

ROSENSTRUM

ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES NEWSLETTER

Access? To What?

by Kate Clark, President

Among the principle values California community college faculty hold dear is ACCESS as a tenet for the education and services we offer to California residents. Concepts of access also apply to hiring of faculty, staff and administrators: do our workplaces reflect, like a microcosm of our state, the diversity of race, gender, ethnicity, and abilities that characterize our society? But the remarkable inclusiveness of the 1960 Master Plan, with its efforts to address the needs of a broad range of potential students “who could benefit from instruction,” seems to be undergoing a systematic reconsideration. Though lip service is paid to retaining access, I hear my mother’s refrain: “actions speak louder than words.”

Most especially over the last 40 years, community colleges have accepted students who, as immigrants, wished to acquire functional language skills necessary for citizenship, or those who initially needed basic skills education to contribute to California’s economy, or older adult students who saw their continuing education as a mechanism

for ongoing personal and public health, or a variety of employed individuals for whom occupational education courses—either individually or as a program—would ensure their hold on their career ladder. And, of course, we continued to nurture the educational aspirations of those students intending to transfer—and more compassionately, those students who may not initially have held those aspirations but who, under our collective nurturing, acquired their baccalaureate degrees. To all these students, we guaranteed a quality education.

In Sacramento, however, there is an undercurrent that while these have been noble intentions, they may not be as relevant when measured against current budgetary constraints. Legislators and politicians who struggle with a projected structural state budget deficit of \$8-20 billion next year and continued smaller deficits for an extended period of time may need to be convinced anew that access is good for the economy and fulfills the long-standing promise to educate all our citizens without charge. To begin, we will ask questions such as those

| | |
|--|----|
| President’s Message | 2 |
| Educational Policies Committee | 3 |
| What is a Good Education? | 4 |
| Faculty Development. | 6 |
| Associate’s Degree Standards . . . | 8 |
| Accreditation Standards. | 10 |
| So, You’re Thinking about a Vote of No Confidence | 11 |
| The High Tech Center Training Unit | 12 |
| Equity and Diversity | 14 |
| What’s Been Happening in the Legislature? | 20 |
| CVC, What’s Going On? | 22 |
| The Academic Senate and the Nursing Advisory | 24 |

appearing in the list accompanying this article. In the end, we must be able to explain what constitutes access—to our institutions, *within* our institutions, and *outside* of our institutions.

Keeping the Door Open: Who Should Fund Access?

Increasingly we hear comments that **students and their families** must assume their “fair share” of the cost of education. Setting aside disagreements about what exactly constitutes their “fair share,” this argument buries two common misapprehensions about the



Kate Clark

President's Message

by Kate Clark, President

July's budget uncertainties have lingered into our California fall, translating into general hesitancy and an Indian summer-malaise as we (and the nation, it seems) awaited the results of the recall: some budgetary demands would be postponed until subsequent years, Master Plan bills would hibernate until their second year began in January, and our campuses lit bonfires that consumed discarded fiscal advice, full schedules of classes, and commitments to part-time faculty. Yet, our circumstances also lit fires across our system: we drafted strategies to capture our fair-share of the Prop 98 split, to make clear our students' plight, and to unify faculty, staff, administrators, and local communities in support of our community colleges. Thus, though politics and funding levels were moribund, faculty energies since spring have been running at heart-stopping speed: we have been working to preserve our principles.

Access and Quality of Education

Even early in the summer, the threat of higher fees impelled many new and continuing students to seek out our offerings over the summer months before the bargain rates disappeared; regrettably, many colleges had curtailed their summer school class schedules or abandoned summer offerings altogether. Faculty faced, even then, the tension between our desire to serve all comers and our need to retain instructional quality by limiting class size; we were also caught in the balancing act between offering most-needed courses versus the broad range of courses—often less demanded—that are required of transfer students or workers seeking to upgrade skills.

We do not yet fully know the consequences of increased student fees, despite our reminders of historical declines in access to underrepresented groups when raised fees and reduced general revenues combined in the early '80s and again in the

early '90s.¹ Even prior to the raising of student fees, FTES numbers declined in Spring 2003, the first time in 15 fall-spring terms that we have experienced a decline. The Academic Senate hopes to work with the Chancellor's Office this year to identify the student populations most impacted and to hypothesize reasons for the declines of spring—and perhaps this fall. Our principled commitment to access, as I discuss elsewhere in this publication, is under scrutiny; our commitment to quality may be under siege as well.

Employment, Transfer Issues, and Curriculum

Assaults on instructional quality are also felt on the outer bastions of our institutions' programs, especially those lobbied by well-intentioned legislators or commissioners whose understanding of curriculum and transfer is somewhat incomplete. While I don't want to belabor the fortress metaphor, it is true that occupational programs (e.g., nursing and administration of justice), leaders of innovative efforts (e.g., teacher-reading projects leading students to transfer into UC/CSU credentialing programs), and providers of student services efforts (e.g., UC's Dual Admission Program) are feeling somewhat besieged. As our local control over our own curriculum and student support becomes increasingly regulated by legislation or by institutional decisions on the UC and CSU campuses, we feel less in control of our own destiny and less able to assist our students in pursuing their own.

Nonetheless, our ICAS (Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senate) partners assure us that faculty primacy over our curriculum is essential if UC and

¹ For a more full discussion of this historical overview, see the document prepared as background material for the September Board of Governors' Study Session on Access: *California's Investment in Public Education: A Look at the Past Three Decades*, Tom Nussbaum, September 2003, available at <http://www.cccco.edu>

Continued on page 7

Educational Policies Committee



Ian Walton

Ian Walton, Educational Policies Committee Chair

The charge of the Educational Policies Committee includes analysis of issues that have wide educational implications for our colleges and students. The committee then develops recommendations to the President, the Executive Committee and the field. Our findings and recommendations may also be included in published position papers. Committee members this year include Greg Gilbert (Copper Mountain), Paul Setziol (De Anza), Angela Caballero de Cordero (Allan Hancock), Gary Morgan (Oxnard), Glenn Yoshida (Los Angeles Southwest) and Alisa Messer (San Francisco).

This year's committee inherited a long list of goals from the 2002 – 03 Educational Policies Committee. Many tasks that originated in specific areas, for example, technology, have been returned to other Academic Senate standing committees in order for initial work to occur. Following is a description of some of the goals that the committee expects will occupy them actively this year.

Budgetary Matters

The committee will monitor the complex area that includes the system budget, student fees, access and quality, and will provide advice to the President on how best to promote Academic Senate positions in arenas such as Consultation Council and the Board of Governors. The Academic Senate participated in a special Board of Governors study session on access in September 2003. Our fall plenary session will feature a breakout that mirrors that discussion with participation from President Kate Clark, Chancellor Tom Nussbaum and student Board of Governors member Kristin Jackson Franklin. Included in this wide-ranging topic are fundamental questions about Proposition 98, financial aid, funding equalization and the Board of Governor's "Real Cost of Education" project. There is periodic debate on whether we are best served by remaining within the Proposition 98 umbrella and seeking the larger share of those funds that was promised in the original legislation. Some feel that we would be

more successful outside Proposition 98 in a funding arena that would interact directly with the CSU and UC systems.

Equalization is a problem that we have failed to solve since Proposition 13 created different per student funding levels at different colleges. A solution is difficult to achieve, perhaps especially in tight budget times, and requires agreement on what would constitute fair and equitable funding. Unfortunately, changing the measure changes the ranking of what colleges most deserve equalization (for example, dollars per FTES or percentage of program based standard to take account of high cost program mix.)

The Real Cost of Education project seeks to solve many of the "smaller" budget problems by radically changing the level of community college funding in California. It starts with assumptions about what it would take to fund high quality education at a model college and it reaches a figure that is approximately double the current funding level. The Board of Governors has agreed that the project's analysis and conclusions should form the basis of the system's long-term budget strategy and funding requests. Success will require considerable political effort. The Academic Senate has historically opposed increases in student fees because of the well-documented effect on access for our most vulnerable students. This year, part of that conversation must focus on the effect fee increases have on instructional quality. It is not an acceptable solution to maintain access to an education of declining quality.

Faculty Chairs

The appropriate role of faculty division chairs within each college culture and its governance structure continues to be an area of considerable interest. The Ed Policies Committee will present a Fall Session breakout on this topic. Questions include collective bargaining issues such as faculty supervision and delineation of duties, and senate issues such as academic governance. Are there good models that we can share? What is appropriate training for faculty

Continued on page 23



Leon Marzillier

What is a Good Education?

Asks Leon Marzillier,

Relations with Local Senates Committee Chair

As a faculty member, do you find that your students today are as well prepared as they were when you were a student? Has the preparation, with which students have come to you, improved or deteriorated with each passing year? My guess is that you would say the latter. Who or what is to blame for this state of affairs? If we believe that the high school curriculum is lacking in the rigor or design to produce well prepared college freshmen, then we may look towards who exercises the most control over that curriculum. A comparison between the control of curriculum in K-12 with that of our colleges is revealing. In the K-12 sector, under the mantra of accountability, parents, government, business and industry, and school administrators each try to have a say about what goes on in the classroom, despite any objections the teacher may have. After a teacher (at any level) has been trained, only his/her peers and students should evaluate how the job is accomplished. Too often, a parent or an administrator unfamiliar with the discipline will try to second-guess a teacher's performance in the classroom. Add to that mix, the drive to have students at various stages of their education tested with so-called "standardized" tests, and society has effectively emasculated not only creative, quality education but also those that were specifically trained to purvey it. Is it any wonder that so many K-12 teachers quit the profession in frustration?

We would find such practices antithetical to effective education at the community college level. Who do we believe understands best what comprises a quality liberal arts education at the community college level? Who do we believe knows best what the content of a course in our respective disciplines should be? Students, administrators, classified staff, and the community can all provide valuable input to help us evaluate our courses and programs, but ultimately it

is faculty that must maintain hegemony over the community college curriculum.

On the other hand, community college professors tend to stay, sometimes far longer than is fiscally wise, given the size of their potential pensions, and sometimes even after being offered lucrative retirement incentives. Why is that? Unlike K-12 educators, California community college professors have more opportunity to retain control of their classrooms, have more academic freedom, and through their faculty organizations definitely have more say about how their institutions can help them perform their tasks effectively.

While it is true that K-12 teachers have union representation, there really is no equivalent to our local academic senate, an organization that when I started teaching I viewed as little more than a social club. The passage of AB1725 into Education Code and the consequent changes in Title 5 regulations not only empowered our local senates, but have also produced a salutary effect on community college education in California. "Shared Governance" entered our vocabulary.

In a paper, *Participating Effectively in District and College Governance* (accessible at: http://www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us/Publications/Papers/Participating_college_governance.html), the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) and the Community College League of California (CCLC) write:

"Shared governance" is not a term that appears in law or regulation. Education Code §70902(b)(7) calls on the Board of Governors to enact regulations to "ensure faculty, staff, and students ... the right to participate effectively in district and college governance" and, further, to ensure "the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards."...

Consequently, the more precise terms call for the governing board to assure effective participation of students and staff and to consult collegially with academic senates... The term "shared governance" can take on many meanings and it is suggested that its use be curtailed in favor of the more precise terms.

AB1725 was a remarkable piece of legislation in that it acknowledged which constituencies have expertise in which areas. As the jointly authored paper goes on to say:

How the administration is organized may be a matter for wide participation by the affected parties but is outside the scope of the district's responsibility to consult collegially with the senate. However, organizational changes which affect academic and professional matters such as curriculum or faculty role in governance would require consultation with the academic senate.

Ours is a remarkable system. With adequate funding, we could perform even more miracles. What we provide, dare I say it, is the answer to the title question. Almost all of us are in our positions because we want to educate, not driven to do research in our disciplines, as are so many of our university colleagues. Most of our students are there because they want to be educated, despite what it may seem like at times. After all, they have many other choices of how to spend their time. And the whole system is run through *effective participation* of all constituencies.

However, participation can only be effective if those involved, well ... participate. If we wish to continue to provide what I believe is a good (if not the best) education, we need more than just "the magnificent seven" (those that seem to be on all committees) participating at each campus. The whole will run more effectively if each of us assumes a part.

I would argue that the ingredients in an institution providing a good education are:

- ▶ a well-qualified faculty with the academic freedom to impart the material as they see fit;
- ▶ a faculty that has the right and responsibility to participate effectively in how the institution's education is delivered;
- ▶ a student body genuinely interested in learning; and
- ▶ funding at an adequate level to keep the institution running.

Unfortunately, there are forces at work that jeopardize the great work that community colleges do in educating our students. For example, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) in June 2002 adopted a new set of standards by which to accredit community colleges. Do these standards promote "good education"? Repeated requests by the Academic Senate for research to substantiate their premises that collecting and analyzing student learning outcomes enhanced student success fell on deaf ears. We still view the adoption of these new standards as a serious mistake, but it is up to the faculty to take control of the process, up to the Academic Senate to provide statewide leadership, and up to local academic senates to ensure campus leadership in that endeavor. Title 5 lists accreditation processes as one of the ten-plus-one academic and professional matters that come under the purview of the academic senates.

Even more importantly, it is our responsibility to help future generations continue to provide what we understand to be a good education. We can congratulate ourselves on providing a good education, but we ought not to sit back on our laurels. Instead, we should make sure it continues, while striving to find ways to make it better. We have only to consider the performance of K-12 to see what happens when faculty lose control of curriculum decisions.



Beverly Shue

Faculty Development: Hanging on by a Shoestring?

The lack of funding for faculty and staff development is beginning to show at the colleges. While enrollments and class sizes increase, student preparedness and the student skill levels in reading, writing, and mathematics decrease, and the economy forces more students into working beyond a 40-hour work week, splitting their class schedules to attend both day and night classes—although budget reductions and compressed calendars have limited class offerings. Our faculty and colleges are less able to cope with the stresses of today’s community college environment. Potentially, we will be less able to meet the changing needs of community college students in 2003-2004.

When colleges had annual and predictable funding for faculty and staff development, they could offer workshops, pay for faculty and staff to attend seminars and conferences, and create innovative projects to enrich their teaching and student learning environments. Unfortunately, this past scenario is now the exception, not the norm or expectation.

Many faculty learned about teaching-learning, matching teaching style with preferred student learning modalities, and attended workshops presented by experts in the field of sound teaching methodology, meeting diverse learning styles, and updating curriculum and programs to meeting transfer and occupational needs. Most colleges “squirreled away” their faculty and staff development funding and used their carry-over funds to get through 2002-2003. Some miserly colleges managed to save a little for 2003-2004!

But now, the well has almost run dry. In response, the Academic Senate has increased the number of scholarships it can offer to faculty this year to ensure their continued professional development at the sessions and institutes it will offer; further, IMPAC’s one-day, regional gatherings of inter-segmental discipline faculty are offered without charge to participants—and with travel reimbursed. Yet most faculty must still rely on their innovative and creative skills to continue their professional

Beverly Shue, Faculty Development Committee Chair

or discipline workshops and programs with little or no funding. Some colleges managed to negotiate down the fees charged by presenters. Most colleges went to “faculty development on a shoestring”—this meant that many colleges moved to faculty sharing at noon lunch, brown-bag lunches and discussion of college issues, and other minimal-cost informational forums. While most of these programs provided good information, they do not substitute for having experts with research findings to share. For example, the neurological research being conducted today could help faculty to understand how learning occurs and how understanding the workings of the brain can improve teaching and learning.

Come to the 2003-2004 plenary breakouts to learn the latest on many faculty development topics, not just faculty development on a shoestring, geared to promoting student motivation and student achievement.

President's Message

Continued from page 2

CSU faculty are to have faith in the quality of our students' preparation; and business leaders insist that, in tandem with ensuring job-specific skills, we offer a general education that prepares potential employees for the critical reading, writing and thinking necessary for the workplace. Clearly, providing all for everyone is an increasingly challenging task.

Full-time Faculty Hiring Obligations

Last year the plenary body repeatedly expressed its views about our need to hold firm in the face of efforts to erode full-time faculty hiring for this current year. As an Executive Committee member, I urged flexibility to provide some room for compromise during discussions with other system leadership, believing that half a loaf was preferable to none. Nonetheless, the resolution process shaped our public statements in Consultation and before the Board of Governors. Yet despite the adamant voices from the floor, local senates from college after college conceded their support to their districts' request for a temporary waiver for full-time hires. While your Academic Senate representatives demurred to these local perspectives, the seeming inconsistency between the plenary's view and the local decisions raised questions about whether we truly represented the statewide faculty view. At the Chancellor's Leadership Conference, October 2 in Sacramento, many district representatives excoriated the system's state leadership for compelling districts to hire new faculty and to retain their 50% obligation in the face of declining revenues. These debates will not subside during this year, and faculty—fully committed to the 75/25 mandate and to ensuring equitable working conditions for part-time faculty colleagues—will have to measure the greater, long-term principles against short-term, local measures.

A Principled Perspective

As fiscal constraints, nervous electorates, and ambitious politicians seek to nibble away at our dearly held principles, we cannot be afraid to reexamine where we have been, where we hope to go, and what alternative routes might get us there. That, indeed, becomes our challenge this year: it is not inconsistent of us to rail against accreditation standards that require excessive resources without demonstrable benefit to student achievement, and at the same time, work collectively to ensure that *faculty* retain control of any research agendas and *faculty* determine how research results might best be employed to improve the education for all students. It is not inconsistent of *faculty* to examine the consequences of providing so much to so many (after all, Tidal Wave II is splashing around out there somewhere). And it is not inconsistent of *faculty* to work with legislators now to generate affirming, lasting, hallmark legislation of the sort that ensconced the 1960 Master Plan and that was modeled in AB 1725.

Ultimately, our task as faculty is to ask, "When does compromise begin to compromise—when does the ability to reshape our direction without abandoning principles begin to erase those principles themselves? When does the greater good offset the immediate gains? When does the spirit of giving result in a diminution of the gift?" It is the asking of these questions—and the seeking of responses—that must, and will, engage us this year and result in a principled and defensible perspective.



Mark Snowwhite

Revisiting Associate's Degree Standards

by Mark Snowwhite,
Standards and Practices Committee Chair

During the last two Senate plenary sessions, there has been spirited debate over whether to raise statewide requirements (Title 5) in mathematics and English for the associate's degrees. Currently statewide minimum requirements specify a course in elementary algebra and a course no more than one level below transfer-level English composition (Title 5, section 55805.5). Thoughtful arguments were put forth in previous breakouts by both those who favor raising these requirements and by those opposed to raising them.

Those who favor raising standards pointed out that elementary algebra and English composition one level below transfer-level English composition are unquestionably high-school-level courses and that to offer a college degree for high-school level work undermines the value of that degree. In addition, offering a two-year college degree that appears to require less than college-level course work could vitiate our efforts to convince the public that we deserve to be considered a full partner in post-secondary education, a claim important to gaining funding at an FTES rate closer to that of the other two segments of public post-secondary education. Further, those who want to raise standards point out that our associate's degree standards are lower than those in other states, except for those that offer a separate occupational associate's degree, and lower than the new expectations for a high school diploma in California.

Those opposed to raising Title 5 standards for the associate's degree requirements in mathematics and English point out that raising standards could, in some cases, remove the likelihood that many overburdened and underprepared students would obtain their degrees, especially important to people who are the first in their families to attend college. Opponents also assert that more demanding English and mathematics course requirements make sense for transfer students,

but that many of our students seek an associate's degree for its value in the job market and would be deterred by added requirements that they believe may not be needed for this goal. In addition, there is the problem of timing. Without far better support systems in all of our colleges, those with limited English proficiencies would be unfairly impeded in reaching their goals, as would those who have struggled with mathematics. They conclude that in this time of budget cuts, when we cannot provide the basic skills support many of our students need, raising requirements would not help our students and would in fact be unfair to them.

Some faculty hold that decisions about degree requirements should be made by faculty at the local level, not by statute at the state level. However, carrying this argument to its logical conclusion would have us advocate for the removal of all state standards and recognize only local standards for a degree recognized nationally. Also, because we are funded with state money, it follows that the state's perceived interests must be satisfied and that a statewide mission for our colleges is legitimate and necessary.

Important questions of educational philosophy have been posed in discussion groups. How much mathematics does one need to succeed in today's vocational and educational environments? Why does everyone who might transfer, let alone those entering the job market, need algebra? Are applications more important than rule and formula-driven approaches? What pedagogical approaches and support services might increase students' success? If our associate's degrees are designed for those going into the job market and not just for transfer students, why require an English course that includes a term paper and essay writing skills? How are such narrowly defined skills requisite to jobs?

The faculty who want to raise the standards in mathematics and English respond by pointing out that they favor providing college-level courses that are well designed for vocational students and that will have clear value in the workplaces where our students will find themselves. A more advanced mathematics course need not include high-level algebra; a college-level English course can include instruction in job-related research and writing tasks in lieu of traditional term papers. Today's jobs require greater skills in reading, writing, information gathering, and mathematics than those in the past, and the demand for a better educated work force will certainly continue.

But perhaps this debate has focused too much on the parts instead of the larger consideration of what our degree represents. The first questions on which we need to come to some agreement is what the associate's of arts or science means and what common features it must have to best serve our student populations.

Our community colleges are two-year institutions, so it follows that a degree a student earns must represent two years of college study. The degrees our students leave us with must certify to the public—the folks whose taxes support our colleges and who hire our graduates—that these graduates have the skills that are expected of a person with two full years of college preparation. These include college-level skills in reading, writing, and mathematics. This does not mean that the appreciations and values that exposure to a tapestry of lectures, study groups, clubs, music and drama productions, and other parts of the campus culture—the less quantifiable elements of higher education—are not every bit as important to the development of our graduates. Certainly the development of an openness to new ideas, an appreciation for evaluating one's own culture in terms of the broader mix of cultures, and a respect for all sorts of knowledge and talents that we are exposed to on our campuses—both in classes and outside of class—are essential elements of higher education. But to require competencies less than those defined as college-level for associate's degrees subverts

the value of those degrees in the public domain (much as the value of the high school diploma has evaporated), and it leaves the associate's degrees ill-defined in the eyes of the degree holder. For these reasons the associate's degrees must be clearly defined as a college degree.

If we agree with this premise, we are still left with the question of who determines what competencies are truly college-level and what courses our students must successfully complete to demonstrate those competencies. Should English 1A and college algebra be requirements for everyone who earns an associate's degree? Not if we value the diversity of goals of our degree-seeking students. The faculty must work within their disciplines and with their curriculum committees to develop new courses that both meet the requirement of being college-level and at the same time meet the practical needs of our students. Students should not be required to jump through the same old hoops of traditional freshman composition (English 1A) and college algebra. Many of us have been creative enough to develop service learning and learning-community approaches to teaching students college-level skills that our students find relevant and exciting. Others have incorporated on-line instruction and tailored courses to specific occupational areas that nonetheless can, in future years, provide transferable credit for students moving up the career ladder. The challenge of bringing our students up to college-level skills in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics can provide an impetus for us to create better ways of serving all our students.

The Academic Senate has not yet taken a position whether to change any Title 5 requirements for the associate's degree, although those who want a clearly collegiate level of rigor in mathematics and English make a strong case. But the Academic Senate's faculty should periodically review state minimum academic requirements and provide the Board of Governors with its carefully considered position on how academic requirements define this degree so that it retains and even increases its value to those who achieve it.



Greg Gilbert

Accreditation Standards: State and Local Concerns

by Greg Gilbert, Chair, Research Committee

Since Fall 1979, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has passed nearly 120 resolutions that have to do with accreditation. Of those resolutions, nearly one-third date from Fall 2000 and urge opposition to the unilateral imposition of new accreditation standards by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), which includes the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). At the heart of the Senate's complaint is the new standards' reliance on Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's). Though the Senate will continue its dialogue with WASC and the ACCJC, as will other institutions of higher learning, the standards have been adopted and are the official heuristic for all accreditation self-studies beginning this academic year.

Until now, the polemics and posturing that have surrounded the new accreditation standards have resided outside the laboratory of our classrooms, our programs, and our institutions – as a thought experiment. Today, as Drew Barrymore said in *Poltergeist*, “They're here!” Fortunately, the Academic Senate, along with its commitment to provide assistance to local senates, is also here.

Among the Academic Senate's goals for this year is the development of an accreditation primer and toolbox. To achieve this goal, the Senate is working with teaching professionals from around the state, including researchers and those whose colleges have already managed successful accreditation efforts without compromise to principles of participatory governance and service to students. Lamentable though the new standards may appear, the suggestion is that they may harbor the kernels of new opportunities. As my colleague at Copper Mountain College, Doug Morrison, observed, the new standards represent a fairly typical approach to project planning in that they require a mission that is linked to resources, production, and authority. The project, in this instance, involves SLO's, and,

while college administrators manage resources, the role of the faculty is essential to the completion of an institution's successful accreditation report. Administration and faculty must work together, cooperatively and constructively, as they do at many colleges every day.

Certainly, we have seen collaborative success stories around the state. One such example is the Miramar College faculty response to the SLO challenge with their own principled perspective: “21st Century Learning Outcomes.” Miramar's faculty, as well as colleagues from throughout California, will share their experiences and expertise at our Fall Plenary. The upshot is that though we are facing new realities, we need not sacrifice our principles. Neither must we operate within a vacuum. In the words of Adlai E. Stevenson, “Via ovicipitum dura est” (The way of the egghead is hard), and true as that may be, we have our collective wisdom to draw upon and will do so at the plenary. Though the accreditation challenge is unique to each region, all of us are bound by an overarching commitment to academic and professional matters, including valid, reliable, and authentic assessments.

By pooling our best minds, we can determine if our institutional self-studies can represent more than clerical exercises in compliance. Indeed, do we have the capacity to use the new standards to strengthen institutional unity in support of student success? We shall see. By examining the larger issues of accreditation together, we hope to formulate stances that preserve firewall protection between data collection and faculty evaluation, and we can stave off challenges to academic freedom. In that spirit, I hope that you will attend the Fall Plenary and come prepared to gather and dispense information that will help all of us successfully navigate the challenges of the new accreditation standards.

So, You're Thinking about a Vote of No Confidence: 10+ Questions to Ask



Jane Patton

by Jane Patton, Area B Representative

Has your local senate considered taking a vote of no confidence on an administrator? At some colleges, there have been ongoing issues with long-standing administrators. At other colleges, new problems have arisen as a result of the budgetary constraints in the last year. At times of fiscal hardship, typically there are more instances in which local senates find their rights and responsibilities have been curtailed, so the discussions about a no-confidence vote have increased. For example, it is easier and faster for some administrators to make decisions alone about budget processes or curricular offerings and bypass a college's normal shared-governance processes. Before local senates decide to take a no-confidence vote on an administrator to their local board of trustees, senate members must carefully consider the justification and potential effects of such a vote. Below are some questions to stimulate local senate discussions about whether or not to take such an important vote of no confidence.

1. What is your goal or purpose? What do you want accomplished by this vote? Consider whether or not you expect a specific action to be taken after the vote. From whom do you expect an action and by when? How will you know when the action is completed? After a vote is taken, what will occur during the next six months or year?
2. What might be the overall results of such a vote? Sometimes the effects are right on target; sometimes there can be unexpected consequences. Effects may be immediate, or it may take time to see a change. Explore all the pros/cons; examine the advantages and disadvantages of any proposed action. Consider how different groups may react: other administrators, trustees, staff, the community, etc.
3. Are your concerns about **academic** issues (as opposed to union issues)? Refer to the 10+1 areas of local senate responsibilities, to other areas of responsibility in the law, as well as to local board policies that are relevant in your situation.
4. Are the issues compelling enough? Have other avenues of recourse been exhausted? Keep in mind that the Board of Trustees hired this administrator and therefore will be inclined to support him or her. A vote of no confidence probably should be done as a last resort.
5. Is it best to take a vote as the senate? As the union? Both? A vote of all faculty, if you have a representative senate? You could do all or any of these and the sequence could be varied. What are the pros and cons of each choice? What's the union-senate relationship? Are the bodies in accord? In opposition? Will the action of one group divide the faculty or unite them?
6. In a multi-college district, consider the ramifications of one college's unilateral action. Should discussions or a vote be conducted by your district senate, if you have one? What consultation has occurred with the other colleges' senates?
7. Discuss the issues widely across the campus, and consider first adopting a resolution laying out the concerns and calling for a vote. Where is there resistance? Have you explored the opposition's perspective? Might they be right? You could do a temperature check in advance of a vote, to see where people stand. Is there widespread concern or buy-in? Will the faculty as a whole support the senate?
8. What is the perspective of the classified staff? What's their position? Should you work with them, either formally or informally? Can you incorporate their concerns into a statement of your own, demonstrating the administrator's failure, for example, to adhere to principles of participatory governance?
9. Are all discussions professional and focused on issues and behaviors and not on personalities?
10. Who else would be affected by a vote? Will other relationships the faculty have be damaged? How will the community react?

A primary role of the local academic senate in the case of a "no confidence" vote is the same as its role the rest of the time: ensuring that the laws, regulations and policies established by the state and by local boards relative to the senate are upheld. When those are violated, the local senate needs to take action, making certain its own actions are above reproach.



Mark Lieu

The High Tech Center Training Unit

by Mark Lieu, former Technology Committee Chair

Note: Last spring, the Academic Senate approved the paper, *The Impact of Computer Technology on Student Access and Success in the California Community Colleges*. After approval of the paper, I was contacted as the chair of the Technology Committee by Carl Brown, director of the High Tech Center Training Unit (HTCTU), which was only briefly referenced in the paper. He pointed out that the HTCTU was doing much more than the paper had mentioned. Therefore, in order to elaborate on what is included in the paper and in order to spread the word about the work of the HTCTU, I talked more with Carl Brown, the fruit of which is the following article.

Johnson is blind. This semester, he enrolls in American Institutions. He purchases the 976-page class textbook and goes to Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS). The DSPS coordinator consults a database of textbooks that are available in electronic format but doesn't find Johnson's book on it. The book is sent to the regional college that is equipped with a high-speed scanner. The book is quickly scanned into electronic format and converted into text that can be read by a text-reading program. The file is given to Johnson to use on his laptop, and a reference to the scanned book is added to the database.

This scenario illustrates one of the many ways that the High Tech Center Training Unit (HTCTU) assists the 108 colleges in the California Community College System to provide services that help students with disabilities succeed in their classes.

The HTCTU had its beginnings at Monterey Peninsula College 16 years ago when Carl Brown was a computer consultant and programmer. It was obvious that the personal computer was going to have a great impact on education, and then DSPS Coordinator, Martha Kanter, contacted Carl about making sure that there would be PCs accessible to disabled students. Carl redirected computer equipment to address the needs of students with disabilities

on campus, and soon there were more disabled students clamoring for classes than the college was equipped to handle. This work also attracted the attention of the Department of Rehabilitation and the Chancellor's Office, and the result was the initial multi-million dollar grant that officially established High Tech Center programs on virtually every California community college campus. Several grants later, the HTCTU finds itself housed at Foothill-DeAnza District with Carl Brown as its director and a total permanent staff of seven.

As the name of the group suggests, the main focus of the HTCTU is training. The HTCTU provides 30 different training modules on accessibility topics to 1,500 community college faculty and staff each year. Faculty and staff can take advantage of these trainings at no cost, and the HTCTU is even able to provide support for travel expenses for DSPS faculty and staff. Three trainers are on the permanent staff, and each one focuses on a single specialty: assistive technology, web accessibility, and alternative media. In addition, the HTCTU contracts with exemplary trainers among faculty around the state to supplement the trainings provided by the staff. While most of the training sessions take place at Foothill-DeAnza, off-site training is also provided. Support for DSPS faculty and staff also comes through extensive web-based resources and a very active listserv that the HTCTU established three years ago. Today there are approximately thirty active discussion strands with participation from faculty and staff across the state.

The HTCTU also serves the needs of disabled students through projects and advocacy. One project has been the establishment of the Distributed Scanning Network, which was illustrated in the scenario above. Today, 16 colleges in the state directly serve 96 colleges in their immediate areas with high-speed textbook scanning services. Each of the 16 colleges is committed to scanning a minimum of ten books a month and adding these

books to the listings on a centralized database. If a student needs a textbook in an alternative format, once the faculty member has verified that the student has purchased the textbook, faculty or staff can search the database for the location of an existing version of the book in electronic format or submit a hardcopy version of the book for scanning into a format which best meets the student's needs. Although the remaining 12 colleges are not physically near any of the 16 scanning sites, they, too, have access to the database containing thousands of book references and can still arrange to have new textbooks scanned.

In addition to the Distributed Scanning Network, another Chancellor's Office resource, the Alternate Text Production Center (ATPC) at Ventura College, works directly with publishers to provide textbooks in electronic format as required by AB 422 (Steinberg), which was passed in 1999. The HTCTU works closely with the Chancellor's Office and was active in writing the Distance Education Access Guidelines and the Alternative Media Access Guidelines.

The HTCTU also continues to experiment with new products that come out on the market to find those that will best serve the needs of our students. One product the HTCTU is currently testing is a unit with a Braille keyboard and refreshable Braille display that allows students who are blind to take their own notes, obviating the need for a notetaker. These units are only half the

size of a laptop computer, and with built-in Global Positioning System (GPS) capability, students can also use them to navigate a campus. Twelve units are being used in the current trial.

The HTCTU is the largest program of its kind in the United States, and visitors from around the world regularly visit to observe and learn from its work. Much of the early work of the HTCTU has influenced such critical pieces of legislation as Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The HTCTU is a prime example of how the California Community College System provides access to all students in the state. For further information, please contact Carl Brown at cbrown@htctu.net or visit the program's web site at www.htctu.net.

Equity and Diversity

Implementation and the Role of Local Senates

by Wanda Morris,
Equity and Diversity Action Committee Chair

Note: The following historical summary was compiled from on-line histories and documents prepared by the Chancellor's Office.

A Little History

California community colleges are bound by state and federal legislation to provide a working and learning environment that reflects the rights of all students to study and to access services in an environment that is equitable, free from discrimination and harassment, and in which everybody is respected and treated fairly. We are also bound by a pervasive understanding that to do so is morally right.

In the tradition of a series of federally enacted laws (e.g., the 1984 Sex Discrimination Act 1984, the 1986 Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission Act, the 1998 Anti-Discrimination Act, the 1999 Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Act), the California legislature made its own statement in 1991. At that time, the legislature charged all levels of public education to provide educational equity, regardless of ethnic origin, race, gender, age, disability or economic circumstance, and to offer students a reasonable opportunity to develop their potential. In calling for each public institution of higher education in California to make those provisions, the legislature hoped to promote inclusion and appropriate support for students.

In response to this legislation, in 1992, the Board of Governors (BOG) of California Community Colleges adopted a Student Equity Policy, further amended in 1996. In 1993, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in turn, responded to the BOG's policy and developed the *Guideline for Developing a Student Equity Plan*. These guidelines further expanded our understanding of student equity by addressing the needs of

students from rural isolated regions, from low socio-economic or non-English speaking communities, or of women whose studies were in non-traditional courses.

MORE RECENT HISTORY: PLANS OF ACTION

The current Board of Governors has actively committed itself to student equity and to greater diversity throughout our system. In response to expressed concerns, the Chancellor appointed a Consultation Council Equity and Diversity Task Force, co-chaired by ASCCC Executive Committee member, Dibakar Barua.

At the BOG meeting in November 2002, the task force report, *Realizing Our Commitment to Access and Success for All Students Through Student Equity, Equal Opportunity, Nondiscrimination and Workforce Diversity*, was adopted. "This report focused on ways to assist diverse students in entering higher education and finding workforce opportunities." It stressed that equity is both historic and an ongoing commitment in response to federal and state legislation and in keeping with the highest moral concerns we articulate. Additionally, it called for specific actions and presented a matrix that stipulated "Systemwide Commitments to Equity and Diversity." On adopting this report, Board members expressed their desire that they receive periodic updates on the system's progress fulfilling these specific objectives.

A Recommitment by Faculty

ASCCC

The Academic Senate responded promptly to this renewed interest—and ahead of schedule. In the Fall 2002, before the BOG had even adopted the Task Force report, the ASCCC had adopted the revised edition of *Student Equity: Guidelines*

for Developing a Plan. The objectives of the new guidelines are to:

- ▶ to improve access, participation, success and retention rates for under-represented equity groups.
- ▶ to foster a climate of equal opportunity, educational excellence, and success for all students throughout the system.
- ▶ to encourage the acceptance and valuing of diversity within its student population.
- ▶ to provide a supportive and open organizational culture in which all students are able to develop to their full potential.

In addition, the Executive Committee endorsed the renaming of its standing Affirmative Action/Cultural Diversity Committee, now the Equity and Diversity Action Committee (EDAC). The renaming was not an idle exercise: the emphasis is to be on ACTION. Thus, the EDAC Committee sponsored breakouts and resolutions in 2002-03 to reflect its new activist spirit. That energy continues in 2003-04.

This year, in adhering to the Task Force report, the ASCCC will exercise its leadership to secure commitments from all local senates to join collegially with representatives of their governing boards, chief executive officers, administrators, classified staff organizations, and students to address the goals noted below.

Local Senates

The matrix adopted by and now monitored by the BOG also makes very specific requests of local academic senates and sets time-lines for completion.

- ▶ Revision of your college's Student Equity Plan: The Chancellor's Office has now mandated that each college's plan be updated by June 2004 to ensure that educational environments continue to be conducive to the academic success of all students and to the full development of their potential. It has been ten years since we adopted our initial student equity policy, done in an effort to best ensure

students' success; we now need to revisit our original plans and to conduct thorough research. That research must identify specific problem areas associated with faculty and staff diversity as well as patterns of student equity. The roles of local senates are obvious; clearly student success is an academic and professional matter. Yet the ASCCC and its EDAC Committee can assist colleges in identifying successful strategies and promulgating them, or in identifying useful research.

In addition, the matrix calls upon local senates to

- ▶ respond to Academic Senate requests to "form [at the local level] a committee on hiring" to consider non-discriminatory hiring practices that will result in the highest rate of success for all students;
- ▶ coordinate with your local administrators to "ensure that training is provided to Board [of Trustees] members and district faculty and staff regarding
 - a. how to effectively promote faculty and staff diversity, and student equity; and
 - b. the latest changes to the diversity and equity statutes, regulations, and policies, including the Title 5 regulations on equal employment opportunity";
- ▶ work with your local Human Resources officers to "develop procedures to expand diversity of part-time faculty and provide mentors to assist part-time faculty to develop the potential to fill full-time positions";
- ▶ work with Classified Staff Organizations to "encourage and support classified staff in meeting minimum qualifications for instruction."

We welcome these challenges and invite you to join us at our Fall Plenary breakouts to learn how you might creatively meet your obligations and reflect our shared principles; our breakouts are intended to identify components that local senates will want to consider in revising their student equity plans.

Continued from page 1

majority of our students. First, many of our students are single parents with families of their own or returning adults well beyond the sphere of influence of their parents. Of little concern to critics is the fact that the average age of our students is 25 (well past the age of parental consent or students' ability to track down those parental signatures required on financial aid forms). Second, many of students—particularly first-generation college students—are less sophisticated about negotiating the system and are easily discouraged: if the total cost of fees is beyond what they have in hand, or if they are forced to choose between paying fees and purchasing food for their children that day, they may well walk away; if they experience sticker shock at the tally of their textbooks, they may walk away; if a delay in their Pell grant or BoG Waiver means they are without textbooks for the first few weeks, they may walk away; if they encounter long lines (now often exacerbated by reductions in full-time and part-time staff), they may well walk away; and if they discover long wait lists and crowded classrooms, they may walk away. What remains to be seen is whether they will ever return; announcing that these vulnerable and apprehensive students are not contributing their “fair share” is not likely to encourage their return and their future contributions to California’s economic welfare.

Legislators and critics also commonly espouse the “high fee/high aid” approach to funding post-secondary education, despite the warnings of our counselors, our alumni, and even Diana Fuentes-Michel, Executive Director of the California Student Aid Commission. These experts tell us that many of our students find the questions of the multi-page FAFSA form culturally troublesome; that students are reluctant to seek personal assistance in financial aid offices—particularly when the financial aid staff are fellow students. Many of our students are so traumatized by the “high fee” element of the equation that they are unable to contemplate the “high aid” that may—or from their perspective, may not—be available to them.

During the midnight hours of 2003-04 budget negotiations, Assembly members were alarmed by our arguments that historically, higher fees coupled with revenue declines, resulted in a demonstrable decrease in broad access for many populations of students.

Echoing the popular sentiment that higher fees call for higher aid, Senate members raised fees beyond even the Board recommended \$15 level, and then attempted to compensate by shifting \$38 million from PFE to student financial aid efforts at the state and local levels. As I noted in our August 2003 *Update*, this effort arrives as too little and far too late: if past behaviors are any indication, those students discouraged in August and September by escalating fees will not return.

The “high fee/high aid” approach also shifts some of the responsibility for access to the federal government or the private sector and doesn’t account for the responsibility the state has for educating its populace. The argument we faculty make is that the **state** must assume responsibility for providing the equitable funding of access it has promised to post-secondary education. However, we know what has happened to those promises: program-based funding has never been fully funded; program improvement funds have evaporated; our Partnership agreement is not supported; and seldom have we seen our fair share of the Prop 98 split, statutorily set at 10.93%. No wonder, then, at the September Consultation/Board retreat arose the cry for legislators and the Governor to “Honor the Law.”

Finally, in searching for still other ways to fund public post-secondary education, the Assembly’s Higher Education Committee, chaired by Carol Liu, is currently entertaining alternative approaches to funding: Among the strategies being bandied about—in her committee and elsewhere—are these proposals:

- decoupling ourselves from K-12 and the Prop 98 funding mechanism;
- pushing forward on the nearly-successful 2003 efforts to secure property tax backfill; and
- instituting the Australian pay-as-you-go model, in which students would be asked to repay the state through their subsequent lifetime income.

For the past 30 years, the Legislature’s FTES funding for California’s community colleges has generally remained well below the national average. In 2002-03, FTES funding was \$4321; factoring in the unfunded FTES, running about 3% of our total

FTES, that figure drops to \$4191¹; compare that figure with either that 1998-99 national average of \$6300,² or the \$6500 goal set forth in the system's Strategic Plan for 2005. The argument is sometimes made that as a trade-off for access, California has agreed that sub-par FTES funding is acceptable: we'll accept less in taxpayer money because we want to serve more students. I disagree with this logic—and so do other members of the Consultation Council and the Board of Governors who, at their September 18-19 joint retreat, determined that the *Real Cost of Education* document and its proposed \$9200 per community college FTES shall be the foundation for our system's 2004-05 budget requests and justifications. To serve more, we deserve more.

California's voters, through Proposition 98, in their approval of bond measures, and in commendatory public editorials, have repeatedly spoken in defense of local colleges. The Sacramento "march in March" made broad student support visible. Perhaps it is time again to ask California's citizens: Do we continue to value access as a principle? At what level? To what ends? At what cost—and to whom?

The State's Funding/Programmatic Dance

The Academic Senate recognizes that the state, in providing the bulk of our funding, may choose to exercise what it sees as its public obligation to specify priorities for our funding. Within the past few years, however, legislation has overtly linked Sacramento's stated priorities with the funding necessary to fund our colleges and universities. Indeed, Assembly woman Liu, in a recent memorandum³, argued that we must "better align the financing mechanism with state goals and priorities for higher education." She also notes that we "need to move away from the traditional indicators of quality that focus on input measures and begin to focus more on student learning outcomes." The direction is clear and perhaps the conclusions predetermined as she

¹ Thomas J. Nussbaum. "California's Investment in Public Education: A Look at the Past Three Decades," September 2003, pp. 22-23.

² Nussbaum, p. 24.

³ Carol Liu. Memorandum Re: Committee Hearing Schedule, September 25, 2003, sent to "Participants in the Assembly Higher Education Committee Hearing on September 23, 2003."

raises the questions that will drive the Committee's November 18th and December 9th hearings: "What revisions *should be made* in the community college funding mechanism? What are the Committee's recommendations regarding the funding mechanism and *strategies to promote greater productivity?*" (emphasis mine).

Additionally, state legislation to further the 2002 *Master Plan for Education* objectives appears to erode the bilateral agreements between the Board of Governors and your boards of trustees, attempting to shift even curricular decisions to the state level. Even more significant, however, is the effort of some legislators to redefine the essential mission(s) of the community colleges. Our Academic Senate resolutions reflect long-standing support for the right of *local* faculty, in response to *locally*-expressed needs, to determine *local* curriculum and support programs, confirmed by locally elected boards of trustees who consider their local missions as well. Thus, we will continue to work with proponents of enabling Master Plan legislation, and we urge local senates to work with their college constituencies, raising objections to legislative efforts that diminish the role of local senates or unilaterally curtail the missions of *local* colleges.

These efforts to refocus our mission or shift responsibilities beyond the local level have implications for subsequent funding of quality education. Several years ago, for example, the Legislature declared its intent to fund only university-level research projects that reflected "state priorities." Yet state funding of research at UC and CSU is only a tiny percentage of their total funding in that category. Similarly, state funding covers less than 30% of the cost of UC students' education; on the other hand, most community colleges rely almost wholly on general funding provided by the state. UC and CSU continue to have access to outside resources beyond state funding to support research or programs those institutions believe worthy of support, regardless of "state priorities." Not so for the community colleges: threats to withhold our funding may have dramatic statewide repercussions as colleges scramble to respond to these external pressures on curricular offerings.

The 2003-04 Budget Act Language goes one step further—perhaps tottering down a very slippery slope: the Board of Governors must, by early 2004, report

to the Legislature our system's plan for allocating funding to the priorities the Legislature has prescribed. Presently that request is limited to system allocations. How soon before individual districts or colleges will be asked to conform their offerings to comply with the state's priorities? The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) offers salient critiques of the current financing mechanisms, concluding that "the financing structure of the California community colleges fails to provide adequate support for the programs the colleges are required to offer and fails to provide any mechanism to assist the colleges in addressing the unique needs of their community."⁴ The report, however, goes on to urge the state to consider these mechanisms for refocusing on "productivity and efficiency"⁵:

- ▶ decreasing funding for lower priority higher education activities;
- ▶ reducing duplication in academic program offerings; or
- ▶ shortening time to degree through decreasing course requirements.

It thus appears that the state's budget crisis will drive our academic planning rather than, as the Academic Senate maintains, planning drive budget.

The Programmatic Consequences at the Local Level

This fall's plenary session will afford us an opportunity to explore the ramifications these statewide efforts have on access at our individual colleges: how are decisions being made? Who makes them? Is programmatic coherence being sacrificed in the name of cost containment? Are programs being suspended or discontinued without faculty discussion about alternatives? Are crucial general education offerings being curtailed, though doing so jeopardizes our students' ability to transfer? Are colleges

pinning false hopes on technology mediated instruction—when the absence of funding for the Tech II plan and other technology initiatives makes web hosting and hardware and software purchases exceptionally difficult? How do we retain instructional quality for our students in the face of budget reductions and others' priorities?

We will reconsider commitment to access in its broadest sense, examining which students have access to our institutions and when, and we will consider what might await them upon completion of their educational objectives. Over these components we have little control, though we will strive to increase our influence with the system, with partners in the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, and within the political arena.

On the other hand, we have considerably more self-determination over the access to education and services we provide once students enter our doors. What we make available to them upon their arrival—how we retain rigor and challenge, how we offer breadth and depth, how we conserve resources for the most vulnerable, how we guard our cherished principles in this newly recycled reality will call upon us to redefine for others the access we believe is essential—before, during, and after students' presence on our campuses.

⁴ California Postsecondary Education Commission. "California Higher Education Finance: Understanding the Challenge," Assembly Higher Education Committee Hearing, September 23, 2003, p. 3.

⁵ California Postsecondary Education Commission, p. 4.

QUESTIONS OF ACCESS

While we will consider some of these questions at the fall session, faculty will want to raise these and other inquiries on their local campuses and ponder their ramifications for all our students.

Can we Keep the Doors Open?

Will the Chancellor's Office research demonstrate a continued decline in student enrollment? Does the decline occur within particular populations of students?

Will the Legislature continue to increase fees annually in a manner neither predictable, gradual, nor moderate? Will additional fees on materials or services now being proposed by others in our system simply be perceived as prohibitive?

Will those students unable to afford rising fees return? Will our traditional students be supplanted by CSU- or UC-eligible students who find community colleges more affordable? Or might our students be more frequently supplanted by CSU students needing remediation?

To what might entering students have access?

Will entering students, standing at the threshold of education, have access to student services we see as essential to student retention and success—matriculation services, assessment and academic planning, full personal and academic counseling services?

Will cuts in counseling services or administrative reluctance to hire new counselors result in diminished opportunities for students to make reasonable, rigorous academic plans?

Do changes in hours of availability—of counselors, financial aid officers, registrars, EOPS/DSPS services—continue to meet the needs of evening or weekend students? Will those students have equal access to the full range of services to which they are entitled?

How will students' access be affected by efforts to "outsource" academic advisement to private, off-campus, on-line groups whose employees are not hired through the district's hiring procedures and who may not meet minimum qualifications?

Can our libraries continue to support the current academic and business needs of our communities? Will libraries and resource centers be able to provide scholarly journals, new books, adequate and up-to-the-minute software required by the general public, by students entering the workplace or hoping to transfer? Will the library resources offer experiences compa-

rable to those available at other public post-secondary institutions?

As our library faculty retire or are not rehired, will students and faculty find the support they need to conduct research and to demonstrate information competency?

Once admitted, can students—new and continuing—select from a full range of classes? Do they have access only to a few sections of courses most likely to fill, perhaps at times and locations inaccessible?

Will most sections be filled, requiring long wait lists and a persistence unknown to many of our students?

Will courses, especially those less likely to fill to capacity, be cancelled—despite their importance to a student's certificate, to an employer's need, or to a UC/CSU general education certification?

Will students who must complete 60 units and, increasingly, their major preparation requirements prior to transfer, be able to do so when courses offering are curtailed?

Has the faculty at each college been intimately involved with discussions about class cancellations or local program discontinuance or suspension? Has the local senate adopted a process that accords with the Title 5 requirements for notification in the event of program discontinuance? Have students been involved as well? Is, in this local instance, budget driving planning? Or is planning driving budget?

Do full-time faculty now assume larger class sizes and have less time for curricular innovation, for sponsorship of student activities, for professional development, and for the full range of participatory governance activities?

What awaits students once they complete their academic goals?

Will UC and CSU continue to limit transfer admissions in the coming terms? Will individual compacted campuses or majors institute additional barriers or regional restrictions?

In this grim economic period, will our students secure a hold on their career ladders?

Will students who are unsuccessful in moving on remain at our colleges, competing with Tidal Wave II students for our ever-decreasing offerings?

What, in the long term, will "access" come to mean for Californians?



Dan Crump

What's Been Happening in the Legislature?

by Dan Crump,

Legislative and Governmental Relations Committee Member

One of the standing committees of the Academic Senate is the Legislation and Governmental Relations Committee. A major charge of this committee is to track state and federal legislation that affects the community colleges and to keep the Senate President and the rest of the Executive Committee informed about such legislation. A primary goal of the committee is also to keep all faculty abreast of legislative affairs, both through Legislative Alerts to local senate presidents and by providing periodic updates on the Academic Senate's website. The committee also works with other groups, such as the Faculty Association for California Community Colleges (FACCC), the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the various unions representing faculty, especially the California Federation of Teachers (CFT) and the Community College Association (CCA), to advocate for the community colleges with the Legislature and the Governor. The Senate, however, focuses on legislation affecting community colleges and faculty in regards to "academic and professional matters"—those areas in which the Senate has primary responsibility. Legislation affecting working conditions and such are monitored more closely by FACCC, CCA, and the CFT.

A further goal for this year is to develop a plan of action, in response to Resolution 1.04 passed by the

A little background on bills and the Legislature in California

Each session of the Legislature is for two years. The current session started in January 2003, recessed in September and will convene again in January 2004 for the second year of the session. While some bills (notably budget bills) are passed annually, many bills such as SB 6 are designated as two-year bills and will not be voted upon until the second year of the session.

delegates at the Spring 2003 Session, to increase the Legislature's support for community colleges that we might be seen as an equal partner in the California higher education system. This will be the basis of one of the breakouts at the Fall 2003 Plenary Session and will be reported in a later *Rostrum* article.

While there were many bills introduced in the Legislature that affect the community colleges, the two major focuses this year for the Academic Senate have been legislation surrounding the budget and legislation to implement various recommendations of the Master Plan for Education.

The newest articulation of the Master Plan for Education was outlined in the report from the legislative Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education; it contained a long list of recommendations for all levels of public education, from preschool through the graduate university level. Legislators then proposed legislation based on many of the recommendations. Four such bills are of special interest to community college faculty—AB 242 (dealing with school personnel), SB 550 (student learning), SB 823 (adult education) and SB 6.

The Academic Senate has been paying extra attention to SB 6. This bill, authored by Senator DeDe Alpert (San Diego), implements many of the recommendations of the Master Plan in regards to governance. In an early version of the bill, items specifically related to California Community Colleges included:

How to search for a bill

If you know the bill number, simply go to <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov>, click on Bill Information, designate "Senate" or "Assembly" and type in the bill number. You can also search by author and keyword in the bill.

- ▶ Constituting the California Community Colleges as a “public trust”
- ▶ Revising the functions of the Board of Governors (BOG) (now detailed in Education Code §70901)
- ▶ Revising the functions of local boards of trustees (see Education Code §70902)
- ▶ Providing the BOG with the authority to fix the compensation of the executive staff it appoints.
- ▶ Expanding the membership of the BOG to include the Governor, Lt. Governor, Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Speaker of the Assembly as voting members, serving ex officio. Amending Education Code §70901.5 to add language to allow the community college system, working in a bilateral process, to determine whether or not its regulations contain a state-mandated cost.
- ▶ Specifying the intent of the Legislature to provide a process by which employees of the Chancellor’s Office may be compensated at a level comparable to district employees who perform similar functions.

Websites that cover community college-related bills

<http://www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us>, Click on “Legislative Issues”
<http://www.faccc.org>, Click on “Legislation and Advocacy”
<http://www.ccleague>, Click on “Legislation and Budget”
<http://www.cta.org>, Click on “Politics and Legislation”
<http://www.cft.org>, Click on “Legislative/Political”

President Kate Clark represents the Senate on this working group.

Other legislation of interest to community colleges include AB 680 (Community College Enrollment Fees), AB 1417 (Calculation of

CCC Revenue – Property Tax Backfill), AB 1783 (Continuation of the Cross-Enrollment Program), SB 76 and SB 243 (Block Grants for CCC Categorical Programs), SB 81 (Integrated Teacher Training and Articulation),

SB 328 (State and Federal Financial Aid for AB 540 Students), SB 338 (Concurrent Enrollment), SB 728 (Student Financial Aid – Cal Grant) and SB 955 (Community Colleges – Temporary Employees). A more detailed description of these bills and their present status can be found on the Legislative Issues page of the Academic Senate’s website.

If you have questions or concerns about legislative or governmental relations, please feel free to contact the chair of the Committee, Ken Snell at <flc-sase@flc.losriosl.edu>.

While some of these elements have been altered or removed in later versions, one of the major concerns for the Academic Senate was removal of mention in the Education Code §70901(b)(1)E, of the “right of the academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards” and its parallel in §70902 (b) (7), conferring those same rights and responsibilities to the local senates. Most, if not all, California community college constituent groups also had concerns about various provisions in the bill. The author of the bill agreed to temporarily remove the community college governance provisions from the bill and convene a small task force to work on these elements.

A list of legislators for each community college district can be found on both the FACCC and CCLC websites.



Bob Grill

CVC, What's Going On?

by Bob Grill, Technology Committee Chair

The California Virtual Campus (CVC) began as the California Virtual University (CVU). Funded at \$2.9M in the 1998 budget, the CVU with four regional centers was created to assist in the effort to convert and create online courses and programs to cope with the increasing number of students enrolling in California's institutions of higher education. A database of available on-line courses, training, technical support, and shared resources (more efficient through the economy of scale) made the CVU a necessary resource for the successful implementation of online courses. The continued funding for the CVC was included as part of the goals in the Technology II Strategic Plan.

The goal was a system wide technology plan that would build on the Technology I Plan and encourage expanded uses of technology and continue to support the mission of the California Community Colleges. It has fostered long-range strategic plans at colleges for using technology in teaching and learning, increasing student access, improving student support services, and achieving better efficiencies and effectiveness in administrative support.¹

The CVC met this goal by providing hosting and licensing services, faculty training, conferences, and an online course catalogue. These activities facilitate not just distance education but technology-mediated instruction (TMI) as well. TMI is more than "instruction in which the instructor and student are separated by distance and interact through the assistance of communication technology."² It now includes both hybrid classes where part of the class is offered at a distance and web-enhanced classes where online resources are used both in the lecture/lab and outside the class as an adjunct to more traditional resources. These hybrid and web-enhanced classes need the same resources: training, licens-

ing, and hosting as traditional distance education classes. The combined needs of these classes are expected to grow over the next 5 years.

A campus that hosts its own TMI can expect a total annual expenditure of as much as \$30,000 or more each year—after investing twice that much in start up costs. On the other hand, during the 2001-02 year, CVC "hosted" 55 of the 108 campuses; it would seem that its \$2.9 million allocation—that also included training, database catalog, and conferences—was well spent.

Then came last year's budget crisis. The CVC survived after many segments of the California Community College system came to its defense. It survived, but its funding was reduced to \$1.347 million, less than half of the original allocation. As a result of the reduction, the CVC reorganized to maintain the delivery of services that the system depended on: hosting, training, student support services as well as the online professional development center program and course catalog. During the budget negotiations, and with the uncertainties of their own budgets and the future of the CVC in question, some schools cut online course offerings or moved to more expensive alternatives to CVC hosting, a consequence of the downsizing occurring at many community colleges.

Thus, our current fiscal realities constrain the implementation of new technology. For example, ETUDES, currently owned by Foothill College who provides a license at a reasonable cost, is a course management system as is Blackboard or WebCT. Both WebCT and Blackboard started out with attractive licensing agreements, reduced costs, and appropriately sized for colleges offering few classes. Once colleges became dependent on these resources—after investing in equipment and hours—increases in licensing costs followed, and licenses held by colleges with fewer TMI were being eliminated. Many of the smaller colleges

¹ California Community Colleges California Virtual University Legislative Progress Report Fiscal Year 2001-2002

² Title 5 Section 55370

that could not afford these licensing fees have now joined the ETUDES consortium and will have guaranteed, reasonable licensing fees. Yet just as we needed CVC to host Blackboard or WebCT, we will need CVC to host ETUDES. Again, the economy of scale makes it very cost effective for CVC to host this technology. In fact, without this off-site host, many burgeoning programs in online education or TMI would not exist; without CVC, some colleges might have to close their online programs altogether.

The budget proposal for 2004-05 has allotted CVC no money, and the funds are proposed to be transferred to cover other expenses (restore maintenance/special repairs and instructional

equipment). The Chancellor's Office is deciding whether to support this part of the proposal as this article is being written. Without CVC, many colleges with smaller online programs where hosting was not economically feasible will have to go to more expensive alternatives or drop the programs. In the case of TMI the budget not only drives driving programmatic decisions but also sends us four to six years back in the evolution of technical improvements in the classroom.

We invite you to join our breakout, "California Virtual Campus: To be or not to be..." at our October plenary session to discuss CVC, its current state and future plans, and our strategic responses.

Educational Policies Committee

Continued from page 3

division chairs if we eschew the administrator and University of Texas models? How can we best ensure that faculty division chairs reflect and promote the same faculty leadership values as academic senate leaders?

Areas of Shared Inquiry

Many of the committee's interests overlap with other standing committees. The long-running issue of the new accreditation standards will involve both the Educational Policies Committee and the Research Committee. "The New Accreditation Standards: Guidelines for the Field" was sent to local senate presidents last year and is available on the Academic Senate website. There continue to be issues around how faculty should respond to accreditation visits. Is there a meaningful way to incorporate appropriate performance outcome measures and assessment in a manner that contributes to the educational experience of our students?

Another cluster of issues surrounds questions about the associate degree, a possible transfer degree as suggested during Joint Master Plan discussions, a uniform AS degree, and our own current debate regarding Math and English requirements for graduation. Educational Policies Committee will co-

ordinate with Curriculum Committee in this area. Wider issues here include guarding against inadvertent creation of an inferior associate degree, for example, in occupational areas, and the fine balance of standardization that could promote transfer versus the ability of a college to respond quickly to local conditions.

The committee will work with the President on issues concerning minors in the classroom. The Senate originally raised this issue because of faculty concerns such as curriculum content, academic freedom and supervision. A Chancellor's Office task force was created to examine the situation but this work was largely diverted during last year's concurrent enrollment publicity and the subsequent legislative response in the shape of SB 338 (Scott). We need to ensure that the original academic issues are addressed. Educational Policies Committee will also consult with Curriculum Committee regarding broader funding implications of the "lab/hours by arrangement" discussion.

It promises to be another busy and exciting year. The members of the Educational Policies Committee welcome your thoughts and comments on these issues.

The Academic Senate for
California Community Colleges

President

Kate Clark



Design and Layout

Rita Sabler,
Publications Specialist



The Rostrum is a publication
of the Academic Senate for
California Community Colleges,
428 J Street,
Suite 430, 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



You can find this and the previous
issues of this publication online
at:
<http://www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us>



The Academic Senate and the Nursing Advisory

Shaaron Vogel,

Occupational Education Committee Chair

In June 2002, the study “Associate Degree Nursing: Model Prerequisites Validation Study” was completed as a Health Care Initiative Project. It concluded that four factors best predict student success in completing nursing programs: overall GPA, English GPA, core biology courses GPA, and core biology repetitions (the fewer the repetitions the better). Using that data, a formula was then developed that can be used to create cut scores for admission to associate degree-nursing programs. The study found that if this formula were applied, it could result in a 10% increase in completion rates for ADN programs. But the data also showed that if this formula were applied, it would have a disproportional effect on certain student populations. Thus, it appears that while we could increase the efficiency of nursing programs by using this formula, we would lose some of the diversity of our nursing students.

The study noted also that the point of prerequisites is to eliminate the at-risk students and to fill their slots with those who may have a higher probability of successful completion. Clearly the intention of those who wrote the study is to introduce an element of elitism into the community college nursing programs in the name of greater “efficiency.”

We believe that student equity is a core value of the community college system and that the use of this new formula would undercut this value. The Chancellor of the system seems to agree; Chancellor Tom Nussbaum made clear the importance of our core values in an e-mail dated June 7, 2002, in which he expressed a concern that implementing these criteria could negatively impact access, student equity and equal op-

portunity. Thus, the Academic Senate and the Chancellor view the use of these new criteria as a retreat from the Community College mission and efforts.

A subsequent Chancellor’s Office advisory for nursing schools considering using this study to change their admission criteria was released this past July. It also notes that if the formula were to be applied, it could result in rationing access. The nursing advisory goes on to make several valuable recommendations for implementation and offers ideas for interventions once the student is in the program. Yet why wait till the doors are closed and then, if disproportional impact is noted, set up systems that help only those admitted to the program?

Nurses, by nature, believe in early intervention and preventing problems from developing. Would this not be a better approach to assuring students succeed in their prerequisite courses? Let us apply our efforts to increasing the success in the prerequisites through such things as mentorship, tutoring, study skills, and problem solving skills. This way we do not close the door to students but increase their academic successes and help them achieve their goals. Applying interventions that assist students in their prerequisite studies will help to ensure equal opportunity for all to enter and to succeed in Associate Degree Nursing programs.

At the Fall Plenary Session we will be offering an opportunity to discuss the study and the advisory in one of our breakouts on Thursday, October 30. The ADN study is available at <http://www.healthoccupations.org/resources/nursing> and the nursing advisory is available at the Chancellor’s website www.cccco.edu under Educational Services.