*Senate*Rostrum

The Newsletter of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

---

Partnership: Problems and Paradoxes

• *by Linda Collins, Secretary*

It sounded so wonderful. An infusion of millions of dollars over the next seven years to address student success and improve student achievement. Partnership for Excellence, as it came to be called, sounded almost too good to be true. Well, it was.

The Partnership for Excellence is a program to enhance student outcomes. These include transfer, degrees and certificates, successful course completion rate, workforce development measures, and basic skills improvement. The system's proposal was designed to exchange improvement in these areas for "a substantial financial investment by the State."

The Chancellor envisioned a seven-year program of structured budget increases in $100 million increments. In year one, $100 million (M) was added to the system's base; the next year another $100M was to be added onto the $100M base, for $200M total. Year three would be fund-

ed at $300M, and so on. The hope was to bring the California Community College System to within $1500 per full time equivalent student (FTES) of the national average. Currently we lag far behind other states in funding levels per student.

So, what's happening at the state level?

The system received $100M in its 1998-99 budget. The initial Governor's budget for 1999-2000 allots only $10M in increased funds for Partnership. The $100M is in the base, though no cost of living adjustment was given on that sum. While normally the Governor's recommendations are augmented by available state dollars in May (known as the May revise), it is too early to know just what the final sum might be. While it is possible that the allocation will go up from $10M, it's unlikely that the system will get the full $100M additional investment.

This raises a critical question. If the goals established by the system were envisioned as an exchange (a "quid pro quo" as the Chancellor called it), then what is the expectation for achievement if the program isn't fully funded? If we receive only 10% of the funding, it would seem reasonable that we be held only to 10% of the goals.

Can Computers Replace Teachers?

• *by Hoke Simpson, Chair, Publications Committee*

In the Academic Senate paper, *The Future of the Community College: A Faculty Perspective*,[1] the authors maintain that computer-based distance learning is inherently inferior to traditional classroom instruction. This position is not so much argued in the paper as it is merely asserted. "Teaching is the 'business' of creating epiphanies," say the authors, "and this will always be best accomplished through the power of personal presence." (*Future*, p. 14)

It may not surprise anyone that the Academic Senate Office has not been flooded with E-mail and phone calls from the field contesting this assertion. It seems that most instructors—even those most dedicated to developing the new modes of delivery—acknowledge, perhaps on no more than an intuitive basis, the truth of this claim.

As the paper points out, however, there are those whose vision of the future is singularly "faculty-less," and who, instead, see the

Faculty Unity is Within Reach

Cooperation among the statewide organizations that represent faculty is at an all-time high. The results of this unified faculty voice in Sacramento have been stunning. With several challenges on the horizon, it is more important now than ever to keep this spirit of collaboration alive.

Five faculty groups have representatives on the Consultation Council, the eighteen member body that gives advice to the Chancellor and the Board of Governors on matters of policy and procedure. They are the Community College Association of CTA, the Community College Council of CFT, the California Community College Independents, the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges and the Academic Senate. Each union is represented by its president: Debra Landre of CCA/CTA, Tom Tyner of CCC/CFT, and Deborah Sweitzer of CCCI. Sam Weiss represents FACCC as its president, and Lee Haggerty and I represent the Senate on the Consultation Council. Together we make up COFO, the Council of Faculty Or-

ganizations, an informal affiliation that meets each month just before the Consultation Council.

Each of these leaders has contributed their expertise and energy both personally and organizationally to the best interests of faculty in the broadest sense. A few examples should suffice. The efforts of the Academic Senate to oppose performance based funding are well known. But less well known is that the hard-fought concessions during the last stages of the legislative process were through a strong alliance forged by Debra Landre of CCA/CTA. Without her influence in the Legislature, we could be looking at a college-by-college pay-for-performance system right now. Many of you are aware of the burgeoning effort to hire more full-time faculty. But few know of the tireless and relentless efforts of Tom Tyner of CCC/CFT to use Partnership for Excellence funds for full-time hires and produce a budget proposal for 1999-2000 that would pledge another $40 million to full-time hiring. Debra has used her resources to bring legal expertise to bear on the

Education Code revision in which we are all involved. Tom has produced documentation on intellectual property rights contract language which has helped us all advocate for faculty ownership of works we create. Deborah Sweitzer has shepherded our efforts to meet the needs of part-time faculty, particularly through support of the COFO part-time workshops. Last year when the Chancellor attempted to put into legislation his own "Strategic Response for 2005" rather than promoting the Consultation Council plan "2005 Report," it was FACCC that led the way on stifling that bill. Sam Weiss has continued that strong FACCC leadership through her expertise on workforce preparation and economic development which are the subject of several bills this year. On all of these issues, the faculty groups were unified as a joint leadership team.

In my many years in leadership–as a FACCC member and, at various times, a member of locals of CCCI, CCA/CTA and CCC/CFT–I have never seen unity this

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 Seefer, Diablo Valley College
Van Dees, Golden West College
Elton Hall, Moorpark College
Editor: Julie Adams, Academic Senate

high. Yes, many of us remember stressful times. CTA and FACCC have had their tumbles; so have the Senate and FACCC. And the competition of the unions for local representation has occasionally had a ripple effect at the state level. But those days are past. CTA/NEA and CFT/AFT continue to talk about unification. The Academic Senate has recently signed memoranda of understanding with both CCA and CCC to go along with our years-old memorandum of understanding with FACCC. The officers of the five organizations will hold a unity meeting this coming September.

But our task is far from over. The alliance forged among Debra, Tom, Deborah, Sam and myself must continue even as our organizations hold elections to decide the future board members and leaders of our organizations. It is essential that those leaders have the same commitment to collaboration as has been demonstrated in the last two years. There are, of course, those who are very proud of their own organization. I am very proud of the Academic Senate and what we have done. But we cannot champion our own organization over the common best interests of all faculty. The risks are too great. There are those outside of the faculty ranks who are, at this very moment, advocating for the demise of shared governance, for statewide collective bargaining, and for the abolishment of tenure. It will take all faculty working together to stem the tide.

So as you consider whom to select to represent you as the leadership of these groups, ask the tough questions of the hopefuls: "Do you support faculty unity? Will you collaborate with other faculty organizations for the common good?" We will stand or fall together!

Excellence in Education

In 1985 the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges, in honor of the former state Chancellor, Gerald C. Hayward, created awards for outstanding community college faculty. The Gerald C. Hayward Award for "Excellence in Education" has been awarded since 1988. Four recipients, each from different areas of the state, are selected and honored annually at the March Board of Governors' meeting. All faculty, both inside and outside the classroom, are eligible for the award.

Each community college is encouraged to nominate one faculty member. A selection committee consisting of Area Representatives of the Academic Senate evaluate the candidates from a different area. The candidate's identity is unknown to the selection committee. The candidates are evaluated on their commitment to: education; serving students; community colleges, including support for open access and helping students succeed; serving the institution through participation in professional and/or student activities; and serving as a representative of the profession beyond the local institution.

The 1999 Hayward Award for "Excellence in Education" is sponsored by the Foundation for California Community Colleges and was awarded to Elizabeth Barkley, a music instructor at Foothill College; Lynda Corbin, an English instructor at San Diego Mesa Community College; Joseph Munoz, a political science and history in-

structor at Feather River College; and Janet Shapiro, the Coordinator of Disabled Student Services at Santa Barbara City College. The winners were honored at the March 8th Board of Governors meeting in Sacramento. Each recipient was introduced by the Academic President Bill Scroggins and received a plaque and $1,250 cash award presented by Larry Toy, Foundation President. Checkout the Senate's website for more information on each of the recipient.

International and Global Education

• by Bill Scroggins, President

The issue of global education and how it has been approached at the system level has been a concern of the Academic Senate for some time. This article will attempt to put those issues in perspective, at least from my point of view.

The best piece of work on this topic is a recently released report, *Looking to the Future: Report on California Community College International and Global Education Programs,* written by Rosalind Latiner Raby, longtime coordinator of international education for the Los Angeles Community College District. The report points out that 87 of the 91 responding colleges had at least one program in this area. The programs and activities can generally be placed in 8 categories:

• Faculty/Staff Exchange in which jobs are exchanged for a limited period,

• International Development to provide education and training to other countries,

What Makes Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) Succeed?

by Robert Breuer, Las Positas College

@ONE is a grass-roots, faculty-driven project, which last year conducted interviews with California college faculty practitioners who are effectively using technology to enhance or deliver instruction. Their uses of new technologies (multimedia, the web, E-mail, or computer simulations) prompt them to revise the structure of a course, alter assignment design, and to reconsider the ways in which students approach learning. TMI offers very flexible teaching media.

Some California college and university faculty have begun to explore open entry/exit modules, which have untapped potential for tailoring courses to the diverse talents of the community college population. For example, students who are highly motivated with a strong academic foundation can achieve transfer more quickly; others who have a strong base in particular content areas can opt for early exit and focus attention on those subjects which require more effort; students with special needs have the ability to take charge of their learning, can pace how and when they review materials, and formulate responses. For example, Judy Meyer of Santa Barbara City College found that providing materials on-line (and this can be done with E-mail and other technologies as well) is extremely helpful to ESL and students with disabilities, for such strategies reduce the anxiety of losing what is said in lecture.

According to other faculty practitioners, E-mail has greatly improved the quantity and quality of teacher/student interaction and student/student interaction. Access to instructors is often restricted to posted office hours; working students, students with family responsibilities, and those enrolled in night courses often find it difficult to meet directly with the instructor. These students also often find that traditional instruction restricts peer interaction to class meetings or to intervals immediately before or after class. E-mail, by enabling asynchronous discussion, solves such access issues. It provides the opportunity for increased contact with the instructor, fuller participation in peer discussions, and increased participation in collaborative projects. While these pioneers caution that faculty and students must be trained to use E-mail, all testify to its effectiveness in encouraging effective contact between students and faculty, promoting prompt feedback, and developing reciprocity and cooperation among students.

Many faculty have found that asynchronous discussion increases and improves the quality of student time on task and provides those with diverse talents and modalities of learning with enhanced learning opportunities. For example, participation is easier for students with disabilities and multi-lingual students (who may need to reread materials and revise response) and for students who are often silent in traditional classroom discussions, which privileges quick response.

TMI motivates faculty and students to keep up with changing technologies and encourages faculty to explore and experiment with the instructional potential new technologies offer. This translates into increased computer literacy skills for students preparing to enter a technology rich workplace. John Herzog of CSU Northridge finds the process endlessly exciting. Every time you go on the Internet, he observes, you go on a treasure hunt.

The same is true for students. Marshal Cates (CSU Los Angeles) notes that exposure to multimedia, E-mail, and the Web provides students with incremental increases in computer literacy, and Eric Harpell of Las Positas College reports that tying computer literacy to learning tasks allows students to adapt and modify their skills in order to achieve learning and results in other classes. Finally, Christine Pitchess of Joblink (Coastline College) has found that students transfer computer literacy and teamwork skills to the workplace and this has received unanimous positive response from supervisors.

Clearly, faculty and students alike find that using technology to achieve learning promotes the good practice of a self-renewing process. According to Susan Adrian of Mission College, freedom combined with sufficient student desire equals a dream learning situation.

Despite our being located on 107 statewide community college campuses, faculty are brought together through emerging technologies. As faculty ourselves, the @ONE project is one good place to connect. Our @ONE website provides one place to find support and information on technology training. California community college faculty and staff are invited to find one another and many other news items regarding California Community College technology training by visiting our website at http://one.fhda.edu and joining the @ONE eCommunity.

Accreditation Evaluation Teams-The Comprehensive Visit

Serving on an evaluation team for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) can be one of the most rewarding experiences of your professional life. This conclusion is reached by most of those who serve on teams visiting ACCJC member institutions regardless of whether they are veterans of the process or "rookies".

Dr. Joseph Gonzalez, a Professor of History at Moorpark College in the Ventura County Community College District, recently wrote: "I have always stressed to my Modern History students that they would do well to emulate the professional work ethic of the British Expeditionary Force of the First World War. Their motto was 'We'll do it. What is it?' I did not expect to see that level of devotion to duty and pride of craft in accrediting circles, but I have, in fact <u>lived</u> it. I have seen educators commit to the mission of excellence they pursue, living their profession in service to it, never forgetting whom they serve. Serving on a team is a grand experience and one which I seek to have at every opportunity."

Dr. Gonzalez's statements demonstrate the essence of the evaluation experience in the process of accreditation. As a voluntary, non-governmental process, it depends on a cadre of volunteer professionals who serve as independent appraisers of what a college's self study says about what is has, what it does, and what it achieves.

By offering insights based on analysis of what the college has written about itself and in conducting an onsite evaluation, teams call attention to issues of institutional effectiveness. This activity assures Commission members that the college has been responsive to all of the recommendations made by previous teams as well as to all the directions given by the Commission. Teams also assure the Commission that, in its continuing pursuit of excellence, the institution has developed sound evaluation and planning procedures concerning assessment of student outcomes. Having received information from the teams in the form of a report, the Commission can then deliberate and reach an informed decision on the accredited status of an institution as well as on the recommendations to be made for continued improvement.

Team members are selected from a roster of experienced educators who have offered their services as evaluators and who have been trained by commission staff in workshops held twice a year. They are expected to provide impartial and experienced evaluation and to address any special concerns expressed by the college. A typical team will be made up of individuals whose expertise lies in one of the many aspects of the typical college community. Thus, the team will include faculty members; a chief executive officer; academic and student services administrators; a trustee; a business officer; and an individual with experience in planning, research, and institutional evaluation. Teams reflect the diversity of the college and are a balance of experienced and first-time evaluators.

Team members are evaluated on their performance by team chairs and these evaluations are reported to the Executive Director. Evaluations become part of the continuous Commission effort at providing quality assurance to the public.

Experienced evaluators who have gained a reputation as leaders in accreditation issues are invited to serve as team chairs. They are trained by Commission staff to provide the leadership necessary for successful completion of a comprehensive visit. The team chair is the Commission's representative; the leader of the team, manager, and spokesperson; and, with in-put from team members, the author of the report to the Commission. To a large extent, the success of an evaluation visit depends on the quality of this leadership. The team leader, too, is evaluated as part of the on-going process of quality assurance.

The process of accreditation used in this country is unique and remarkable and it relies on the commitment of professional educators for its success. Peer review continues to be at the center of American accreditation. The Commission always has an interest in recruiting new evaluation team members. If you are interested in being a part of this effort, give us a call to receive the necessary application form.

Note: Applications are available by contacting the Academic Senate Office at (916) 445-4753.

teaching function taken over by machines. How much more efficient and cost effective! How many fewer grievances and contract disputes! And shared *what*? Govern this! (…as the plug is pulled.)

In view of recent sightings in our fair state of the occasional manager and even legislator given to the opinion that faculty are far too uppity, and whose eyes grow brighter at the prospect of a future without us, it might not hurt to look more closely at the analysis behind the claim that classroom instruction is the preferred route to learning.

At last spring's meeting of the American Philosophical Association in Los Angeles, Professor Eugene Heath of SUNY at New Paltz found himself on a panel discussing the potential of computers for the delivery of instruction in philosophy. Professor Heath was, at best, lonely and, at worst, he must have felt like he had wandered into some sort of sales convention. His fellow panelists were all from the same institution in the Northwest, and they had come to sell. With the zeal of the newly-converted, they hosanna'd the glory of the machine, and praised the learning experience they had brought to their students through the manipulation of bits and bytes.

Professor Heath was no stranger to distance learning: he had developed and taught his own course via computer and had written about it in an article titled, "Two Cheers and a Pint of Worry: An On-Line Course in Political and Social Philosophy."[2] On this occasion, finding the "cheers" in abundant supply, Mr. Heath gave voice to his "pint of worry," and talked about his reservations about on-line classes. In the panel discussion, as in his article, he grouped his remarks under three headings: the professor as

a cause of thought; the profession of teaching as a practice; and the college as a place.

Behind each of these areas of concern, according to Heath, is the fact "that on-line education reduces all communication to written propositions.…The real issue," he writes, "is whether teaching and learning can be reduced to written propositions." (295)

Heath's answer is "No, they cannot." On-line documents, he suggests, "may offer opportunities for thought and reflection, but these documents may not *cause* reflection, at least not in the same nuanced manner as a skilled teacher causes one to think and reflect." (296) For example, a teacher can cause reflection through the use of her voice and strategic silences. In his spoken remarks, Heath told the story of an instructor whose effectiveness increased dramatically through the device of bringing a cup of coffee to class. Whenever he paused to take a drink, the silence gave students the occasion to reflect and pose questions. Such silences can't be achieved in the medium of the written word.

Additionally, Heath notes, for a professor's words to be effective…

"(in the sense of effecting thought) one must have an awareness of one's audience. This awareness is not merely an awareness of facts about the audience (so-and-so dislikes Plato, is active in student government, is unhappy, and so forth) but an awareness of that audience's attentiveness, comprehension, seriousness, and interest. Without such awareness, the classroom professor is merely speaking, reading, or explaining, all of which could be done in a room with no one present. And what is the professor do-

ing when engaged in on-line teaching? The on-line awareness of the professor is limited to whatever facts may be gleaned from some on-line profile of students or from the professor's own evaluation of the student's written work; however, …none of this matches the immediacy or efficiency of direct, face-to-face, awareness. In its absence, there is little room for the unarticulated understanding, the spontaneous insight, or the developing sympathy that can arise between teacher and learner." (296)

The production of that moment of insight is the "epiphany" of which the authors of the *Future* paper wrote. Of course epiphanies can occur in the course of one's reading of written propositions; their occurrence in such circumstances, however, seems likely to be far more random and less frequent than under the nurturing provocations of an instructor.

This brings us to yet another dimension of the issue of the professor as cause of learning, one which Heath does not discuss. He, and we, when talking about "modes of instructional delivery," tend to be exclusively focused on the advantages and disadvantages to the student. There are, however, advantages to the instructor as well. Through the performatory aspects of their profession, instructors stand in a relationship to their audience similar to that of all performers: They nurture certain appropriate responses in their audience and, in their turn, the performers feed off of—are quickened or nurtured by—those responses when they are produced. As the comedian lives for the laugh, so the professor lives for the moment of insight. From the

professor's perspective, the difference between classroom and on-line instruction in terms of her own satisfaction is similar to the difference between the experience of the singer who has thrilled a live audience, and one who has achieved a "wrap" in the recording studio. The immediacy and intensity of the former cannot be matched by the latter. We have a right to expect that burn-out will occur much sooner for the on-line "performer" than for the one with a live classroom audience.

Heath's concern with the professor as cause of learning leads naturally enough to his concern with the profession of teaching as a practice. At its best, classroom instruction involves the exercise of "judgment and know how, neither of which," Heath writes, "can be reduced to rules or systems, but both of which are essential components of the *practice* of teaching." (296) The effective teacher's awareness of the "attentiveness, comprehension, seriousness, and interest" of the students is constantly translated into judgments as to which phrase, diagram, admonition, or example will bring students closer to achieving insight. One knows how to re-phrase the student's inchoate question in just the way that will help him toward the answer. And one knows that not all inchoate questions are equal, that they reflect greater and lesser distances from the goal of comprehension, and one measures one's responses accordingly.

Heath's concern, of course, is that the conditions of immediacy required for this sort of practice, "involving unarticulated judgment and know how," simply do not exist on-line, especially when " all communication must be reduced to disembodied propositions." (296)

Another dimension of the practice of teaching which gives Heath pause lies in the fact that such practice involves "more than judgment or know how: It is also exemplary of attitudes, dispositions, emotions, and commitments, none of which are easily conveyed through written propositions." (296) In the written word, one finds only the products of the professor's labor; lost are the attitudes, the "intellectual qualities," the passion, discipline, patience, etc., that informed it. Yet, Heath maintains, it is the acquisition of these intellectual qualities, taught by example in the classroom, that makes the difference between true learning and the mere transfer of information.

Finally, Heath's focus on the importance of conveying intellectual attitudes brings him to his concern with the college as a place. One of the great attractions of on-line learning is that of the "college without walls," of learning that is not bound by constraints of space and time, that can be engaged in when it is convenient to do so. Heath believes that these very features of on-line learning inculcate precisely the wrong attitudes and values.

"A (physical) place devoted to learning, study, and research, a place to which one must go at certain hours, may prove inconvenient to some, but its very inconvenience is also its signal importance: Some things have to be set aside if one is to engage, focus, and commit oneself to learning. Though this is one consequence of place, it also implies the seriousness of education. That the computer is convenient because its courses occur in no real space or time easily translates into the view that one need not engage when one

doesn't want to, that one need not set aside certain activities for the sake of learning, and that one may, simply, turn off the machine if something is too difficult; in sum: learning is no more important than anything else." (297)

Heath concludes that "perhaps on-line education has a place, but it is a subordinate one: on-line education is best viewed, at least under current technology, as a surrogate: The best education occurs between teacher and student." (297)

It is certainly worth observing at this point—especially for those who may not yet have read the paper on *The Future of the Community College*—that the paper by no means places the Academic Senate in opposition to the use of technology in education. As is pointed out in the paper's conclusion,

"The Academic Senate would be clear…that it is rejecting only the extreme demand that technology serve as a replacement for faculty. The Academic Senate maintains that technology, both now and in the future, is a marvelous enhancement to instruction, and would urge that its potential continue to be explored and utilized. In addition, the Academic Senate applauds the fine work of those faculty who are developing course content for distance learning, who are maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity while ensuring increased accessibility to higher education for students in the future." (*Future*, p. 17)

Heath's remarks do have considerable import for those who develop on-line courses. If he is correct, and the loss of immediacy involved in going on-line is an impedi-

ment to learning, then it becomes all the more important that on-line instructors adhere rigorously to pedagogical "good practices." As the authors point out in the Academic Senate paper, *Guidelines for Good Practice: Technology Mediated Instruction*, "good teaching is good teaching, regardless of the medium or method chosen for delivery."[3] If the medium has inherent obstacles (and every medium does—yes, even the classroom), then one must take special care to find ways of compensating for them. One way to do this is to seek out and take advantage of unique opportunities afforded by the new medium itself. As we can see from Robert Breuer's remarks elsewhere in this issue ("What Makes Technology Mediated Instruction (TMI) Succeed?"), this seems to be exactly what instructors in California's post-secondary systems are doing.

Does Heath's analysis have implications for the Academic Senate's hard-fought and successful battle to change the "personal contact" requirement for distance learning to "effective contact"? I don't think so. On-line learning has one huge advantage over classroom instruction: It provides access to education for those who cannot get to the classroom. Heath himself acknowledges this. The "personal contact" requirement vitiated this advantage, and the Academic Senate furthered the cause of student access in getting it changed.

I, like Heath, am an instructor of philosophy who ventured into the digital world—in my own case, spending ten years teaching in a department of computer science. I am excited about the potential of on-line instruction, and am delighted by the Academic Senate's insistence on maintaining the highest pedagogical standards. For my own part, however, I am most interested in computer technology as an adjunct to classroom instruction, which, I am convinced, is

8 Senate Rostrum

inherently superior to its on-line cousin.

There is, in sum, an important role for technology in education; but that role will not entail the 'downsizing' of faculty so long as our 'business' is that of creating epiphanies.

---

[1] The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, "The Future of the Community College: A Faculty Perspective." Paper adopted Fall 1998.
[2] Eugene Heath, "Two Cheers and a Pint of Worry: An On-Line Course in Social and Political Philosophy." *Teaching Philosophy*, September 1997, 20:3, 277-300.
[3] The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, "Guidelines for Good Practice: Technology Mediated Instruction." Paper adopted Fall 1997. Page 1.

• International Economic Development preparing U.S. business for global trade,

• International Students coming to our colleges to learn,

• International Studies, degree programs in careers with international focus,

• Virtual Education providing online courses available worldwide,

• Internationalizing Curricula in which international themes are infused in many courses, and

• Study Abroad, an opportunity for our students to study in other countries.

Some of these programs are very common: 90% of colleges reported having International Students, 56% had Study Abroad, and 44% had Faculty Exchanges. The most frequent degrees offered are International Business (26%) and International Studies (11%). Infusion of international themes into the curriculum is very common as well. The most common types of courses with specific units on internationalism are ESL (93%) and Foreign Languages (76%). One of the ED>Net economic development initiatives directly focuses on helping U.S. business deal with international trade.

The value of giving our students an international perspective is clear.

Our students are generally quite insular in their view of the world, a conclusion that is supported by the recent Carnegie Foundation report, *Reinventing Undergraduate Education*. As with Multicultural Education, which gives our students comparisons among ways of life of groups within our own country, International Education broadens the perspectives of our students and can be a springboard for an understanding and tolerance that is sorely needed in this country.

The problem that I have is with the Global Education portion of this equation, those programs in which we assist our own companies with doing business overseas or in which we assist foreign businesses in learning what American industry has to offer. Here I think we are straying from our primary mission to educate the residents of California. And I have a problem with the use of this state's precious education dollars for activities that so directly benefit individual businesses–particularly those in foreign countries. In my opinion, these types of activities should be confined to contract education in which the full costs–both direct and indirect–are covered by the businesses which benefit. Until the proposals that I see coming from Sacramento meet these criteria, I cannot support them.

Currently, a Board of Governors grant is supporting the work of the International/Global Education Network Task Force, chaired by Brice Harris, chancellor of the Los Rios Community College District, and staffed by Juan Cruz of the Chancellor's Office. Our own Executive Committee members Dennis Smith and Mark Snowhite have been liaisons to this group. Those of you who would like to know more about this issue can contact Juan Cruz at (916) 327-2987. Copies of Rosalind Raby's *Looking to the Future* report can be obtained by contacting her at rabyrl@aol.com.

Institutes "R" Us

• by Bill Scroggins, President

As summer approaches, the Academic Senate is working on several training experiences for faculty and others. These summer institutes are a valuable service provided by the Academic Senate and, we hope, at least one of these opportunities may interest you–yes, YOU, not just your senate president! On tap are the Faculty Leadership Institute, the Student Leadership Institute, the Technology in Teaching Institute and the Curriculum Institute. Details on all these institutes will be available on our web site as they develop.

The Faculty Leadership Institute is approaching its ten year mark. Intended for new and emerging local senate leaders, it provides in-depth training and experiential learning all the way from principles of leadership to the nuts-and-bolts of everyday operation of a local senate. This year's institute will be June 24-27 in San Diego and is designed for 50 participants. Co-coordinators are Nancy Silva and Dennis Smith.

The Technology in Teaching Institute is in its second year and is co-sponsored by the @ONE faculty technology training project, a grant spearheaded by De Anza College. This five day intensive training is a hands-on experience in how to use technology in teaching. Held at CSU Monterey Bay from June 14-18, five different tracks are featured, each in a separate computer lab at CSUMB. The tracks include: 1) introductory word processing and related skills, 2) multimedia including scanning and image manipulation, 3) basic web page design for the purpose of using the web to support classroom-based instruction, 4) design of online courses–from curriculum development to software applications, and 5) a train-the-trainers experience for those faculty with the responsibility of training other faculty in technology at their college. Approximately 100 participants can be accommodated. Co-coordinators are Ric Matthews and Ian Walton.

The Student Leadership Institute is a joint project of the Student Senate, the Academic Senate, the Community College League, and the CCC Student Advisors Association. The institute is designed for student leaders, accompanied by their advisors, to develop and enhance individual leadership skills. The event will also be held at CSU Monterey Bay and begins Sunday evening, June 7th, with a dinner and ice breaker and ends just before lunch on Wednesday the 9th. The emphasis will be on characteristics such as advocacy, relationships, communications, ethics, and team building. The program design is built on experiential learning through activities such as role playing, situational analysis, group projects, values clarification, leadership style identification, and guided discussions. All four organizations will be contributing to the facilitation of the institute, which is designed for approximately 100 participants, and is quite reasonably priced at only $250 (which includes room and board–double occupancy in a dorm room!). Collaborating are David Wilkinson of the Student Senate, Cindra Smith of CCLC, Doug Barr of CCCSAA, and our own Nancy Silva.

The Curriculum Institute will be held July 28-30 at the Disneyland Hotel. (No, that doesn't mean that we have Mickey Mouse courses!) The institute is designed for college teams consisting of the CIO, faculty Curriculum Committee chair, and others involved in the development and approval of courses and programs. Teams will be asked to bring curriculum material to share with other college teams in groups who will work together under the guidance of a facilitator. In addition to study sessions on curriculum standards and practices, groups of college teams will share their work products and local practices, spreading the use of good practices and doing collaborative problem-solving on areas of individual college curriculum difficulties. In depth sessions will be held on hot topics such as technology mediated instruction, the articulation process, use of prerequisites, and the rapid response to emerging changes in vocational education. The institute is designed for about 60 participants and is a joint effort of the Academic Senate and the CIOs. Chancellor's Office staff will assist in the facilitation as well. Co-coordinators are John Nixon, CIO at Santa Ana College, and our own Beverly Shue.

This view, however, is not held by other key players in Sacramento. The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) along with the Department of Finance (DOF) and the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC) are charged in the Partnership legislation with assessing whether our goals and measures are "clear, reasonable and adequately meet the state's interest in accountability." In a December 1998 joint letter, these three agencies asserted that the "specific goals should be viewed as targets that can be achieved without increasing the level of additional Partnership investment . . . Any future increase in the level of funding for the Partnership would require that the goals be made even more rigorous."

More recently, in its routine analysis of the Governor's budget, the LAO recommended reducing the proposed $10M augmentation by $8.2M. This would leave only $1.8M as a 1.83% COLA on the original Partnership allocation.

The LAO also recommended that the "Legislature delete the request for $2.5M to improve the transferability of community college courses to four-year colleges, because the community colleges should do this within the Partnership for Excellence Program." Based on plans developed by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, this would fund development of undergraduate major preparation agreements to enhance seamless student transfer across the three systems.

Clearly, one of our deep concerns with Partnership, that we would be expected to do ever more with no additional funds, is a distinct possibility. It will be extremely important that this be addressed by the Chancellor as we engage in discussions about the future of Partnership.

For now, the money is distributed to districts by FTES. But, by April 15, 2000 the system is to develop a "contingent funding mechanism." By the third-year report (using 1999-2000 and possibly Fall 2000 data) it will be determined "whether reasonable progress" has been made. If not, the Board of Governors is authorized to distribute the funds to districts according to performance on the goals. That funding mechanism is to be developed in the state consultation process—and in collaboration with the LAO, DOF and CPEC.

You should note that "reasonableness" has not yet been defined. Whatever the definition, the determination will be based on results from the initial semesters. Given funding uncertainties, the late start-up and general confusion about the program, this is not likely an adequate "test" of colleges' abilities to improve outcomes with funding. It does mean that what individual districts and colleges do their first year of Partnership will be critical to the entire system and our future funding mechanism.

According to the bill, the Legislature "intends to provide funding for the Partnership. . . as an investment to supplement funding for enrollment growth and cost-of-living [COLA] adjustments . . ." However, the Governor's initial budget proposes a disappointing 2.5% rather than the requested 4% in growth funds, and only 1.83% in COLA compared to the requested 3%. It is not clear what happens to the agreement if Partnership were funded while growth and COLA were not.

So what is happening on the local level?

The legislation says that districts will have flexibility in deciding where to put the funds. That sounds good, but what does it really mean? It all depends on whose voices determine the allocation of funds.

Academic senates have both the right and the responsibility to consult on matters of student success, as well as on establishing budget and planning processes, as stipulated in Title 5. Partnership clearly involves all of these. Ensuring the academic senate's role here is a minimum condition of receiving state apportionment. Beyond the legal requirement, if interventions to impact student achievement are to be effective, it is critical that faculty are involved in the design. If faculty haven't been involved at your campus, your senate needs to "crash the party." Let the Academic Senate Office know what's going on, and consider working with us to notify the Chancellor's Office about the problem.

In districts where senates are strong, and administrators are collegially inclined, some wonderful things have happened. Senates in consultation with administrations have set up task forces to address student success and to grapple with how best to utilize the funds to improve education for students. Mentoring projects, tutoring programs, enhanced transfer and articulation efforts, and increased counseling have been added. A sense of excitement, an aura of possibility in previously cash-starved districts, has been created.

But in some districts the

promise has ended in disappointment, as demands for increased accountability on the part of faculty have not been matched with funds. In these districts, faculty report that district administrations have kept all or much of the Partnership money for district purposes; little to no money has actually gone to the colleges. From initial reports, it appears that such districts may have simply reported ongoing activities as if they were enabled by Partnership funds. While the legislation notes "districts shall have broad flexibility in expending the funds . . . ," this supplanting approach belies the legislative intent that the money be used for "program enhancement that will improve student success and make progress toward the system goals."

If your district has not used the funds for projects and activities related to student success, then ask the question—what accountability is there for those who disregard the legislative intent and who keep in the district pocket funds intended for students? How will the actions of these administrations and boards be "benchmarked," and who will suffer if we go to district-specific payouts in the future?

Some of these districts utilized partnership funds to increase their reserves or to pay down pre-existing debt. The Partnership Question & Answer document available on the Chancellor's Office website notes in reference to debt retirement that "such action is not restricted but is not advised. Use of a small portion of the funds to retire debt may be allowable if such action directly enables the district to improve its ability to address

Partnership goals . . . As for reserves, use of the funds in this way is not directly related to progress toward the goals."

Other districts utilized Partnership funds to hire full-time faculty. Increasing the ratio of full to part-time faculty can clearly provide students more access to faculty in office hours, more frequent counseling appointments, or smaller classes. Full-timers review programs and identify areas for improvement or redesign. While some predict Partnership dollars will significantly improve the ratio of full to part-time faculty by the end of this year, it remains to be seen how many new faculty were actually hired with Partnership funds and how many were merely retirement replacements charged to the Partnership in district reports.

Chancellor Nussbaum has requested that CEOs re-examine their commitments for 1999-2000 to ensure they are contributing to the Partnership effort. In a recent E-mail to them, the Chancellor noted, "I would expect each of you to address those isolated instances where some of you may have invested some portion of the funds for purposes that you now recognize as having no conceivable relationship to improving performance on system goals."

It remains unclear, beyond coaxing recalcitrants to do the right thing, what the Chancellor's Office is going to do about those districts not responsibly utilizing the funds. What role will the Board of Governors (BOG) and the Chancellor play? In this era, the expectation is that all groups—faculty, administrators, trustees and staff—will be held accountable. How this will be done without truly categorical funding is not evident.

The Partnership approach can be seen as one in a series of attempts to decategorize funding. General calls for "relief from mandates" and the "deregulation of education" have become almost commonplace. Administrative organizations often argue that funds should be given with the least regulation possible. But those who divert Partnership funds for unrelated projects undermine the case for flexibility and make such pleas sound more like rhetoric than prudent fiscal policy. The Legislature has a right to expect that, when it funds a program, a good faith effort will be made to invest the dollars as intended.

The Legislature also has the right to set fiscal policies and priorities for the expenditure of public funds. Historically, ensuring access to underrepresented populations and the promotion of educational equity have been among the key reasons for categorical funding. While Partnership was funded, augmentations for the very programs with proven positive impact on student outcomes (matriculation, EOP&S, Puente, DSPS) did not receive requested augmentations in 1998-99. In the initial Governor's 1999-2000 budget, augmentations for these categorical programs were again not awarded.

Currently the system is discussing May revise priorities, and categorical programs do not appear to be in the mix. For the following year, local districts are asked to review existing state budget categories and comment on which should continue or be deleted from consideration. Local— and state— boards and administrations need to hear from supporters of such programs if they

are to be funded in the future. In the meantime, local senates should remember to consider the needs of all students as they make Partnership recommendations for program enhancements.

While many may assume that categorical programs are "okay" and have enough money, this is not the case. For example, according to a 1998-99 budget analysis by the Community College League, funding levels for Disabled Student Programs and Services remains roughly the same as 1989 levels — even though the number of students needing such services has substantially increased, as have expectations and requirements for reasonable accommodations with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

While the continued disparity of student outcomes across demographic and economic groups is a glaring problem in all of public education, Partnership did not specifically include any goal or measure to address this problem. For now, if student equity in achievement is to be addressed, local senates and administrations will need to take up that challenge. Revisiting student equity plans and examining current institutional data would be a good place to start.

Your district was required to report in December 1998 processes and plans for partnership spending. Unfortunately, the report was not intended to serve the purposes of accountability as much as it was to enable the Chancellor's Office to lobby for more Part-nership money.

If you were not involved with creating your district's report, or have not received a copy, you should request one from your district office. These are public documents, so you shouldn't have trouble accessing them. The Academic Senate requested a sign-off for the local academic senate on the Partnership reports as is done with matriculation. While this was not adopted, this could be revisited as implementation issues are reinvestigated.

A summary and analysis of the district spending reports is being prepared by the Chancellor's Office. The Academic Senate President, Bill Scroggins, has requested copies of the district reports. We'll be working together to provide that information back to each local senate president. We urge you to review the report and investigate the local use of the funds. If the report is inaccurate or misleading, contact the Academic Senate Office and challenge the report with the Chancellor's Office.

The Academic Senate is sending out a turn-around survey to gauge how many districts actually used Partnership funds for student success purposes and engaged in consultation to do so. Be sure that your senate representatives turn in the survey. It can be mailed back, or brought to the on-site Senate Office at the upcoming spring plenary session (April 15-17, San Francisco Airport Westin)

The Academic Senate will be holding a session breakout on the Partnership for Excellence. Representatives of successful college partnerships will be invited to share tips. Other breakouts will address a range of student success issues and model programs.

Each college will be receiving in the near future a "FACT Book" detailing baseline data on Partnership measures for each college for 1995-1998. It is important that faculty and college personnel review and verify the accuracy of the reported data.

Those faculty and administrators who have risen to the challenge and are using the money to enhance students' educational experiences deserve our recognition and gratitude. They are contributing to the statewide effort; more importantly, they are focused on our true calling, student success.

If we are to take advantage of the current funding and forestall moving to district specific payouts in the future, local senates will have to do what they can to secure Partnership dollars to enhance educational programs and services. Work on your campus to form a real partnership with other faculty, administrators and staff committed to improving education for students.

After all, the point is to get the money to the students. That's where the real magic happens— in the classrooms and student services, libraries and tutoring rooms, the transfer centers and counseling offices— wherever student aspirations and achievements can be supported and extended.