

SenateRostrum

April 1998

- 2 President's Message
- 4 Curriculum Issues
- 5 Counseling/Library
- 6 Program Discontinuance
- 7 Santa Rosa J.C.
- 9 CalWORKs



The Newsletter of the Academic Senate
for California Community Colleges

Performance Based Funding: Not A Partnership

• by Linda Collins, Secretary

The Governor, picking up on a budget request by the Chancellor and the Board of Governors (BOG) for the California Community Colleges, has proposed funding part of the system's budget on an incentive, or performance basis. Taking their proposal one step further, the Governor established the outcomes: degrees, certificates, course completion, transfer and transfer ready students, persistence and retention rates, specialized training, earnings after education, movement from remedial to college level work. Clearly, the Governor upped the ante: not only were the indicators defined, statewide performance goals and measures would now be determined by consensus of the Chancellor, the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, the Office of Child Development and Education, and the California Post Secondary Education Commission (CPEC). The increasingly centralized definition of productivity and efficiency embodied in this proposal flies in the face of the local nature and character of

the community college movement in California.

The Chancellor claimed that the proposal, dubbed "Academic Excellence" and later, "Partnership for Excellence," was needed to convince the Governor to re-invest in the system. Often referring to the proposal as a "quid pro quo," the Chancellor asserted that the Department of Finance and legislators in general were looking for assurances that the taxpayers' money was well spent. Key staff members in the Chancellor's office also asserted that the system needed something that would "sell," that was "sexy," in order to compete with K-12 reduced class size in the allocation of scarce Proposition 98 dollars. The Chancellor was asking for some \$100 million per year over ten years to boost system funding to within \$1500 per FTES compared to other states (we're now at \$3500, well below the national average of \$6000); in exchange he offered a departure from the historic, enrollment-based funding system. Moving to a district-

specific payout mechanism on the basis of performance on selected indicators of student achievement, the Chancellor argued, would assure the state that the community colleges were serious about accountability.

While \$100 million more per year would be most welcome, the Chancellor and the Board have found opposition to the idea of district-specific pay out to be uniform among members of the consultation council and an ongoing task force considering the approach as well as among the various institutional and organizational players within the system. The Master Plan crystallized the central tenet embodied in the community colleges: that all citizens who have the ability to benefit from instruction would have access to affordable, quality educational opportunity. If one considers the cumulative impact of \$1 billion differentially awarded to districts over a 10 year period, it's easy to see that such an approach could undermine the

see "Partnership" p 10



What is Needed to Realize the Vision of AB 1725?

Many think of AB 1725 primarily for its enactment of "shared governance" and the strengthening of the role of the academic senate, which was discussed extensively in this column in the last issue of the *Rostrum*. It is all too easy to forget the sweeping nature of the reforms of this landmark legislation. A brief article such as this cannot hope to touch all those points, but I have chosen a few for which I feel additional steps must be taken to realize the vision of AB 1725.

Faculty Development

The legislature recognized the importance of faculty development in its intent language: *"Community colleges have less resources available for faculty professional and intellectual development than do other segments of the system of higher education, and this disparity may become a substantial barrier to the future recruitment of quality faculty. Yet,*

faculty in the community colleges should be no less intellectually engaged than their colleagues in the other segments. Their primary commitment to teaching makes it imperative that they have a vibrant and rich intellectual life. AB 1725, Section 4(j)."

Ed Code 87150-4 established the Faculty and Staff Development Fund and the legislature has annually appropriated \$5 million. The intention of AB 1725 was that funding for staff development would grow from 1/2% to as much as 2% of the system budget, which today would equate to \$100 million. The Ed Code also requires a campus committee to assess needs and develop the staff development plan.

Today we struggle to meet the most basic training needs of faculty, still with the annual seed money of 10 years ago. Emerging industries, state-of-the-art technical programs, and infusion of technology all await sufficient

support of faculty development. Districts consider the state allocation a ceiling, contributing little of their general apportionment dollars. In fact, it is not uncommon for districts to skim off staff development funds for district-identified special staff development projects, ignoring the requirement for committee involvement. Years-old plans sit in the Chancellor's Office gathering dust.

What is needed to realize the vision of AB 1725? Local funding of staff development has failed in a climate that only rewards enrollment. The Ed Code should be strengthened to require academic senate-developed plans and adequate funding: a 1/2% statutory set-aside with local district 1:1 match, including faculty development budget processes developed by mutual agreement between the governing board and the academic senate. State level training

(continued on next page)



The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Bill Scroggins, President; **Lee Haggerty**, Vice-President
Linda Collins, Secretary; **Lin Marelick**, Treasurer; **Janis Perry**, Past President
Publications Committee:

Lin Marelick, Chair, Mission College, Santa Clara
Lacey Barnes-Mileham, Kings River College
Winston Butler, Los Angeles City College
Alan Buckley, Santa Monica College
Diane Glow, San Diego Miramar College

The Rostrum, September, 1997. 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

programs should provide specialized training to college faculty and staff, especially for staff development coordinators who need the expertise to make best use of local funds. These state training programs should be state funded and developed and operated by the state Academic Senate and 4CSD, the California Community College Coordinators of Staff Development.

Full-Time Faculty

The Legislature recognized the essential nature of a core of full-time faculty:

If the community colleges are to respond creatively to the challenges of the coming decades, they must have a strong and stable core of full-time faculty with long-term commitments to their colleges. There is proper concern about the effect of an over reliance upon part-time faculty, particularly in the core transfer curricula. Under current conditions, part-time faculty, no matter how talented as teachers, rarely participate in college programs, design departmental curricula, or advise and counsel students. Even if they were invited to do so by their colleagues, it may be impossible if they are simultaneously teaching at other colleges in order to make a decent living. AB 1725, Section 4(b)

To enact this vision Ed Code Section 87482.6 states the intent of the Legislature to achieve 75% of hours of credit instruction taught by full-time instructors. \$140 million in program improvement funds were appropriated during the two years immediately following passage of AB 1725 to actualize the formulas in Ed Code 87482.6, but nothing since! In fact, during the recession of the early '90s,

dependence on part-time faculty increased.

What must be done to realize the vision of AB 1725?

Legislative intent has not been enough. The Ed Code should be strengthened to require a percentage of the annual community college appropriation to be used to increase the number of full-time faculty. A 1% annual increase, approximately \$50 million compounded each year, could add over 1500 full-time positions annually and achieve the 75% standard within 6 to 8 years. The standard of 75% full-time faculty continues to be reasonable, as does the legislative intent for the use of part-time faculty:

Decisions regarding the appropriateness of part-time faculty should be made on the basis of academic and program needs, however, and not for financial savings. AB 1725, Section 4(d)

We must continue to assert locally that this is the only standard by which hiring of part-time faculty is permitted.

Hiring and Affirmative Action

The Legislature recognized the importance of the faculty role in determining the qualifications for hire of their new colleagues and the importance of the diversity of our future educators.

The state should provide the community colleges with enough resources and a sufficiently stable funding environment to enable them to predict their staffing needs and to establish highly effective hiring processes. [This subsection goes on to specify the essential elements of that process including the role of faculty and administrators, the need for good planning and recruitment, clear and complete job

descriptions, affirmative action training, diverse selection committees, and the necessity to normally accepting the hiring recommendations of faculty.] AB 1725, Section 4(t)

It will be imperative for the faculty to be sympathetic and sensitive to cultural diversity in the colleges especially when the student body is continually changing. One means of ensuring this is for the faculty to be culturally balanced and more representative of the state's diversity. AB 1725, Section 4(a)(3)

No single approach to hiring faculty can guarantee attainment of the colleges' affirmative action goals and consistent selection of qualified individuals. Nevertheless, any hiring process adopted by a college should require the joint and cooperative exercise of responsibility by the faculty, administration, and board and should reflect the differing source of each participant's authority and the kind of responsibility that authority conveys. AB 1725, Section 4(s)(1)

Ed Code Sections 87001 and 87355-9 establish the process of minimum qualifications for hire, replacing the credential system. Sections 87102-7 establish affirmative action and the Staff Diversity Registry and Fund. Section 87360 gives the requirement for local governing boards to develop hiring criteria, policies and procedures jointly with the academic senate.

The minimum qualification system has generally worked well. The state academic senate oversees the update of the disciplines list on a three year cycle, next to occur in 1998-9. Local hiring processes generally work well, although friction occasionally develops over

(see "Vision" on page 4)

Curriculum Committee

• by Bev Shue, Curriculum Committee Chair

Based on my many faxes, emails, and phone messages, I am convinced that faculty view the curriculum process as very important yet often overly bureaucratic and cumbersome. Many faculty have expressed similar concerns to me directly during several of my recent visits to campuses around the state. Among the questions I've heard at the local, district, and state levels are: How do we avoid unnecessary rewrites of course proposals? How often should course outlines be updated? How do we deal with prerequisites and levels of scrutiny validation? How do we prepare on-line course proposals? What are the best ways to redesign curriculum for welfare-to-work and CalWORKs programs?

Community college faculty have many resources available to them that can help through

these technical and often difficult issues. The *Curriculum Standards Handbook* and the draft policy on good practices in writing curriculum can help faculty prepare new courses. Bill Scroggins, Academic Senate President and past Chair of the Curriculum Committee, is knowledgeable about these matters and has provided technical assistance to many local curriculum committees. Most of the specific concerns I've heard will also be discussed in breakout sessions at the Spring Academic Senate plenary session.

With respect to intersegmental matters, community colleges submit courses each December for fulfillment of the CSU General Education Breadth Requirements and IGETC Requirements. Lois Yamakoshi, the FACCC Liaison to the Academic Senate, and I sit on

the intersegmental review panel, which also includes CSU faculty, an articulation officer, a UC liaison, and a CSU Chancellor's Office liaison. This panel reads course outlines, evaluates their strengths, and determines if they fulfill specific categories of general education. The occasional tensions on the panel are perhaps evidence of the seriousness with which all segments view course transfer, articulation, and general education requirements.

Finally, the Curriculum Committee is working with the Library and Counseling Faculty Committee on their information competency draft. More about this important work in future issues of the *Rostrum*.



"Vision" continued from p 3

appropriate roles of faculty and administrators. Local academic senates should keep hiring practices current and assure that they are followed.

Progress on diversifying our faculty has been less than satisfactory. It appears that the AB 1725 goal for the diversity of our faculty to reflect that of the general population by 2005 [Ed Code 87107(a)] will not be reached. The passage of Proposition 209 has created a reactionary climate which may further hinder progress on diversity.

However, our Title 5 regulations on affirmative action, recently modified with the participation of the Academic Senate, do much to insulate our system from the ravages of Prop 209 and still leave many tools at our disposal.

What is needed to realize the vision of AB 1725? Faculty are still empowered, under our local policies, to make recommendations for hiring of our new colleagues. Each local academic senate should publicly recommit to diversity and vigorously

pursue the statutory hiring requirements. The intent language of AB 1725 Section 4(t) should be enacted into Ed Code. This would go a long way towards assuring that local hiring processes are strong and effective. The requirements for technical assistance and compliance monitoring by the Chancellor's Office, as stated in Ed Code 87104, should be followed to the letter. In addition, a complaint process should be initiated so that violations of

Counseling and Library Faculty Counted in the 75/25 Ratio

• by Janis Perry, Past President

Finally, after five years of research, meetings, resolutions, and debates, the Academic Senate was successful in getting counseling and library faculty included in the full-time/part-time faculty (75/25) ratio calculations. The Board of Governors at their November 1997 meeting approved the regulations making this change. Current counseling and library faculty will be included in the base year number for each district beginning Fall 1998. This base year number is the mandated "maintenance of effort" number that is the full-time faculty hiring obligation which cannot be reduced without the penalty of \$40,000 for each position lost. New counseling and library faculty hired from January 1, 1998 on will be included in these numbers as they are hired.

The increase in the base year numbers is beneficial toward new faculty hiring. As the system receives growth money the requirement for hiring faculty increases by the percentage of growth. For example: a district whose base year number is 293.2 and has 20 full-time counseling faculty and 6 full-time library faculty will now have a base year number of 319.2. If growth is declared by the Board of Governors at 3%, at 293.2 ($.03 \times 293.2 = 8.79$) the district is required to hire an additional 8 full-time faculty. Now with the counseling and library faculty included making the number is 319.2 ($.03 \times 319.2 =$

9.57). This shows that the district's full-time faculty hiring obligation for that year requires an increase of one additional faculty hire.

In addition, the full-time counseling and library faculty numbers will be included in the 75/25 ratio calculations. The hours of Counseling and Library faculty services will be counted the same as the hours of instruction of a full-time instructor load. For example, if the number of full-time plus part-time hours of instruction are 300 and the number of full time hours of instruction alone are 100, then only 33% of the hours of instruction in that district are delivered by full-time faculty, a ratio of 33/67 or 50%. This number is obviously way below the required goal of 75% of instruction/services provided by full-time faculty. If the district has 3 full-time counseling faculty (3 x 15 lecture hour equivalents) and 2 part-time counseling faculty hired at 60% (2 x 9 lecture hour equivalents), the numerator and denominator would increase to 363 and 145, respectively. This would change the ratio to 40/60 or 67%. This example, shows a benefit of moving toward 75%, however, the numbers will vary greatly depending on how much part-time faculty are used in the counseling and library disciplines.

In spite of the regulation change, faculty are reporting that, while including these two

disciplines increases full-time faculty hiring, there is still a struggle to get counseling and library faculty hires prioritized. The Academic Senate worked diligently to get the regulations changed because student success depends on student access to full-time faculty in ALL disciplines. Also recognized by the Academic Senate through a number of resolutions is that student retention and success depends greatly on the enhanced educational and personal skills counseling and library programs provide to students who participate. With the change in these regulations the Academic Senate continues to believe that faculty must prioritize the hiring of faculty, that priorities are based on student and program needs, and must be that ALL disciplines be given equal consideration in order to meet student needs and achieve the mission of the CCCs.



Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Issue

• by Lin Marelick, Executive Committee Member

At a recent meeting of representatives from college administration, trustees, and faculty, the issue of program discontinuance came up. One of the participants suggested that program discontinuance is not an academic or professional matter. My astonished response was, "Isn't program discontinuance a matter of student success? Aren't standards or policies regarding student preparation and success one of the eleven areas of responsibility for academic senates?" Some member's eyes glazed over and I thought I was heading for a spirited discussion. But the discussion didn't materialize. Why? I don't know, because this is one of the hottest issues facing local academic senates state-wide.

The Educational Policies committee of the Academic Senate is presenting the first draft of a paper, entitled *Program Discontinuance: A Faculty Perspective*, at the Spring 1998 Plenary Session. This paper should be an important resource for local academic senates.

The paper cites statutes and regulations that address program discontinuance and lists the major issues faculty will face. The issues include: the role of the local Academic Senate in developing a program discontinuance process; the effects on students of program discontinuance; balancing the college curriculum when programs are discontinued; the educational

and budget planning implications of program discontinuance; regional issues; collective bargaining issues; considerations when developing a local model; and recommendations to local academic senates. Proposed revisions of the education code will also be included.

Title 5, section 51022, Instructional Programs, requires local governing boards to submit policies for the establishment, modification or discontinuance of courses or Programs to the Chancellor's office no later than July 1, 1984. A quick phone call to the Chancellor's office indicated that no such policies are on record. Confusion will likely arise if districts discontinue programs in a "willy-nilly" way, without a written process agreed upon through consultation with faculty. That's why local senates have to be on top of this issue at their college.

Faculty should be concerned about program discontinuance for a number of reasons. First and foremost, they should be concerned because their students will be directly affected by potential changes to their educational direction and goals. Second, program discontinuance could strongly affect the surrounding community and industry. Third, the balance of college curricular offerings can be upset and articulation agreements for related disciplines can be jeopardized.

Finally, discontinuing a program can bring up numerous collective bargaining issues including the determination of faculty service areas and faculty retraining. Program discontinuance is seldom a simple matter and should not be taken lightly by local academic senates.



Save The Date

1998 Faculty Leadership Institute

June 25-28

**at the
Double Tree Resort
Palm Springs**

Make sure that the new academic senate president at your campus has the tools for the job, send them to the Academic Senate Faculty Leadership Institute this summer. Long time senate presidents may want to tune-up their skills or get informed about the latest issues facing faculty.

There are a limited number of spaces available, register early!

Problems at Santa Rosa J.C.

• by Johnna James, Santa Rosa J.C. Faculty

Editor's Note: The troubling events that occurred recently at Santa Rosa Junior College are complex and the faculty are still trying to understand them. Here is one faculty member's account of these events.

Faculty rights of tenure, freedom of speech, and privacy are threatened statewide by actions taken by the Santa Rosa Junior College District in response to anonymous letters critical of its President and Board of Trustees.

Beginning in August 1995, a flyer and then a series of anonymous letters appeared which criticized the professional performance and personal character of President Robert Agrella as well as the competency and leadership of the Board of Trustees. In the spring 1996, the Board authorized a secret investigation to identify the author of the anonymous letters. The investigators examined computer files in faculty offices at night and examined documents and analyzed handwriting from faculty personnel files without notice or consent. Dr. Sylvia Wasson, a tenured instructor, was alleged by the investigators to be the author of the anonymous letters. The Board took no immediate action but after copies of another anonymous letter were distributed in the fall of 1996 to the visiting Accreditation Commission, Dr. Wasson was summarily removed from the classroom in January 1997 the day before Spring classes were to begin, and proceedings to terminate her were initiated.

As Dr. Wasson took legal action to protect her rights, the existence of the secret investigation was exposed. The actions of the District became the subject of intense faculty and public outrage. The college's academic senate unanimously adopted unprecedented resolutions expressing no confidence in, and censure of, the President and Board.

Shortly before Dr. Wasson's legal action against the District was to be heard, the District rescinded her removal from the classroom, but the Board continued to allege publicly that Dr. Wasson was the author of the anonymous letters and that the termination proceedings could be reopened. Dr. Wasson has since filed suit against the District in both federal and state courts.

Although the final legal resolution of these events may not occur for years, they have serious implications for faculty rights. Faculty have a right to practice their profession and may only be removed from the classroom for grounds specified in the Education Code. Tenured faculty have a right to continued employment and may be terminated only for cause. These rights protect the right of academic freedom and free speech. The suit filed by Dr. Wasson contends that the District has evaded the limits which protect these rights.

Dr. Wasson was suspended pending a hearing on grounds of "evident unfitness for service" [Ed. Code 87732 (d.)]. Before the hearing could take place, the

District lifted the suspension. The District also defeated Dr. Wasson's legal efforts to recoup the money she had spent in her defense.

The District proceeded against Dr. Wasson on the basis that she was the author of the anonymous letters and that the allegations in the letters were false. Dr. Wasson denies that she wrote the letters but claims that the letters are protected free speech. By abating the proceedings, the District not only avoided having to prove that Dr. Wasson was the author but also avoided an examination of the truth of the letters. The Board President has publicly admitted that no money was spent investigating whether the letters' allegations were true even though thousands of dollars were spent investigating their authorship. The District's tactics of administrative action and public accusation combined with systematic avoidance of formal process and determination of facts not only weakens tenure rights but also chills free speech.

The California Constitution expressly establishes the right of privacy. As an aspect of that right, confidential personal information in faculty personnel files should not be used for purposes other than those for which it was obtained. When the District's secret investigation was exposed, a number of faculty were shocked to discover that confidential personal information in their personnel

see "*Santa Rosa*" on p 12

“Vision” continued from p 4

law and regulation which occur in local districts can be investigated and resolved in a timely fashion. This process should include a visitation team broadly inclusive of constituencies, especially the Academic Senate. The statutory authority given to the Board of Governors to withhold funding in cases of violation should be taken seriously.

Peer Evaluation

The Legislature recognized that the professionalization of community college faculty included the need for us to uphold the standards of faculty ourselves:

A person should be granted tenure as a faculty member only after it has been determined through a process of evaluation that he or she is, and will likely continue to be, a positive asset to the community college. In other words, the award of tenure should be an affirmative act, rather than the result of default.

The faculty’s inherent professional responsibility to ensure the quality of their faculty peers requires faculty review to be at the heart of the evaluation process leading to tenure decisions. AB 1725 Section 4(w)

Ed Code Section 87663 lays out the evaluation process and recognizes that it is within the scope of bargaining, with consultation with the academic senate needed. Contract (probationary) employees are to be evaluated each year, regular employees every three years. Peer review is required, and must be by departmental or divisional peers of diverse backgrounds. The intent is to include student evaluation “to

the extent practicable.” Probationary faculty have the right to “clear, fair, and equitable evaluation procedures” to “ensure good-faith treatment without according him or her *de facto* tenure rights.” Governing boards are to have written evaluation procedures for administrators which include faculty evaluation “to the extent possible.”

While peer review is strong and vibrant on some campuses, others are far from the professionalism envisioned in AB 1725. Some state faculty union representatives decry the need for faculty to do “administration’s dirty work” and call for faculty to stop participating in evaluations that can lead to termination. In fact, many faculty feel uncomfortable in this role.

A recently introduced bill, AB 1647 (Scott) calls for broadening the “incompetency” criteria for terminating tenured faculty to “unsatisfactory performance.” This change would confuse the evaluation process with the termination process and would clearly be contrary to the vision of AB 1725:

The specific purposes for which evaluations are conducted should be clear to everyone involved. This requires recognition that the principal purposes of the evaluation process are to recognize and acknowledge good performance, to enhance satisfactory performance and help employees who are performing satisfactorily further their own growth, to identify weak performance and assist employees in achieving needed improvement and to document unsatisfactory performance. AB 1725 Section 4(v)(4)

A national debate continues over tenure, with outside organizations such as the Citizens

Commission for Higher Education characterizing tenure as a job security program rather than as protection for the free pursuit of excellence with the academy.

What is needed to realize the vision of AB 1725? First, we must recommit ourselves to evaluations of probationary faculty to assure that our colleagues maintain the highest standards for those who become tenured in our profession. If we do not protect the integrity of our profession, in the way that physicians and attorneys see their role, we will provide ammunition to those who seek to destroy tenure. Senates and unions should work together to provide meaningful training to those who evaluate probationary faculty. Staff development resources should be earmarked for those who need to enhance skills at the direction of the evaluation team.

Tenured faculty should continue to benefit from reviews of their work by their colleagues. Likewise, those who have become incompetent or unable to perform their duties should, after complete due process, find other employment. However, those are two separate and distinct needs. Clarifying language should be sought in the Education Code to crystallize the vision of AB1725 that peer evaluation of tenured faculty is for the purpose of improvement and improvement alone! Such language should clearly distinguish the due process for competency review, stating that such reviews take place only under conditions negotiated locally, such as substantiated complaints of ineptitude at or avoidance of one’s duties.

see “Vision” on p 9

The Other Side of CalWORKs: Issues Colleges Need to Consider

• by *Tonie Hilligoss, Member of the Academic Senate Ad Hoc Welfare Reform Committee*

The growing attention to welfare reform and the CalWORKs program is revealing new issues for community colleges. These programs are intended to provide job-specific education and the support services that will enable welfare recipients to develop the initial skills to get a job. Once employed, individuals will return to college for the more advanced education that will permit them to pursue a better life-style. In order to make this program successful, community colleges must address new issues that are rarely, or at best peripherally, mentioned in the mandates issued by the state.

Primary among these new issues is shared governance. Collegial consultation with the academic senate as well as

"Vision" continued from p 8

The enhancement of the professionalism of community college faculty, which took a major leap forward with AB 1725, must remain an on-going process. Every one of us, every day of our professional lives, feels the demands of one of the most challenging professions one can undertake: education. We deserve no less than complete professional recognition for that critical task.



participation by staff and students is necessary if the challenges of welfare reform are to be overcome. The success of CalWORKs depends on the creation of a learning experience that invites students back, which in turn depends on instructional and student service faculty. Returning students will also depend on the expertise of classified staff, many of whom already work with welfare recipients in offices like Financial Aid. A CalWORKs team comprising representatives from all constituency groups, including students, has a much better chance of designing and implementing a program that will meet its objectives than does any group without varied perspectives.

Another issue is program evaluation. Colleges have traditionally been evaluated on their ability to graduate or transfer students or to place them in jobs for which they are qualified. But CalWORKs will assess the effectiveness of colleges by the success of students after they enter the workforce (e.g., students' ability to keep the jobs in which they are placed). This may require colleges to provide students with social skills in addition to subject matter instruction. This has historically been the job of postgraduate programs, not community colleges. Now, community colleges may have to expand their offerings.

To accomplish this new goal, community colleges may need to establish partnerships with community based organizations to which students can turn for help with clothing, transportation, child care, and other personal matters. Some communities may have organizations in place that are prepared to offer those services, but others will need to help establish them. Another possibility is to identify funding to contract for those services, but current budget guidelines preclude that.

In fact, current budget guidelines are better suited for start-up activities than for ongoing operational purposes. Community colleges need line items for case management and support services such as those discussed above, particularly for the large numbers of students with learning disabilities who are expected to become part of the CalWORKs population. Without the ability to fund those components of the program, our chances of effectively preparing students for the workplace will be severely reduced.

Although welfare reform legislation might fall short of our preferences, we have to make the best of it for the sake of our students. If we address the issues that have not been adequately discussed up to this point, we stand a chance of turning draconian legislation into programs that can positively affect students' lives.



“Partnership” continued from p 1

very foundation of our system. Differential payouts on the basis of specified student achievement would clearly reward the “haves” in our college communities over the “have nots.” While there has been recognition by the Chancellor’s office of the need to level the playing field, it has not been built into the proposal.

The Chancellor has gone farther than working with the Governor to put performance funding in budget language. Nussbaum has proposed to the Board of Governors “A Strategic Response” document which would enshrine this approach as policy. Already, legislation drawn up by the Chancellor’s office and carried by Migdin (AB2005) would put into law state indicators and a performance funding mechanism. And performance funding for a portion of the budget is among the recommendations made by G. Hayward for revision of the Education Code.

In a previous Rostrum, (September 1997) we noted some of the ethical and methodological concerns with the performance based funding approach. The general incentive funding approach has been marked with predictable problems with goal displacement: the tendency to promote cosmetic improvement in indicators rather than solid advancement in institutional objectives. Furthermore, the use of redundant measures (in this case the overlapping variables of high completion, transfer and graduation rates) will exaggerate the benefits accruing to colleges whose student profiles fit the underlying, interrelated causal

10 SenateRostrum

factors of higher socioeconomic status, parental education and access to superior high school instruction.

Evidence against the utility of performance based funding approaches in higher education continues to surface. A RAND sponsored study examined in depth the experience of four states that were early implementers of the 1990 Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act that mandated use of state performance-based accountability systems. RAND found that while substantial progress has been made in designing and implementing the measures and standards, as of 1994, little attention had actually been paid to translating the resulting data into improvements in programs or services to students. (Stecher, Hanser, & Hallmark, *Improving Perkins*, 1994)

According to a study released by the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), a harbinger of the future of performance funding can be found in Europe where such efforts have been ongoing in higher education for a longer time. There “the role of performance indicators and funding is declining” amid “growing doubts about the validity of measures in evaluating and rewarding quality—this has led to a retrenchment in such countries as the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.” More focus is being placed on “national and institutional experiments with assessment techniques like peer reviews and quality audits, relegating performance indicators to the role of supporting tools in such efforts.” (Gaither, Nedweck & Neal, *Measuring Up*, 1994)

The California community college system should profit from the international experience; it should avoid the pitfalls which have clearly attended hasty, and ill-conceived efforts at performance funding in Texas and South Carolina. The state simply cannot afford to waste funds in chasing chimera—even if wrapped in the appealing rhetoric of accountability. Such simple solutions to complex problems have proven short lived and expensive. A recent *Crosstalk* article characterized South Carolina’s performance-based budgeting plan as “mired in detail and confusion.” The plan utilizes some 37 variables for the entire budgets of all higher educational institutions in the state. As one university official put it, “This is costing the state a fortune . . . Higher education is in such tough shape in this state, the situation is growing more and more desperate, and we’re spending all this

see “Partnership” p 11

Save The Date

1998 Faculty Technology Institute

June 15-18

**at
CSU Monterey Bay**

There are a limited number of spaces available, register early! Call The Academic Senate office for more information.

time and effort on this exercise." (Trombley, Crosstalk 1998)

The California community colleges have indeed done much with decreasing shares of state revenue. The Chancellor and the Board are right that the state needs to reinvest in the success of our students. But, it needs to do so without gimmicks, and without costly and unproven funding mechanisms. Utilizing UI wage data, Friedlander (1996) has shown that degrees and certificates, as well as individual courses, quite literally "pay off" for our students. The Chancellor's office already tracks some 60 accountability variables in the state MIS system, as mandated by AB1725. The system may be ready to commit to generally agreed-upon system goals—but trying to induce certain behaviors by penalizing the communities and students at schools which do not make acceptable progress on improving such measures as completion rates will serve only to further disadvantage districts already in need of more, not less, support. Punishing students and whole regions of the state for not making arbitrary performance gains in serving areas having a higher percentage of underprepared students, and/or students who must work while in school, hardly sounds like promising ground for enhanced academic excellence or for a partnership in the state.

While the Chancellor and the Board proposed the Partnership for Excellence to increase funding, already that hope is problematic. In exchange for improved performance on the selected indicators, we are told, we will receive significant

increased investment in the system. But the system has no means to guarantee that the funds will be delivered as the proposal makes its way through the Department of Finance and the legislature. The governor has already halved the amount by earmarking \$50, not \$100, million for the Partnership. Furthermore, recent recalculations of Proposition 98 revenue indicate that the Governor's original budget may have been based on faulty projections. If so, it is conceivable that the overall amount proposed for the community colleges in the Governor's budget might be revised downward. In that case, it may be that the Partnership would be funded while other system needs go wanting. Many organizations, like the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the Academic Senate, have insisted that the Partnership should not be funded at the expense of other budget priorities, especially growth.

If we look at the budget requests which were not funded in the Governor's budget, we can see what has been displaced by the funds earmarked for the Partnership. Augmentations to the Puente Program, disabled student programs and services, and matriculation were not funded. Nor was the hiring of more full-time faculty, or an ongoing investment in the management information system (which presumably will be used to report and track district and college performance). One-time requests totaling almost \$150 million were given a one-time block grant of only \$40 million. These

included requests for such essentials as instructional equipment and library materials, maintenance and repairs, ADA architectural barrier removal, and student support services equipment.

To date, economic development and CalWORKS, important additions to our historic mission, have been largely funded out of redirected Proposition 98 funds. The California community colleges face increasing demands to meet state priorities; we need a corresponding state commitment to help us meet these expectations. However, efforts to secure increased investment in the community colleges must be grounded in sound educational policy, not political maneuvers such as "performance payouts."

The Academic Senate has already gone on record with some five resolutions at the Fall 1997 plenary session opposing performance-based funding. The Senate intends to make these concerns clear in testimony before the legislature; legislators need to hear from us the likely educational implications of such a funding approach. Local senates should educate their faculty, boards and administrators of the problems and dangers of moving toward district specific payouts as a means of distributing state educational resources.

No one constituency or organization by itself will be able to counter performance based funding. We can and should come together with other

see "Partnership" on p 12

affected groups—DSPS, Puente, Matriculation directors and staff—to sound the alarm over the direction our system is taking. We need to work with local trustees and administrators, staff and students to raise public concern over this policy direction.

The Academic Senate, professional faculty and collective bargaining organizations, along with organizations representing administrators, CEO's, trustees and students have all registered opposition with the Board of Governors—now we must go on record with our local assembly persons and state senators. If we act now, together

we can more effectively show the growing opposition to the reduction of accountability to crass payout schemes, while building a critical mass ready to defend student access and educational quality from those willing to compromise it. In the long run, access and educational quality are the prizes upon which we must keep our eyes focused.



NOTE: For a complete list of sources cited in this article, call the Academic Senate office at (916) 445-4753 or email requests to asccc@ix.netcom.com.

files had been examined by the investigators. Those faculty were publicly identified in the media as subjects of the secret investigation. The District responded that privacy rights were not violated because of a District policy that confidential personal information may be examined without notice or consent if the President determines that there is a "need to know." The President has acknowledged that the majority of the faculty investigated were not suspected of writing anonymous letters. Faculty privacy rights are seriously subverted by the arbitrary use of such vague "need to know" policies.

Faculty should not have to rely on individual litigation to protect their collective rights. Because such litigation is frequently settled out of court in order to limit economic loss or avoid adverse publicity, decisions on the underlying issues are evaded and violations of faculty rights continue to impose the burden of defense on the individual. Neither should faculty have to rely solely on unions or associations to defend their rights; such groups may be limited by contract or lack resources to match those of community college districts.

The rights of freedom of speech and privacy are inseparable and are critical to the mission of faculty in the community colleges, particularly in curriculum. Throughout California, as the voice of faculty, academic senates can and must provide leadership in protecting and strengthening these crucial faculty rights.

