have proven unworkable on a large scale. We also know the value of putting our textbooks on reserve, or of donating our examination copies for use by students. We know we care.

On the other hand: We acknowledge the limitations of legislation to control the free market system. Most significantly, we retain our rights as faculty to determine the best educational materials for our students, without interference by local administrators or legislators who seek to control textbook selection or limit when we could renew or refresh our selected supporting materials. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges willingly represents you in these discussions with students and other interested parties.

Vocational ESL: Current law requires colleges who receive CalWORKs funds to submit a vocational plan for their recipients. SB 1639 now requires that plan to include "intensive English language immersion"; if funds are provided, colleges are required "to redesign basic education and ESL classes so that they may be integrated with vocational training programs." This is a curricular matter that must remain in the hands of local faculty.

On the one hand: we concur with legislative findings that students with English language literacy are more likely to achieve greater social and financial success. We also believe that the conversations that counselors and support staff in such programs undertake with discipline faculty positively contribute to their students' achievements.

On the other hand: While discussions about how to improve the linguistic fluency of CalWORKs students are valuable under any circumstance, curricular changes must be made within the context of students' entire educational experience and not merely offer a "quick-fix" for employers. The universal mandate for compliance by all colleges presumes there are such linguistic needs on all campuses in all sections of the state. We continue to resist the imposition of curricular changes or mandates through legislation. And significantly, while planning for such implementation may not require significant investment, the actual implementation of VESL courses or modules seems to be an unfunded mandate that may well require colleges to hire new faculty or develop new programs or courses beyond the scope of their current educational master plan. I can assure you that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges will represent you in any statewide discussion of this matter.

Thus, you have seen glimpses of our responses to these matters. Our views are based on adopted resolutions, earlier precedents, and common sense. In the coming months prior to our next session, we will doubtless call upon you to help us evaluate comments, proposals, responses offered forth in these eight areas; I trust you will respond and will weigh the multiple perspectives that emerge. Our aim is to preserve reasonable process, to assert our delegated authority where appropriate, and to respond with alacrity. As with local conundrums, you will observe that it's too often a matter of "on the one hand but on the other hand."

The Forgotten Ones: Whom Do We Represent?

(May 2005)

by Jane Patton, ASCCC President 2009 - 20011

At the recent Spring 2005 Plenary Session, the Occupational Education Committee sponsored a breakout titled “The Forgotten Ones: Whom Do You Represent?” The premise for discussion was that often on our campuses, certain programs and services can be left out of campus discussions, because they are unique in their needs, because they are smaller programs or because the representatives at the table are not informed about the variety of program and faculty characteristics across campus.

While a December 2004 Rostrum article addressed occupational programs specifically (programs that are often forgotten) and suggested that faculty leaders need to broaden their knowledge of occupational programs, this article points to the wider range of programs and services that can be ignored or forgotten when college decisions are made.

The discussion at session was organized around five questions. Those questions are listed below with some of the responses generated by the panel and audience. They are offered here informally, as a summary of the conversation we had. Perhaps their discussion will serve as starting point for local discussions you might want to have.

The first question we asked was: Why are we having this conversation? What are the issues? Responses included these points: Senates and shared governance groups have to represent all programs; that is hard. We are physically separated on campus, leading to real or imagined barriers and distance between people and programs. Some of us feel like or are treated as “step-children.” We feel we have to defend our programs

and ourselves. If our program is labeled as “non WSCH-generating”, a negative stigma is attached. Campus meetings are scheduled at times we have work duties (counseling, clinical duty, labs), so we cannot attend them. We’re left out. There is a lack of collaboration across programs. Noncredit is not understood; it’s a mystery to many people.

The second question we asked was: What do all programs and areas of the college have in common? The audience and panel had the following responses. Students! We all care about student success and retention. We are all at the same institution. We all serve our local community’s needs and demands. We each have requirements for accountability and funding. Faculty across disciplines may have similar concerns about trustees or administrators. All faculty have guaranteed powers and authority (via their senates). We have personal lives too!

The third question was: What things are unique to certain programs (e.g. occupational programs, counseling, libraries, noncredit)? The responses included the following. Some work schedules and workloads are different from those of classroom faculty—such as those of Counselors, Librarians, and Coordinators. Faculty in different positions can have different relationships with certain administrators; this can cause friction with other faculty. Some faculty deal with staff issues (as supervisors, doing scheduling, etc.). There may be unique funding needs. Accreditation processes and standards may vary. Some programs maintain community relationships and involvement in their programs (e.g. advisory committees). Students in different programs need different kinds of support services and retention strategies. Primary missions of certain programs differ. Student’s expectations

and goals differ (e.g. fail program = no career). Special programs include internships, Puente, etc. Our counselors are faculty-unlike elsewhere. Some programs have access issues.

The fourth question put to the group was this: What are some strategies senates and senate presidents can use to a) educate themselves, 2) educate the senates, 3) ensure governance committees take broad perspectives and not limited views? These suggestions were made: Remember that you are powerful! Work with administrators. Don't attack colleagues. Think "we" not "they." Ensure faculty from various programs attend and participate fully. Help them become leaders (e.g. by attending Vocational Leadership Institutes). Look at your governance policies; revise where needed (if not all groups are represented). Be accessible. One senate president's example: he went around his campus to meet each faculty member personally. List the various causes or issues on your campus. Be aware of them. Have a climate of unity. Defend all programs. Do your homework. Research. Prepare. Make a special effort to inform people who did not attend a meeting. Take advantage of networks, listservs and other ways to contact people. Have counselors serve as a liaison to each program or department. Librarians can work with individual departments. Educate the Board and administration about your unique programs (e.g., "A Day in the Life of our Department"). Celebrate people and the good work they do. Get more people to attend governance meetings - not only those on the committee.

Informal processes are also important. Be inclusive. Build good relationships between union and academic senate.

The final question put to the group was: What are some terms or labels we use that might inadvertently push people's buttons? Because our language shapes perceptions, what alternate expressions could we use? The first concern was about minimum qualifications. On the Minimum Qualifications list, the terms "master's" vs. "non master's" creates a category that is a "non." An alternative might be a heading that says "degree or education requirement" and the categories can be "master's" or "baccalaureate." The participants then said that there are various terms we use that can needlessly contribute to negative impressions about programs or groups. They listed some of those expressions and suggested alternative language. Instead of saying "They" we can say "We" because after all, we are all in the same boat. Rather than say "Non-teaching" we could say "faculty" because we all are faculty. The term "Nonacademic" can be insulting. Perhaps this term should be avoided. If someone is comparing, say, occupational programs to transfer programs, those terms are preferable. When one says "Non WSCH-generating," it suggests that services provided by faculty are not all equally valued. And it was suggested that ultimately, all faculty help keep students in their classes, no matter what their role may be. Another expression that people found irritating was "non-transfer faculty." It is the course that is transferable, not the faculty member!

Think "we" not "they."
Ensure faculty from
various programs attend
and participate fully. Help
them become leaders (e.g.
by attending Vocational
Leadership Institutes).

In general, the suggestion was to use more specific language when discussing our programs and faculty and to be sensitive to the possible effect that labels can have on our relationships on campus.

This conversation reminds us of several rather obvious principles: When we know people personally, we are more apt to include and defend them. The language we use to define one another contributes to the quality of our relationships. If we all keep talking and learning from one another, we will probably all benefit. As Woodrow Wilson once said, "I not only use all the brains I have, but all I can borrow."

Confrontation and the Common Good

(May 2007)

by Ian Walton, ASCCC President 2005-2007

T Spring Session we examined the delicate balance between cooperating with colleagues who hold a different opinion of issues, versus confronting them. You heard the suggestion that automatic, public confrontation, while perhaps immediately satisfying, is not always an effective long-term strategy. And you've seen the results of recent attempts by the Academic Senate to better cooperate with groups such as state-wide administrative organizations, the System Office and the Board of Governors. The most spectacular example has been the interconnected conversation that began with graduation competencies and has led to the Basic Skills Initiative and the emerging exploration of assessment practices.

However, recent events have focused attention on an aspect that was not perhaps apparent at Session. While decision to confront or cooperate depends on specific personalities and specific issues, you will sometimes reach a different conclusion at the local level from that reached statewide. Sometimes local interests are in conflict with the "greater good."

Discussion of the Diablo Valley College lawsuit on division chairs has recently appeared on the informal CCCSenates Google Group along with questions about the role of the Academic Senate. I want to share some of the long history and decision making process from the point of view of the ASCCC.

On the surface it seemed like a fairly simple issue. Contra Costa district administration proposed the replacement of a faculty division chair structure at their three colleges by an administrative dean structure. Faculty at

Contra Costa College and Los Medanos College appeared relatively accepting of this concept, but faculty at Diablo Valley College were strongly opposed.

ASCCC does not have an official position about which structure is "best." The Spring 2004 position paper Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty Academic Chairs: An Academic Senate Perspective strongly encourages meaningful college-wide conversations to resolve that very question. With different leadership personalities, that might have been a possibility for Diablo Valley but, in fact, that didn't happen and both sides turned to the court system. As we often remark in governance training, this is a sure sign that participatory governance is already seriously broken.

In December 2001 Diablo Valley faculty attended an ASCCC Executive Committee meeting in Oakland to explain their situation and to ask for support. While obviously supportive of fellow faculty, Executive Committee was immediately concerned about the possible wider impact on other colleges should DVC faculty lose their lawsuit. In Executive Committee's opinion, the possible downside consequences of a loss, for all colleges in the system, were more serious than the possible upside consequences of a win, for DVC. Six years later, this is, in part, what has resulted.

At the time in 2001, Executive Committee determined that ASCCC would not participate in the DVC lawsuit. They did this for two reasons: a judgment about the likelihood of negative statewide consequences and a specific concern that part of the DVC faculty case was weak because language in the collective bargaining contract had already conceded that faculty were doing administrative duties.

The court originally ruled in favor of several of the items in the DVC academic senate brief – most notably that the local academic senate did indeed have legal standing in the case. But they ruled against the DVC faculty desire to reinstate the original faculty division chair structure and to mandate collegial consultation. Much of the remaining discussion centered around whether “collegial consultation” on the issue was required and whether it had taken place. This refers to the meaning and intent of the language in Title 5, section 53200 that says “district and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles.”

In December 2005, ASCCC filed an Amicus Brief at the appeal level because a greater systemwide threat had suddenly appeared. Contra Costa District was claiming for the first time in their appeal that the entire Title 5 Regulations on participatory governance for the community college system should be declared invalid.

In 2007, the Appeal Court in a “published” decision declined to address the Contra Costa newly raised issue concerning the validity of statewide governance regulations but continued to say that collegial consultation was not required in the specific reorganization that took place at DVC.

The DVC faculty senate recently requested that ASCCC join their appeal to the California Supreme Court on the grounds that the “published” response will negatively affect other academic senates.

In consultation with our attorney we determined to maintain our original position and not join the new appeal. The Appeal Court’s decision could, in fact, help all local senates because it focuses attention on traditional faculty roles. It strengthens the case that if those roles are indeed affected by a reorganization, then collegial consultation must take place. But it also strengthens the opposing case that if traditional faculty roles are not affected, then collegial consultation does not need to take place. Unfortunately for the DVC faculty, the court determined that in their specific example, traditional faculty roles were not significantly changed. ASCCC has consistently refrained from joining that part of the dispute and determined to intervene only where we believe clear statewide principles are at stake.

Only time will tell how this issue plays out. Personally, I continue to believe that the inability to effectively discuss this issue in 2001 was a missed opportunity and that new leadership should seize the chance to discuss it now. Of course, some districts may claim that the Appeal Court ruling gives districts carte blanche to unilaterally abolish faculty department and division chairs. But neither our legal counsel nor statewide administrative leaders, that I have unofficially consulted, interpret it that way. DVC faculty will continue to fight for what they believe to be best for their institution – as they should. ASCCC will continue to protect what it sees as statewide faculty interests – as we should.

I have great confidence that your newly elected ASCCC leadership team will successfully navigate these tricky waters on your behalf – under the able command of Mark Wade Lieu. I have enjoyed playing my part for the past two years and look forward to continued informal associations with the many of you who have become friends. Thank you for a wonderful collaborative leadership experience.

You heard the suggestion that automatic, public confrontation, while perhaps immediately satisfying, is not always an effective long-term strategy. And you’ve seen the results of recent attempts by the Academic Senate to better cooperate with groups such as statewide administrative organizations, the System Office and the Board of Governors.

Budget Processes: Maintaining the 10 Plus 1 in Budget Crisis

(December 2008)

by Shaaron Vogel, Butte College

The world, the nation and the state are in financial crisis and people are panicking. The late California budget and now the emergency session regarding the budget are causing many campuses to hold emergency budget meetings and administrators are calling for quick action. How do we preserve our budget processes in these times?

In Title 5 Article 2. Section 53200, number 10 of the “10 plus 1” is “processes for institutional planning and budget development”. Even in crisis a budget process that has been developed can be followed. So where do you as a faculty leader begin? First find your written planning and budget process. Your Board of Trustees should have approved a formal planning and budget process policy. Start there if you do not know what was approved and when. Look to see if it defines faculty, classified and student roles. Does it allow for feedback in the process and rationales for why decisions are made? What are the timelines for this process and how can these timelines be changed in time of crisis? Your process should be transparent and clear and all should have a chance to provide input at certain steps of the process.

In crisis this planning and budget process comes down to relationships and people. In good times, you should build relationships so in the bad times you can work together. Meet with your classified senates and unions, meet with your faculty unions, meet with the student senate and administrators and start problem solving now as a unified front. Keep in mind your college mission, strategic plan and educational master plan when looking at budget items. Are program review and unit plans used to help drive the process? These items may help you focus and give you guidance when you

feel pressure to act immediately. Remember the good news about accreditation is that it requires the college to follow its planning and budget process and show that it uses these linkages to program review to make budget decisions—so use this to your advantage.

Take the time to review where your budget process starts and who is involved. What are your budget committees and who is on them? Do you have strong relationships with those faculty who are on key budget decision committees, and do they have a firm grasp of the 10 plus 1? Budget decision criteria should be well defined and clear at all levels of the process. Decide early in this crisis what time-lines can be changed and by how much. Continuous feedback will be essential in this adjustment of the planning and budget process. Do not forget the other pots of money that may help you during this time such as reserves, grants, Perkins, any flexibility with categorical funding and others.

Multi-college districts leaders should ask themselves the same questions that single college districts leaders do. Questions to ask in multi-college districts include: Where is the written planning and budget process? Where does it start and with whom? Are the criteria clear throughout the process? Is it fair to all colleges? How much goes to the district administration? Who makes the decisions? The budget process can be more complex in multi-college districts, but the key principles of the process and the policy should still be followed.

So now is the time to be proactive in the problem-solving process and take the lead in preventing crisis at your campus. Do not forget to contact your legislators during this special session and make them aware of how community colleges impact the economy. Community

colleges are the educational structure that turns out the largest number of people ready to enter the workforce and immediately add to our economic base and pay taxes. Call legislators, write them and e-mail

them with the numbers of students who leave your campus with certificates and degrees and enter the workforce. Community colleges can be the force that helps our economy re-cover but we can only do that if we are funded!

Budget Processes: Maintaining the 10 Plus 1 in Budget Crisis

SHAARON VOGEL, AREA A REPRESENTATIVE

The world, the nation and the state are in financial crisis and people are panicking. The late California budget and now the emergency session regarding the budget are causing many campuses to hold emergency budget meetings and administrators are calling for quick action. How do we preserve our budget processes in these times?

In Title 5 Article 2, Section 53200, number 10 of the "10 plus 1" is "processes for institutional planning and budget development". Even in crisis a budget process that has been developed can be followed. So where do you as a faculty leader begin? First find your written planning and budget process. Your Board of Trustees should have approved a formal planning and budget process policy. Start there if you do not know what was approved and when. Look to see if it defines faculty, classified and student roles. Does it allow for feedback in the process and rationales for why decisions are made? What are the timelines for this process and how can these timelines be changed in time of crisis? Your process should be transparent and clear and all should have a chance to provide input at certain steps of the process.

In crisis this planning and budget process comes down to relationships and people. In good times, you should build relationships so in the bad times you can work together. Meet with your classified senates and unions, meet with your faculty unions, meet with the student senate and administrators and start problem solving now as a unified front. Keep in mind your college mission, strategic plan and educational master plan when looking at budget items. Are program review and unit plans used to help drive the process? These items may help you focus and give you guidance when you feel pressure to act immediately. Remember the good news about accreditation is that it requires the college to follow its planning and budget process and show that it uses these linkages to program review to make budget decisions—so use this to your advantage.

Take the time to review where your budget process starts and who is involved. What are your budget committees and who is on them? Do you have strong relationships with those faculty who are on key budget decision committees, and do they have a firm grasp of the 10 plus 1? Budget decision criteria should be well defined and clear at all levels of the process. Decide early in this crisis what timelines can be changed and by how much. Continuous feedback will be essential in this adjustment of the planning and budget process. Do not forget the other pots of money that may help you during this time such as reserves, grants, Perkins, any flexibility with categorical funding and others.

Multi-college districts leaders should ask themselves the same questions that single college districts leaders do. Questions to ask in multi-college districts include where is the written planning and budget process? Where does it start and with whom? Are the criteria clear throughout the process? Is it fair to all colleges? How much goes to the district administration? Who makes the decisions? The budget process can be more complex in multi-college districts, but the key principles of the process and the policy should still be followed.

So now is the time to be proactive in the problem-solving process and take the lead in preventing crisis at your campus. Do not forget to contact your legislators during this special session and make them aware of how community colleges impact the economy. Community colleges are the educational structure that turns out the largest number of people ready to enter the workforce and immediately add to our economic base and pay taxes. Call legislators, write them and e-mail them with the numbers of students who leave your campus with certificates and degrees and enter the workforce. Community colleges can be the force that helps our economy re-cover but we can only do that if we are funded! ■

Putting Students First: The Solution to the Challenge of Program Discontinuance

(April 2010)

by **Richard Mahon**, Riverside City College
and **Wheeler North**, San Diego Miramar College

Not surprisingly, given the extraordinary budgetary times we find ourselves in, the Academic Senate finds itself receiving more inquiries about program reduction and discontinuance than is typical. Faculty aren't contacting the Senate to find out how to jettison programs; rather, how can faculty defend vulnerable programs and the students they serve when programs are identified for reduction or elimination not on the basis of need, but on the basis of potential cost savings?

HELP FROM TITLE 5

Title 5 is not silent on the question of program discontinuation. Title 5 §51022 requires that "Within six months of the formation of a community college district, the governing board shall adopt and carry out its policies for the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of courses or programs. Such policies shall incorporate statutory responsibilities regarding vocational or occupational training program review as specified in section 78016 of the Education Code" (emphasis added). Section 78016 in turn requires that "Every vocational or occupational training program offered by a community college district shall be reviewed every two years by the governing board.

A second Title 5 Regulation §55601 requires local governing boards to appoint advisory committees: "The

governing board of each community college district participating in a vocational education program shall appoint a vocational education advisory committee to develop recommendations on the program and to provide liaison between the district and potential employers." This language suggests that local boards have a responsibility to receive guidance about the ongoing need for vocational programs before making decisions regarding their reduction or elimination. An active and effective advisory committee can be a very valuable asset in defending a program from discontinuance since it provides a direct link to the specific community need each program serves.

Thus the first line of defense for targeted programs is the district's own policy and procedure. What process has the local board established to deal with program discontinuance? In recognition of how regularly this challenge arises, the state Chief Instructional Officer board and the California Community College Association for Occupational Education (CCCAOE) assembled sample procedures from several California community colleges in December 2003, and those local policies are available for review at: www.asccc.org/Events/VocEd/2007/Program_Discontinuance_Models.doc.

A related question concerns the degree to which a college may curtail a program. On this point, the Program and Course Approval Handbook (2009) asserts that in proposing a new program, a college must indicate that

it has resources to allow it to “commit to offering all of the required courses for the program at least once every two years” (p. 6). Thus there seems to be an expectation in principle that a program is still viable if courses are offered biennially. A district could argue that it still meets the spirit of the regulation if required courses are offered only every other year. No requirement in Title 5 requires a college to offer as many sections as student demand would warrant, and current budget cuts have made it impossible for colleges to meet demand.

HELP FROM THE ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

There is also a discussion of program discontinuance in the 2002 Accreditation Standards that would seem to prohibit a district from eliminating programs too hastily: “When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption” (Standard II.A.6.b). This requirement is broader than the one established in Title 5. By specifically obligating a college to meet the needs of enrolled students, there is the implication that required courses must be offered in sufficient number to meet the needs of students the college has permitted to enter the program.

Perhaps most relevant and most challenging to meet in a fiscal crisis is the accreditation expectation that requires colleges to plan and budget effectively. The introduction to the accreditation standards requires that “The institution provides the means for students to learn, assesses how well learning is occurring, and strives to improve that learning through ongoing, systematic, and integrated planning.” Nothing could be more contrary to this principle than reducing or eliminating expensive or vulnerable programs as the easiest path toward cost reduction. Unfortunately, unless a college is scheduled for a site visit in the near future, the vague threat of an accreditation sanction probably pales in comparison to the budget shortfalls colleges are facing now. It is (1) the effectiveness of the planning processes and (2) working relationships local senates develop in their colleges before a crisis arrives that are probably the best foundation for a thoughtful approach to the threat of program reduction or discontinuance.

HELP FROM THE ACADEMIC SENATE

The Academic Senate has a longstanding position about program discontinuance that recommends a process that is distinct from program review. Program discontinuance raises issues broader than those addressed by program review and questions which are likely to require the participation of the collective bargaining representative (who should certainly be involved in any campus discussion about program discontinuation). Rather than focus on the negative aspects of program discontinuance some colleges have chosen to focus on the question of program vitality. A program vitality process focuses on how a program can improve, reexamining community needs, other college processes, and data that indicates the program is still viable. This examination should seek to ensure resources whereby the program can effectively meet the need for which it was initially developed. The Senate’s paper on the topic of program discontinuance can be found at: http://www.asccc.org/Publications/Papers/Program_discontinuance.html. Because program reduction or elimination is also related to enrollment management, readers should also review Enrollment Management Revisited, which can be found at: <http://www.asccc.org/Publications/Papers/Downloads/Enrollment-Mgmt-Spri>.

There are few prospects that can put faculty more at odds with their constituent partners than the idea of reducing or eliminating a program. Our ideals of professionalism and supporting student success must guide the tenor and goals of campus decision-making processes. Fiscal challenges to colleges can lead to drastic consequences for every program, employee, and student at a college. In times of draconian budgetary reductions, choosing between across-the-board cuts versus eliminating one or two struggling programs can be a difficult choice. In spite of the challenge it is never appropriate to treat others unprofessionally. We must recognize that all sides of this process have very real reasons for feeling threatened as we and our colleagues wrestle with these challenges. In the end, decisions must be made for the right reasons. A program that is discontinued because it was only staffed by part-time faculty or had high equipment costs in spite of the fact that it was effective and met community needs is a bad decision, even if it might have been expedient. Budget crises are generally temporary in nature, but sadly the havoc they wreak is

often permanent. Putting student needs at the center of our decision-making processes is our most powerful guide in seeking the right policy and practice.

REFERENCES

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC). (1998). *Program discontinuance: A faculty perspective*. Sacramento, CA; Author. Retrieved March 14, 2010, from <http://www.asccc.org/papers/program-discontinuance-faculty-perspective>

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC). *Enrollment management revisited*. Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved March 14, 2010, from <http://www.asccc.org/papers/enrollment-management-revisited>

California Community College. (2009). *Program and course approval handbook*. Sacramento, CAL Author. Retrieved March 14, 2010, from http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/PCAH3_Mar2009_v3.pdf

Putting Students First: The Solution to the Challenge of Program Discontinuance

BY RICHARD MAHON, CHAIR, CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
WHEELER NORTH, CHAIR, STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Not surprisingly, given the extraordinary budgetary times we find ourselves in, the Academic Senate finds itself receiving more inquiries about program reduction and discontinuance than is typical. Faculty aren't contacting the Senate to find out how to jettison programs; rather, how can faculty defend vulnerable programs and the students they serve when programs are identified for reduction or elimination not on the basis of need, but on the basis of potential cost savings?

Help From Title 5

Title 5 is not silent on the question of program discontinuation. Title 5 §51022 requires that "Within six months of the formation of a community college district, the governing board shall adopt and carry out its policies for the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of courses or programs. Such policies shall incorporate statutory responsibilities regarding vocational or occupational training program review as specified in section 78016 of the Education Code" (emphasis added). Section 78016 in turn requires that "Every vocational or occupational training program offered by a community college district shall be reviewed every two years by the governing board.

A second Title 5 Regulation §55601 requires local governing boards to appoint advisory committees: "The governing board of each community college

district participating in a vocational education program shall appoint a vocational education advisory committee to develop recommendations on the program and to provide liaison between the district and potential employers." This language suggests that local boards have a responsibility to receive guidance about the ongoing need for vocational programs before making decisions regarding their reduction or elimination. An active and effective advisory committee can be a very valuable asset in defending a program from discontinuance since it provides a direct link to the specific community need each program serves.

Thus the first line of defense for targeted programs is the district's own policy and procedure. What process has the local board established to deal with program discontinuance? In recognition of how regularly this challenge arises, the state Chief Instructional Officer board and the California Community College Association for Occupational Education (CC-CAOE) assembled sample procedures from several California community colleges in December 2003, and those local policies are available for review at: www.asccc.org/Events/VocEd/2007/Program_Discontinuance_Models.doc.

A related question concerns the degree to which a college may curtail a program. On this point, the *Program and Course Approval Handbook* (2009) asserts that in proposing a new program, a college must indicate that it has resources to allow it to "commit to

Federalization of Higher Education and the Expanding Data Bubble

(December 2010)

by **Greg Gilbert**, Copper Mountain College

The following is a speech presented by Greg Gilbert, Copper Mountain College to attendees at the Fall Session Plenary on November 12, 2010. Faculty requested that this article be printed in the Rostrum.

Good afternoon. I am pleased to be joined today by Lee Fritschler, President Clinton's Assistant Secretary of Education. In this problem-solution presentation, I will play the role of the problem and Lee will posit the solutions.

Frank Luntz, a statistician and communications professional, writes in his book, *What Americans Really Want*, that Americans see the greatest need in government is for "Accountability." This hunger for data is endemic throughout our society and as global as climate change. Unfortunately, this fondness for numbers is accompanied by a prevailing penchant for simplistic, opportunistic analyses, hasty generalizations, and a lack of patience for nuanced commentary. The result is a system that favors uniformity and for-profit opportunities. And make no mistake, the uses of data and the people who manipulate and interpret data will be part of an expanding bubble well beyond the foreseeable future. Anyone who believes that accountability is a passing fad is not paying attention. Needless to say, the federalization of education is part of that expanding bubble.

Against the backdrop of growing accountability there remain the day-to-day responsibilities associated with teaching and governance.

Here, then, is the story of teachers at a small, rural college, people typical of community college faculty who employ

data in local decision making in an effort to better serve students – and this is also a story of bigger dogs.

I begin by quoting Woodrow Wilson: "I not only use all the brains that I have, but all that I can borrow."

The story you are about to hear is a direct result of what I have borrowed from a number of people, particularly a professor who teaches at my college, Doug Morrison (Ed.D. in Business, MBA, CPA). What I've learned from Doug is to focus unflinchingly on student learning and advocacy for student needs. He's taught me how to provide administrators and boards with the data they should want concerning the allocation of resources in support of student learning. He's also taught me that when all appeals to reason fail, it's time to go and get a bigger dog. I've also learned from Doug the sheer energy-infusing joy of collaborating across the curriculum in support of student learning, both in the classroom and throughout the system. Here's what happened. In 1999 my college separated from its parent college and became an independent district. We achieved full accreditation under the old ten standards, a process that said, in effect, if you can demonstrate that you have the tools and resources to do a good job, we'll assume that that is exactly what you'll do, a good job. There was no thought of micro-managing professionals, particularly within a system with so many checks and balances.

Really, all of the employees, faculty and staff at my college were having a love fest back then. We'd pulled together in a collective effort to accomplish separation and accreditation. But then, fortune's wheel turned a few degrees, slipped into a rut, and we found ourselves below 40% on the 50% Law and at 49/51 on the 75/25. It seems that the administration team had become

focused on reorganization, added several additional layers of management, and distanced itself from the instructional side of the house. Doug's response was to suggest that our senate meet a half-hour early each time to focus on how we could better serve our students and collect data toward that end. The faculty managed to work with the college's constituencies, including the foundation and administration, and together we all fashioned a new mission statement that aligned with the 2002 accreditation standards. We also developed a matrix that associated our mission elements with every category of people who attended our college and with every service that we provided. It was a living, responsive educational master plan.

Then, 19 of the 23 faculty in our senate-of-the-whole participated in the drafting of white papers on such topics as advising, distance education, student success, governance, and minimum standards, among others. We worked across-the-curriculum and relied on one another's strengths to quantify, analyze, employ computer graphics, and write. Each paper was succinct, polite, and focused on serving the mission. We also formed a taskforce that worked with the administration to achieve an agreement wherein 65% of all new monies would go toward our becoming compliant with the 50% Law. Though labor intensive, our efforts drew the faculty closer together in support of our students.

Here I will compress a story of years into a few short lines. The administration reneged on the 50% Law agreement, ignored our papers, treated us like interlopers within our own village, and stonewalled any additional requests to address our concerns. When the next ACCJC (Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges) team arrived, Doug and a gifted statistician from our math department, Mike Chlebik, and I met with the visiting team leader and provided him with what was in effect a shadow report, detailed evidence of denied faculty efforts on behalf of students: our agendas, minutes, documents, white papers, everything.

With all of that, in June of 2007 the ACCJC granted the college five years of accreditation with a midterm report and a list of recommendations. While recommendations included issues of campus climate, referred to the need to improve governance, and alluded to the white papers, the provision of five years of accreditation and

the general tone of the report left the faculty believing that their voices had been marginalized and that the administration had, in effect, had its dismissive attitude toward the faculty validated.

Then a student, Yaniv Newman, came to the senate (some of you may recall Yaniv was active in the formation of the Statewide Student Senate for California Community Colleges). He demanded that the faculty step forward on the issue of funding for instruction – and that is exactly what we did. Heartened by Yaniv's encouragement, we filed an appeal to the Chancellor's Office that challenged the college's request for exemption from compliance with the 50% Law. We went and got a bigger dog.

The result is that fortune's wheel lifted out of its rut. The Chancellor and Board of Governors denied the college's request for exemption, a denial that had repercussions around the state as small, rural colleges could no longer assume that they had the right to an exemption just because they were small. At about this same time, as fate would have it, in April 2008, Barbara Beno made a special trip to our college. She met with our administrative team and invoked the two-year rule. We were placed on warning.

While the payout on 50% was significant, faculty said that they would prefer to earn the money, so we worked on program reviews and accreditation outside of our normal contracts at the part-time rate, and about 15 faculty donated a thousand dollars or more to student scholarships. The big dogs had provided the resources necessary for my college to begin setting things right. Then the faculty stepped forward to design our program review process:

- Established a Blackboard template for minutes and documents
- Worked with all constituencies to adopt institutional student learning outcomes
- Designed program review templates
- Arranged for data collections
- Moved ALL calendars, processes, and templates through participatory governance
- Adopted an annual program review cycle
- Arranged for accreditation training by the Academic Senate
- Conducted in-house training of all administrators.

Results as of June 2010:

- Warning was lifted; accreditation was reinstated
- A new administration team was in place
- Annual compliance with 50% Law was achieved
- An improved climate was being built
- A new enterprise system was purchased and installed
- A full complement of Tenure Track faculty was hired
- Forty two program reviews are conducted annually and linked directly to the college budgeting process.

Today, we are a better school because with Doug's wisdom at the forefront, the faculty remained focused on student success, even to the extent of getting bigger dogs. The collection and application of data specific to our situation was a vital part of our local effort.

So, here's the dilemma. The same ACCJC that is non-responsive to the Senate concerns, the same ACCJC that pulled Compton's accreditation and between 2003 and 2008 placed 37% of California's community colleges on sanction, this same agency that cannot itself be accountable for its decisions, came to my college, respected faculty findings, and used its authority to set things right.

In 2004, I authored a *Rostrum* article, "Thinking Outside the Horse," which compared external accountability to a Trojan Horse that contained within its dimly lit interior legions of functionaries intent on a singular mantra: "What cannot be measured cannot be assessed and what cannot be assessed cannot be controlled and what cannot be controlled cannot be permitted." Now I wonder if it isn't more appropriate to point an accusatory finger toward the federal government.

...of the 133 regional accreditation commissioners serving nation-wide, outside of California, only ten are designated as faculty. Ten out of 133 commissioners.

I am reminded of this quotation from F. Scott Fitzgerald: "The test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function." While I take great issue, and have for many years, with the noblesse oblige of the ACCJC, I believe now that we must do all that we can to keep collegial peer review in an intermediary role between the classroom and the federal government. We will have to think in many directions at once to accomplish this, but I believe that without collegial peer review, the role of local decision making will experience disheartening and debilitating erosion.

Consider the following: Not counting the 20 faculty serving as commissioners on California's two regional accrediting organizations (WASC, ACCJC), of the 133 regional accreditation commissioners serving nationwide, outside of California, only ten are designated as faculty. Ten out of 133 commissioners. Presently, tenure levels throughout the US are estimated to have fallen to about 30%. Set against the growing influence of external auditors and big money, it takes little imagination to understand that the influence of educators within their own profession is in serious decline.

During George W. Bush's Presidency, Texas businessman Charles Miller, designer of No Child Left Behind, worked with Education Secretary Margaret Spellings on her Future of Education Commission and produced copious documents alleging that because of academic freedom and adherence to local missions, universities had fostered a decline in institutional accountability and public oversight. Furthermore, the Spellings Commission asserted, tenure had become a costly, inflexible system dedicated to the protection of job security.

Had the Bush/Miller/Spellings vision of market-driven accountability and a federalized system of higher education prevailed, colleges and universities would have been reduced to legions of untenured faculty, and a proliferation of bright line indicators leading directly to Washington, D.C.

And lest you think that we dodged that bullet and can breathe easier with President Obama, Arne Duncan and Under Secretary Martha J. Kanter are on the same path as Bush/Spellings, only they are better financed. Even though Martha Kanter was a vice chancellor for policy

and research for our Chancellor's Office and President of De Anza College and eventually its chancellor, we have no assurances that the present Department of Education respects educators and local institutions any more than did the previous administration. By way of example, an ominous cloud on the horizon is the recently approved federal credit hour.

The federal definition of the newly designed credit hour describes it as "an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement," establishing a "quantifiable minimum basis" as a means to "quantify academic activity for purposes of determining federal funding." The credit hour will become enforceable in July 2012. The pleas of educators, administrators, CHEA (Council for Higher Education Accreditation), and others was that the Department of Education not impose uniformity on a dynamic system, but they were summarily ignored.

And mark my words, you can be certain that just like when No Child Left Behind was implemented, the next wave to break over our nation's colleges will be a tsunami of consultants prepared to make our lives easier and to help us with the new accountability. There's a lot of money to be made from the new accountability.

And while I wouldn't say it's entirely about the money, consider that the National Education Budget for 2007 was \$972 billion (public and private all levels), and this is when Arne Duncan was the Deputy Secretary of Education.

In Washington's halls of power, lobbyists spent \$3.49 billion in 2009, the equivalent of a senior professor's annual salary every two-to-three minutes that Congress was in session, and this was prior to the recent Supreme Court decision allowing lobbyists to spend without limits.

Everyone here
understands the direct
link between American
freedom and academic
freedom.

There are those who see our students as potential customers. After all, total US enrollment in all education, K-Ph.D. is 76.6 million students. Post-secondary education alone is 17.6 million students. If we consider only California, there are 3,600,000 students in higher education, more than 20% of all the higher education students in all of the United States.

What I'm alluding to here is clout. California has the largest system of higher education in the world, and California's Community College System alone is responsible for 17% of all higher education in the United States. Our nearly 60,000 faculty prepare the most diverse student body anywhere for the greatest number of career and academic choices anywhere. We respect local control while overseeing the most massive transfer and articulation system anywhere. We prepare more students to take their place as responsible participants in a democratic society than any system anywhere. Our students are the primary source of enrollments for the UC and CSU systems, and the primary source of training for our state's teachers, police officers, nurses, and fire fighters. We manage our complex mission because we respect local decision making and work system-wide in support of student success.

Surely, everyone here understands the direct link between American freedom and academic freedom and that tenure may well be the parakeet in the mine shaft. As the federal government tightens its control over America's schools and colleges, the nation is looking to California. That's no exaggeration. We are the only state where academic authority is enshrined in law. Governance is bargained in other states, and as tenure slips away so does the ability to bargain. We know that power in the new data driven world will belong to those who define the data and determine how it will be interpreted and used. We know that collegial peer review can only succeed if it is collegial, rigorous, and respectful of local decision making. We know also that Washington will never be our colleague. While juggling a range of contrary thoughts, we must act wisely, and as Doug Morrison would tell us, keep the needs of our students at the forefront of everything that we do. As individuals, as members of our professional organizations, and as patriots, we must link arms to defend our nation's glorious mind: a free academy.

United We Succeed: Responding to Criticisms of the California Community Colleges

(March 2011)

by Michelle Pilati, ASCCC President 2011 - 2013

Higher education in the United States is under attack; references to support this statement are really not necessary to those of us in higher education. We see advances from various fronts relating to all aspects of the way we perform the service that we perform. And, for a variety of reasons, community colleges are the bull's eye of the higher education target. This is natural: we serve more students than any other segment of higher education, our students are less-prepared and less-supported, our missions are multiple and sometimes in conflict, and we are more likely to have embraced distance education. Time and time again the California community college system is the subject of reports that are received with high regard, despite the lack of peer-review, the often explicit bias, and unjustified leaps from data to policy recommendations.

While the “completion” agenda (calling for an increase in course, certificate, and degree completions, absent quality controls or support to facilitate success), ongoing budget shortfalls, new accreditation challenges, and other influences erode and detract from our ability to serve our communities, we also must face critical reports that capture the attention of the general public. At the end of 2010, the California Community College System was faced with one such report – followed by another that aimed directly at the largest district in the state. The first, Moore and Shulock’s *Divided We Fail: Improving Completion and Closing Racial Gaps in California’s Community Colleges*, is the focus of this article.

The second, Moore and Shulock’s *Divided We Fail in LA: Improving Completion and Closing Racial Gaps in the Los Angeles Community College District*, provided an analysis comparable to that conducted in the first, but with the Los Angeles Community College District as its focus. But the purpose of this article is not merely to respond to this one instance of criticism – but to remind us that we must work together to counter such reports. We need to move beyond being offended by conclusions that we view as unwarranted and approach such reports in an academic and intellectual manner, helping those who read such things uncritically to develop an appreciation for where they (the reports that is) are flawed. This report is selected as a sample; there are many similar reports that have been received unquestioningly by the general public but need to be appropriately dissected and examined. While the California community colleges are certainly not above criticism, data gathered and interpreted with the end-goal of supporting an existing policy agenda does not serve us well.

In order to understand any data, context is required. Numbers do not exist in a vacuum. Comparing community college students to students in other segments of higher education is no more appropriate than comparing the golf skills of Tiger Woods to those of an amateur at a local country club: one has extensive training and experience and is noted for his skills, while the other is someone on a green with a club acquiring and practicing skills. Intersegmental and intrasegmental comparisons are generally inappropriate without the proper controls.

Any analysis or claim regarding our students must be made with caution due to the diverse communities served by the community colleges. Furthermore, lamenting changes over time, absent a consideration of context, is yet another inappropriate comparison. While no one is likely to challenge the statement that “College attainment in California has actually been declining with each younger generation...” (Moore & Shulock, 2010, p. 1), to highlight such a statement without delineating the many factors at the state and national level that serve to explain such a decline is unfair. Longitudinal examination of any trend in higher education is going to be altered by broader societal changes, especially when considering segments of higher education that are open access and serve multiple missions.

Moore and Shulock conclude that the real problem does not stem from a lack of college participation, but a lack of completion – an issue that is further exacerbated by the growing Latino population enrolling by preference in the community colleges, where, according to the authors, “transfer to four-year institutions is problematic.” (p. 1). No discussion is provided as to why certain populations opt for the community college over the direct route to the California State University or University of California. And no reference is made to the large number of students who do transfer successfully and fare as well as or better than native university students.¹ There is a presumption that policy change is the sole answer, and an answer that will emerge from the compilation of data: if we merely could track cohorts of students effectively this would inform practice and policy. If this is the case, then we are on the verge of finding the answers to all our problems as the ability to track students and to make meaningful comparisons within our system has been dramatically expanded in recent years; the implementation of Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) by the California Community College’s Chancellor’s Office and the Bridging Research, Information, and Culture (BRIC) Initiative led by the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges signal the system-wide recognition of the value of data, as well as efforts

to review it and use it to guide decision-making. The development of ARCC reflects the recognition of the value of data, while the BRIC initiative recognizes the need for objective analysis of data by qualified experts who consider relevant data to inform decision-making. Colleges know what is effective; they offer programs that are aimed at helping just the students that *Divided We Fail* argues that we need to serve. Yet such programs and efforts have been decimated by budget cuts that intentionally permit colleges to continue offering classes to generate revenue while dramatically reducing the non-revenue generating programs that support student success and facilitate completion.

As with many critical papers, *Divided We Fail* contains ideas with merit. Alas, the bottom line is ignored: no policy or statutory changes that require funding will ever be implemented at the system level without an identified source of funding. Moore and Shulock state, “The Board of Governors should change system policy, and seek statutory changes as necessary, to ensure that all degree-seeking students are assessed for college readiness and are directed appropriately into courses that will expedite their transition to, and success in, college-level instruction.”(p. iii) This proposal has two fundamental flaws. First, money is needed to implement such change. Second, it lacks a clear definition of “degree-seeking.” Definitions of “degree-seeking” can vary considerably, from definitions based on expressed student intent to those based on some behavioral indicator. If we are to funnel all “degree-seekers” in a given direction at the beginning of their college career, then a broad definition will necessarily be employed and the impact on colleges great. Even if a broad definition is employed and most students are identified as “degree seekers” (necessarily skewing completion data in a negative direction by using too generous a definition), is it appropriate to establish policy that ignores the other groups of students served by community colleges? The authors imply that we should only be working to assist those students who are “degree-seeking.” Don’t all students need assistance in reaching their goals? Such a policy suggestion encourages a shift in priorities towards degree-seeking students and away from the other missions of the community colleges. The goal of the community colleges is to effectively serve all students, regardless of their end-goal and how it factors into external measures of accountability.

1 “Data from the California State University demonstrates that community college transfer students perform as well as, or better than, native four-year university students.” [http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/News/press_releases/2010/Chancellor%20Scott%20React%20to%20Gov.%20Schwarzenegger%20Signing%20SB%201440%20-%20FINAL%20\(9-29-10\).pdf](http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/News/press_releases/2010/Chancellor%20Scott%20React%20to%20Gov.%20Schwarzenegger%20Signing%20SB%201440%20-%20FINAL%20(9-29-10).pdf)

Legitimate and reasonable statements in *Divided We Fail* frequently are followed closely by suggestions that are problematic or difficult to support, such as “The Legislature should take steps to guard against erosion of the historic transfer function of community colleges by investigating recruiting practices and completion rates at for-profit colleges...” (p. iii). This statement presumes that the Legislature has the power to “fix” transfer (which is certainly impaired by the inadequate funding that universities receive to make room for prepared and eligible transfer students, as Moore and Shulock do note) and that community colleges have lessons to learn from for-profit colleges. Absent the provision of additional funds, it can be argued that the practices from for-profit colleges that community colleges could adopt that lead to increased completion would require a compromise in quality. We could award credit for having lived or worked for some certain number of years, pay people to “recruit” and retain students, and offer unstructured design-your-own programs of study. Our transfer partners would likely, and appropriately, take a dim view of such questionable preparation.

Any useful study should begin with appropriate operational definitions. As noted earlier, definitions of “degree seekers” vary and, while overly broad definitions would be appropriate upon student entry into a system of higher education, once a student has completed some coursework a more appropriate definition can be applied. Here is where Moore and Shulock commit one of the most disturbing errors in their paper: “The analyses focus on students identified as ‘degree seekers’ (a term we use to include degrees and certificates) based on having enrolled in more than six units during the first year.” (p. 3) While “degree seekers” could be defined in many ways, this definition is deeply flawed. No constraints were placed on such important issues as the courses being taken, the units enrolled in, or the level of the courses. While the courses were identified as being “credit” courses, they were not necessarily courses that would be taken by students who were actual degree-seekers. A professional returning to earn units for promotion or advancement would be captured by this definition, as would a parent taking a few courses to better support his child’s studies, a returning student who needs a few courses to apply for studies elsewhere, or a high school student taking a few classes to get an early start on college. The source

for this definition is cited as “Adelman, C. *Proposed amendment for the Student-Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-542) to produce a full and honest account of college completion rates*. Obtained through personal communication on June 2, 2008.” A relevant definition of “degree-seekers” at the community college level cannot be based on a suggestion made over twenty years ago regarding federal data collection in the context of investigating student progression within one segment of higher education within the state of California. Such a definition necessarily skews the data contained within the paper: the more common proxies for degree-seekers used by researchers within the California community college system likely would not have yielded the devastatingly negative findings upon which the paper is based. Furthermore, Adelman’s interests appear to be focused not on accurately tracking community college students, but upon preventing anomalies that lead to reporting inaccuracies in other segments of higher education. Once again, comparisons between community college and other segments of higher education are inappropriate and problematic. While one may safely assume that all students entering universities and registering for any number of units are “degree-seeking”, making enrollment a valid proxy for “degree-seeking” at the university level, no such assumption can be made for students in the community colleges, be they in California or elsewhere.

The recommendations in Moore and Shulock’s *Divided We Fail* are representative of the sort of problematic suggestions for change that confront community colleges with increasing frequency. I want to encourage each and every one of you to be advocates for our system, and for the good that we do and to be educators of the general public. Our messages tend to be more academic and complex: our clever titles don’t make it into headlines, nor do we hold press conferences to tout our accomplishments, nor partner with organizations that will see that our publicity needs are met. But we can educate our boards, our communities, and our legislators. Such outreach on our part is necessary to combat the attacks on our system from reports such as *Divided We Fail* and other efforts to promote systemic change without a sufficient understanding of our successes and our needs.

Why We Resist the Business Model

(March 2011)

by **David Morse**, ASCCC President 2014 – 2016

In Fall 2007, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges passed Resolution 13.04, presented by Greg Gilbert of Copper Mountain College and titled “A Document in Support of an Academic Culture.” The resolution stated in part that “just because our students pay fees, they are not customers; and just because managers have adopted such titles as Chief Instruction Officers, Chief Executive Officers, and Chief Business Officers, they are not corporate officers but managers whose jobs are to provide the necessary resources for all faculty to serve our students and missions.” Greg Gilbert’s statements in this resolution reflect a long and ongoing struggle of faculty as we resist the corporatization of higher education and the adoption of a business model for our colleges. Some college administrators and outside observers of our academic system fail to understand why faculty express such vehement opposition to the characterization of education as a business, and even some faculty members fail to understand why such a characterization is so dangerous. Many of us frequently find ourselves in the position of explaining why the business model of education is detrimental to our institutions, our educational programs, and, most importantly, to the success of our students.

STUDENTS ARE NOT CUSTOMERS

If I order a pizza from Domino’s, I become a Domino’s customer. I tell them what sort of pizza I want, and, if I have the money to pay for it, I receive my pizza. Indeed, if I am unhappy with my pizza, or if the order takes an exceptionally long time to arrive, Domino’s management will go to great lengths to ensure my satisfaction, in some cases even granting me the product in question or some future order for free. In no

case will Domino’s judge whether I deserve the pizza. They will not take my money and say, “In three or four months we will determine whether you’ve earned your order.” As long as I can pay, Domino’s has no interest in determining whether I meet any sort of standard to be eligible to eat their pizza.

In other words, businesses do not evaluate their customers. If we accept the characterization of students as customers, we likewise implicitly accept the cliché that “the customer is always right.” As Jane Buck, a retired Delaware State University psychology professor, states, “The concept of students as customers cannot possibly have a positive influence... Pandering to students rather than expecting them to do work in order to get a decent grade is not a very good idea, to put it mildly” (Clay 2008). The characterization of our students as customers leads to an abdication of our responsibility to hold students accountable for the quality of their work. If we strive constantly to satisfy our students’ immediate desires for success without ensuring that they acquire the knowledge and skills we know they need for long-term achievement in their lives, we must lower our academic standards and either alter or relinquish our methods of evaluation. The integrity of our instruction and the education of our students are both therefore inevitably damaged.

THE CORPORATE MODEL THREATENS ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND QUALITY

If academic institutions are run as businesses, then their practices will be focused on bottom-line fiscal productivity. Evidence of this trend is clear in calls for merit-based pay systems and faculty evaluation procedures that involve statistical measures of student

performance. Such incentivized compensation and evaluation practices may be reasonable in the business world, but they do not translate to an academic environment. As Robert Engvall (2010) states, “The first difficulty with using market standards in academia is that we ‘produce’ educated individuals and articles and books, not widgets that can be counted and easily valued” (p. 5). Academic success cannot always be measured in quantitative terms, and the ‘products’ of our work can be defined in many ways that often are neither immediate nor objective. Therefore, in areas of evaluation and reward, as in many others, the business model does not apply to academia.

If corporate attitudes are allowed to infiltrate the academic world, then the resulting fiscally-driven culture will constrain the ability of faculty to properly educate students. “Corporate models for operating colleges and universities value short-term profits over long-term investment in education... Professors are commodities to be exploited and traded, and academic administrators are managers whose decisions make shared governance and due process inefficient and unnecessary” (Andrews 2006). If faculty are evaluated and retain their job status based on fiscal productivity or on their ability to keep student-customers satisfied rather than on the quality of their own performance in educating the students, they will be forced to alter their instruction in multiple ways. Likewise, if administrators are encouraged to see consultation with faculty as an inconvenient obstruction to reaching economic goals, then the training and expertise of the faculty will be disrespected and the integrity of the academic program compromised.

EDUCATION IS NOT A COMMODITY

Most importantly, the business model does not translate to higher education because the goals of education and the corporate world are in fundamental opposition to each other. The Academic Senate paper *California Community Colleges: Principles and Leadership in the Context of Higher Education* (2009) makes this point through the following comparison:

Where the successful business develops a product or service that is designed to meet (or meet more effectively) an identified need, thus establishing a

relationship of dependency for the customer, colleges and universities are their most successful when their graduates have developed the intellectual independence to be successful anywhere (it is a hallmark of many graduate programs that they accept few of their own undergraduate students, believing that both the student and the institution are best served when students pursue graduate studies elsewhere). The point of education is to develop intellectual independence in the student. (p. 11)

The same paper follows with a more succinct statement of the same difference: “Perhaps most important, where businesses need customers to be dependent on their product or service, the point of education is to make learners *independent* of the authority of teacher and textbook” (p. 11). Thus, because the motivating outcomes of business and education are not only different but even conflicting, imposition of a business model on an academic institution would fundamentally alter the mission and integrity of that institution.

Because of their focus on fiscal productivity, corporate models of education tend to place more value on efficiency than on quality. “Our problem is that teaching is not about delivering a product. Education is not a commodity” (Reznik, Grill, & Marzillier 1995). Goals based on production and adherence to an economic bottom line lead to a sacrifice of the principle that our primary purpose is to provide education, not to turn out a product. Academic institutions exist not for profit, but rather, in the words of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), “for the transmission of knowledge, the pursuit of truth, the development of students, and the general well-being of society,” (AAUP, 1992). A misguided emphasis on fiscal efficiency endangers the most basic values to which faculty are committed: free exchange of ideas, service to students’ best interests, and a well-rounded and in-depth educational experience.

For these reasons and others, faculty have resisted and rightly should continue to resist all attempts to characterize higher education in corporate terms. The potentially detrimental impacts of the business model on both the integrity of our institutions and the education of our students are too severe to allow for any other position on this issue. Our professional responsibility to

ourselves and to the students we serve requires that we remind community members, well-meaning but non-academic organizations and foundations, legislators, and our own administrators that the practices and models of the corporate or business world cannot translate or be applied to higher education.

REFERENCES

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2009). *California Community Colleges: Principles and Leadership in the Context of Higher Education*. Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from <http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/PrinciplesLeadership.pdf>.

American Association of University Professors. (1992). *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students*. AAUP Policy Documents and Reports (The Redbook). Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policy-docs/contents/stud-rights.htm>

Andrews, J. G. (2006). "How We Can Resist Corporatization." *Academe Online*. May-June 2006. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2006/MJ/feat/andr.htm>

Clay, R. (2008). "The Corporatization of Higher Education." *Monitor on Psychology*. 39 (11). Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/monitor/2008/12/higher-ed.aspx>

Engvall, R. V. (2010). "The Corporatization of American Higher Education: Merit Pay Trumps Academic Freedom." *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom*. Volume One. Retrieved

from <http://www.academicfreedomjournal.org/VolumeOne/Engvall.pdf>.

Reznik, Z, Grill, B, & Marzillier, L. F. (2005). "The Corporatization of Higher Education." *Senate Rostrum*. September 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.asccc.org/node/176434>



Perceptions of Campus Climate and Engagement for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Community College Students (September 2012)

by [Crystal Kiekel](#), Los Angeles Pierce College

Over the last four years, a group of Senate leaders has worked to raise awareness about the special needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students in our colleges. This group has conducted breakout sessions at various conferences and formed the LGBT Caucus. The following article, which will be followed by another in the winter, is part of this effort. It describes a case study that was conducted in 2011 to explore community college campus climate as it relates to LGBT students. This article will provide an overview of the study and its findings, while the next one will explore the major findings in more detail.

Applying current research and theory on student engagement, campus climate, and LGBT student characteristics and experiences, the study explores the extent to which the campus climate at one community college engages and supports LGBT students. It focuses on community colleges as a unique destination for LGBT students, one which has the opportunity to provide a safe space where students can learn to engage, take risks, and thrive.

Student perceptions of campus climate have a significant impact on student engagement; engagement, in turn, is the single greatest predictor of college persistence and success (Kuh, 2001, 2003). Underrepresented groups, like people of color, women, and LGBT students, tend to express more negative views of campus climate than their majority counterparts (Rankin & Reason, 2005; Worthington, 2008). The literature that examines the role of campus climate on LGBT student engagement, persistence, and success in higher education demonstrates that LGBT students experience marginalization and discrimination at higher rates than their hetero-

sexual peers and even other unrepresented groups. However, although structures that begin to address the unique needs and strengths for many underrepresented groups have been created, the voices and needs of LGBT students remain largely unrecognized on community college campuses (Rankin & Reason, 2005; Worthington, 2008).

There is substantial literature to support the fact that LGBT students experience discrimination and marginalization that puts them at risk for academic failure. In high school, these students are at higher risk for depression, suicide, truancy, and homelessness (D'Augelli, 2002; Espelage, Aragon, Birkett, & Koenig, 2008). They are about half as likely to have plans to go to college (Fisher, Matthews, & Selvidge, 2008). They are more likely to disengage from the educational process and fail coursework, are less socially integrated, and less likely to complete college-preparation course. Despite these added academic risk factors, in 2010, fewer than 7% of institutions of higher education offered institutional support for LGBT students, demonstrating a severe lack of systemic response to the needs of this underrepresented group (Rankin, Weber, Blumenfeld, & Frazer, 2010).

The framework for this study draws from two theories for understanding student success: student engagement and campus climate (Astin, 1999; Hurtado, 1992; Kuh, 2001). Student engagement is the extent to which students engage in educationally purposeful activities; evidence suggests that engagement in these activities is associated with academic persistence. Campus climate theory demonstrates that a supportive campus climate plays a substantial role in helping students feel valued and comfortable in an institution, which increases

engagement and persistence. Campus climate literature suggests that an institution's commitment to diversity can have a significant impact on underrepresented students' perceptions of climate (Hurtado, 1992; Kuh, 2001). Using these theoretical models to provide a framework for understanding the LGBT community college experience, two research questions were explored:

1. How do self-identified LGBT community college students describe their community college campus climate?
2. What are the experiences of self-identified LGBT students who engage in college-related activities?

The site of this study was a large, urban community college. Primary data were collected through ten LGBT student and five faculty member interviews and one focus group comprised of nine students. The theoretical framework provided a lens through which these perceptions and experiences were examined and interpreted. These findings were triangulated with a document analysis. Data were analyzed for themes around climate and engagement.

The first theme that emerged was that there was a complex relationship between how students viewed the climate overall and the descriptions of the individual "microaggressions" students reported. Overall, students had positive perceptions of campus climate. Faculty and students agreed that the campus was a relatively safe, accepting, and inclusive place for LGBT students. On the other hand, students encountered multiple microaggressions on campus.

Microaggressions are subtle, non-verbal, or even preconscious daily actions that marginalize members of underrepresented groups. As single events, these acts may go unnoticed or may be forgotten. However, over time, persistence of microaggressions contributes to a constant subtext of threat and stress for members of underrepresented groups. The pervasive presence of these behaviors belied an undercurrent at the college that was difficult to pinpoint, and therefore difficult to address. These actions were sometimes overt, like seemingly innocuous gay jokes told by instructors or students. Some were subtle or unconscious behaviors, like a barely perceptible glance or even a general sense or feeling of otherness.

The second theme that emerged was that classroom experiences can have a powerful impact, positive or negative, on how students engage with their learning environments. Faculty behaviors and attitudes about the LGBT community influenced classroom engagement for these LGBT students. Seemingly subtle behaviors, like making passing jokes or even lack of behaviors, like failing to intervene when microaggressions occur in the classroom, left these LGBT students feeling alienated from their learning environments. On the other hand, affirming behaviors, like intervening when microaggressions occur in the classroom or incorporating LGBT topics into the curriculum, had a substantial positive impact. These small gestures of inclusion allowed these LGBT students to feel like they could engage more fully in the classroom.

These students derived a strong sense of belonging and identity through their affiliation with the LGBT club. The significance of this club supports literature that underscores the importance of social groups as predictors of college success. Peer association is particularly important for underrepresented students, who often perceive campus climate as more hostile or less inclusive. Similar to the sanctuaries or counterspaces that Grier-Reed (2010) described, this club provides a safe space for students to feel welcome and normal. The fact that students identified this club as their primary, and sometimes their only, social network underscores its importance. Students saw the club as an opportunity to learn about their community, teach others on campus about the community, and find vital peer support and acceptance.

Students encountered multiple microaggressions on campus. Microaggressions are subtle, non-verbal, or even preconscious daily actions that marginalize members of underrepresented groups.

This research supports three conclusions that make a significant contribution to our understanding of how LGBT students experience community college: (1) these students do not experience campus climate in the same way that heterosexual students do; (2) their social and classroom experiences had a major impact on their perceptions and levels of engagement; and (3) while this community college has made significant progress in helping them feel safe and respected on campus, the pervasiveness of microaggressions continues to leave them feeling stigmatized on campus.

We recommend providing ongoing, accessible, and comprehensive professional development for faculty, increasing campus dialogue across faculty, staff, and student constituencies, and fostering leadership around LGBT student engagement and support. By creating a culture of inclusivity and respect for all students, leaders can create an environment where students feel safe enough to take academic risks and engage in meaningful academic activities that lead to success.

REFERENCES

- Astin, A. W. (1999). *Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education*. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 518-529.
- Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. F. (2008).
- D'Augelli, A. R. (2002). *Mental health problems among lesbian, gay and bisexual youths ages 14 to 21*. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 7(3), 433-456.
- Espelage, D.L., Aragon, S.R., Birkett, M., & Koenig, B.W. (2008). *Homophobic teasing, psychological outcomes, and sexual orientation among high school students: What influence do parents and schools have?* *School Psychology Review*, 37, 2002 - 216.
- Fisher, K., Matthews, C.R., Selvidge, M.D. (2008). *Addictions counselors' attitudes and behaviors toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual clients*. *Journal of Counseling and Development*. 83(1).
- Grier-Reed, T. (2010). *The African American student network: Creating sanctuaries and counterspaces for coping with racial microaggressions in higher education settings*. *The American Counseling Association*, 49, 181-188
- Hurtado, S. (1992). *The campus racial climate: Context of conflict*. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63, 539 - 569.
- Hurtado, S., Griffin, K.A., Arellano, L. & Cuellar, M. (2008). *Assessing the value of climate assessments: Progress and future directions*. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. 1(4), 204-221
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R., and Allen, W. R. (1998) *Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice*. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(3) 279-302.
- Kuh, G.D. (2001). *Organizational culture and student persistence: Prospects and puzzles*. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 3, 23-39.
- Kuh, G. D. (2003). *What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE: Benchmarks for effective educational practices*. *Change*, 35(2), 24-32.
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). *The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual and empirical foundations*. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 141, 5-20.
- Lock, J., Steiner, H. (1999) *Gay, lesbian and bisexual youth risks for emotional, physical and social problems: results from community-based survey*. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 38, 297-304.
- Pearson, J., Muller, C., Wilkinson, L. (2007). *Adolescent same-sex attraction and academic outcomes: The role of school attachment and engagement*. *Social Problems*. 54 (4), 523-542.
- Rankin, S.R., Reason, R.D. (2005). *Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups*. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(1), 43-61.
- Rankin, S., Weber, G., Blumenfeld, W., Frazer, S. (2010). *State of Higher Education for Lesbian Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People: 2010 National College Climate Survey*. Charlotte: Campus Pride.
- Renn, K.A. (2010). *LGBT and queer research in higher education: The state and status of the field*. *Educational Researcher*, 39(2), 132-141.
- Sheets, R.L., Mohr, J.J. (2009). *Perceived social support from friends and family and psychosocial functioning in bisexual young adult college students*. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 56(1), 152-163.
- Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., Yosso, T. (2000). *Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students*. *Journal of Negro Education*. 69(1/2).
- Worthington, R. L. (Guest Ed.) (2008). *Special Issue: Measurement and Assessment in Campus Climate Research*. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1,201-274.

Searching for an Authentic Definition of Student Success

(December 2012)

by **Kim Harrell**, Folsom Lake College
and **Carolyn Holcroft**, Foothill College

Educators, policymakers, and other stakeholders have long debated what it means for students to be successful, and the Student Success Initiative has brought the discussion to the forefront yet again. The Student Success Task Force recommendations indicate the measures in the Accountability Report for Community Colleges, more commonly known as the ARCC Scorecard, as the basis for setting goals at both local and state levels. The ARCC Scorecard certainly provides useful data, including an overarching view of student persistence, degree and certificate completion, and progression through remedial coursework. Although these metrics are part of the picture, many faculty are emphatic that they are inadequate and exclude some of the most important aspects of success. Not every student who comes to our system has the goal of fulfilling remediation requirements, achieving a certificate or associate degree, or transferring to baccalaureate institution. Rather, California community college students comprise an extremely complex demographic with characteristics and life circumstances that directly affect both their goals for themselves and our goals for them as educators. Can a student be successful without meeting one of the standard metrics? Faculty throughout the state would answer this question with a resounding “yes.”

For example, Jared is the first in his family to attend college. He lives in an economically depressed area, and his most immediate goal is to obtain full-time employment as quickly as possible in a job that both interests him and will allow him to support himself.

His passion lies in health and fitness, and he entered college with the goal of completing the personal trainer certificate program. However, after successfully completing the first few courses, Jared was able to pass the national exam, and he left school before completing the certificate when he was offered a full-time job at a fitness center as a personal trainer.

Similarly, Sharon is a working mother of two who is attending her local community college to improve her keyboarding skills in order to earn a promotion. She has no degree or certificate aspirations, nor does she plan to persist beyond successfully completing her keyboarding class. Sharon perseveres, passes the class, and earns her promotion.

Jared and Sharon are just two examples of success that are not currently reflected in the ARCC metrics. Even though job attainment, promotion, and salary increases are concrete success indicators that are relatively easy to measure, the ARCC report does not account for them, nor are they communicated at the system level where policy and funding decisions are made.

But the ARCC report also fails to include an even more significant element of success, one that seems more abstract and subjective and does not lend itself as readily to quantitative measurement systems: student learning. As faculty, we strive to help students gain knowledge and confidence in a particular discipline. We are even more fervent, however, about helping them become competent in the “big picture” outcomes that employers are demanding and that so many colleges have

articulated as institution-level goals: communication, critical thinking, quantitative literacy, and citizenship. Success means empowering our students to contribute to finding solutions to challenges in their communities and to become thoughtful members of society. Although these institutional-level goals seem more difficult to measure, they lie at the heart of what we do. We do not have to start from scratch: faculty have already been testing many different approaches at their colleges, and we must continue to share these ideas with each other. Goals such as these are no less valuable to California's vitality than more easily quantifiable measures, but they seem glaringly absent from the ARCC Scorecard metrics.

Education in the United States is rapidly evolving, and community college faculty must therefore develop novel ways to capture student success and learning more comprehensively and to more effectively communicate these successes to the public both formally and informally. We may be able to learn from our partners in adult education, who have adopted the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS). The data obtained through CASAS is compiled in the California Adult Education Annual Performance Report, which shows outcomes for hundreds of thousands of students in the program, including those who were served at California community colleges. The intake form paints a clear and comprehensive picture of who their students are and goes beyond the standard demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, and ethnicity) to dive deeper into student characteristics and goals such as personal status (e.g., veteran, displaced homemaker, etc.), native language, primary and secondary goals for one year, work status, highest degree earned, and affiliation with special programs such as Perkins or State Corrections. This rich student profile is coupled with learner results

in a variety of categories, including work status (e.g., got a job, entered an apprenticeship, entered job training, etc.), citizenship successes (e.g., achieved U.S. citizenship, registered to vote for the first time, increased involvement in the community), and personal or family successes (e.g., increased involvement in their children's education or met another family goal).

In addition to the measured successes, CASAS provides a reporting mechanism for those individuals who leave the program—a type of data that would be of use to community college faculty, who have great interest in understanding the reasons that students do not complete our programs. CASAS offers a solution through the assessment process by capturing “reasons for exiting,” which include program completion, met goal, got a job, moved, lack of childcare, family problems, lack of transportation, health problems, and others. The CASAS system lets adult education faculty know who their students are, why they are in the program, and what their outcomes are, whether they be “completers” or “leavers.”

The truest definition of student success is determined by the goals and personal situation of each individual student. For this reason, no single comprehensive statement or simple set of metrics can offer a complete and meaningful picture of the many ways in which our students succeed every year at all of our colleges. Nevertheless, although tracking and defining student outcomes and progress is a difficult task, we have an obligation to our students and our society to develop meaningful student success metrics and indicators and to find ways to more authentically communicate our students' successes on the ARCC Scorecard. We must continue to work to help policy makers both within and outside of our system understand that simple definitions and purely quantitative measures cannot present an accurate image of the many ways in which our students succeed or of how our colleges serve the state. Only through our continued and determined efforts in this area can we ensure that the metrics by which student success is measured will benefit both our students and the state as a whole and will align with the important and complete mission of the California Community Colleges.

**The truest definition
of student success is
determined by the goals
and personal situation of
each individual student.**

Take a Look in the Mirror: Should the Diversity of Our Faculty Reflect the Diversity of Our Students?

(May 2015)

by **Robert (BJ) Snowden**, Cosumnes River College

This *Rostrum* article is not intended to be an exhaustive review of literature and research but rather to serve as a working document that can help guide the efforts of academic senate leaders. The purpose is to discuss the importance of a diverse faculty and its positive impact on our student body. It should serve as a beginning to this discussion and as a call to action for local senates as they question their status quo in regard to hiring practices and the current makeup of their local senate leadership.

The student body in California community colleges is more diverse than it has ever been. We have a wider breath of students taking courses, earning degrees or certificates, receiving job training, and filling our classrooms. As a system, we are making extraordinary strides in attempting to meet their increasing demands. Between innovative approaches to teaching and learning and much needed financial support from the state, we have attacked many of the challenges associated with serving our students head-on and with great vigor. Yet, while we are attempting to meet these needs, we must also be proactive in shaping the overall college experience of our students. We should always work to create the best environment to produce well-rounded citizens that will leave our institutions and be able to truly contribute to society and not to shield

them with like-minded and outdated perspectives and experiences.

According to the CCC Chancellor's Office Faculty and Staff Demographics Report, 17,059 tenured or tenure track faculty were working in the system during the fall of 2014. Of that number, 10,726 self-identified as White Non-Hispanic, which translates to 62.88% of our faculty. During that same semester, our student headcount was reported as 1,571,534. Only 440,974, or 28.06% of those students self-identified as White Non-Hispanic, which clearly is a stark contrast to our faculty ratio. The students' statistics are not an anomaly and will only continue to increase in the future. If presenting a diverse collective of thought and reflecting the social diversity of our state is of importance to us as leaders, we must take action now.

The greater the diversity among faculty, the greater our diversity in class assignments, mentoring, course content, and, even more importantly, scholarly ideas. A diverse faculty brings to campus a way of thinking that may have been unexplored; it brings a voice to decision-making that has historically been absent. It brings authenticity to the experience of the underrepresented students who have navigated the educational system and now stand on the other side ready to serve. A diverse faculty will not only directly

impact students but also add value and perspective to shared governance practices, to planning efforts, and to the campus community. Institutions as a whole will benefit when a wide range of ideas and outlooks are included and valued. When we limit ourselves to what we know and whom we know, we are in danger of doing a much greater injustice that permeates beyond our campuses and into our communities.

One of the most critical decisions a campus can make is whom it hires as a tenure track faculty member. Unlike administrators, faculty members rarely move from campus to campus. We commit to our college and our department often spending whole careers at one institution. We must therefore take steps to diversify our faculty for the benefit of our colleges and our students.

RECRUITMENT

The recruitment of a diverse faculty pool for an open position requires districts and institutions to publish and distribute vacancies as widely as possible. The expansion of recruiting efforts allows for the position to reach all possible potential candidates. Connections to local universities are also critical to recruitment.

Having a faculty more reflective of our student demographics can reduce anxiety for many students as they are the first in their families to attend college, and it can also generate a sense of connectedness to the institution that is impossible to fabricate.

Faculty chairs should be in regular contact with graduate programs in their field encouraging promising students to apply for fulltime or adjunct positions after graduation.

HIRING COMMITTEES

Colleges should examine their hiring practices and specifically their hiring committees. They should consider who they place on committees and what strengths and perspectives those individuals bring. And they will need to show courage in the face of opposition, understanding that many may not see the value of looking for input outside of the discipline or from newer faculty. In essence, in order to cast a wider net, we must diversify our vision of hiring. This vision is important not only in regard to ethnicity but also in a broader context including seniority, discipline, age, and background. As leaders, we must motivate those who might not normally serve and communicate to those who are limited in their perspective.

MENTORING

Perhaps one of the most important elements in diversifying our faculty is to mentor prospective full-time applicants in our adjunct pools. An adjunct position is often the gateway to a fulltime job in community colleges. Because of this natural pipeline, faculty leaders have a responsibility to encourage and guide adjuncts into contributing roles on campus and in the discipline. When we make our adjuncts solid candidates, we have a better opportunity of hiring the best colleague.

Diversifying our faculty ranks can have a multitude of benefits, but none more important than the impact it can have on our students. Having a faculty more reflective of our student demographics can reduce anxiety for many students as they are the first in their families to attend college, and it can also generate a sense of connectedness to the institution that is impossible to fabricate. Academic senates should foster an ongoing dialogue concerning these difficult conversations while addressing the benefits to diversifying our faculty ranks, as well as continuing to acknowledge how important it is for those in leadership to act now.

Table of Contents

FROM THE PRESIDENT (OCTOBER 1984)	1
REFORM ACT OF 1986 DIES (NOVEMBER 1986)	3
REFORM BECOMES REALITY (SUMMER 1989)	5
AN IN-DEPTH LOOK AT THE MERTES 'NO CONFIDENCE' VOTE (JUNE 1994)	8
OVERUSE AND UNDERCOMPENSATION OF PART-TIME FACULTY IN THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES (OCTOBER 1998)	10
LEADERSHIP IN AN EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT (JUNE 1999)	13
TEACHING: A CALL FOR RENEWAL AND REDEDICATION (OCTOBER 1999)	15
WHY THE MASTER PLAN MATTERS (APRIL 2001)	18
VALUING DIVERSITY (OCTOBER 2002)	25
INTEGRITY OF PROCESS: ON THE ONE HAND (DECEMBER 2004)	29
THE FORGOTTEN ONES: WHOM DO WE REPRESENT? (MAY 2005)	33
CONFRONTATION AND THE COMMON GOOD (MAY 2007)	35
BUDGET PROCESSES: MAINTAINING THE 10 PLUS 1 IN BUDGET CRISIS (DECEMBER 2008)	37
PUTTING STUDENTS FIRST: THE SOLUTION TO THE CHALLENGE OF PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE (APRIL 2010)	39
FEDERALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE EXPANDING DATA BUBBLE (DECEMBER 2010)	41
UNITED WE SUCCEED: RESPONDING TO CRITICISMS OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES (MARCH 2011)	45
WHY WE RESIST THE BUSINESS MODEL (MARCH 2011)	49
PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS CLIMATE AND ENGAGEMENT FOR LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS (SEPTEMBER 2012)	51
SEARCHING FOR AN AUTHENTIC DEFINITION OF STUDENT SUCCESS SUCCESS (DECEMBER 2012)	55
TAKE A LOOK IN THE MIRROR: SHOULD THE DIVERSITY OF OUR FACULTY REFLECT THE DIVERSITY OF OUR STUDENTS? (MAY 2015)	57

THE ROSTRUM IS DISTRIBUTED TO ALL FACULTY THROUGH COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENTS AND BY INDIVIDUAL MAILING. FOR DEADLINE INFORMATION CALL (916) 445-4753 OR EMAIL INFO@ASCCC.ORG

NOTE: THE ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN THE ROSTRUM DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT THE ADOPTED POSITIONS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE. FOR ADOPTED POSITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, PLEASE VISIT OUR WEBSITE.

YOU CAN FIND THIS AND THE PREVIOUS ISSUES OF THIS PUBLICATION ONLINE AT: WWW.ASCCC.ORG

PRESIDENT: JOHN STANSKAS · EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: KRISTINNE MICA