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**Having lost sight of our objectives, we redoubled our efforts.** - Pogo

**The Commission**

The Commission on Innovation was formed in November of 1991 by the California Community College Board of Governors to study how the community colleges in California could **serve an increasingly larger population of students without requiring any additional state expense.** In order to ensure a view that was not tainted by any hint of self-interest, the Board of Governors selected Commission members who were not connected to community colleges in any way. Membership on the Commission included a couple of former legislators, a former state legislative analyst, University of California and California State University administrators, and **a selection of executives from corporations such as Price Waterhouse, IBM, TRW, Pacific Bell, Pacific Gas and Electric, and ARCO.** It is noteworthy that many of these persons work for organizations that have a direct economic interest as providers of services to the community colleges and are, as a result, not immune from attacks based on contentions of self-interest. The Board of Governors also appointed a couple of people to the Commission who have been involved with community groups, including one person from organized labor.

The motivating force behind the creation of the Commission on Innovation was the **gross underfunding** that the community colleges are currently living with. The underfunding of community colleges has led to increased fees for students (which have effectively eliminated thousands and thousands of students from community college education). It has led to the turning away of hundreds of thousands of students needing education but unable to get it because of an insufficient number of class sections.

The lack of adequate funding by the state has led to **increased class size, neglect of physical plants, an overreliance on part-time faculty, and to a revision of the dream of full access to higher education to all that can benefit.** The Commission was not asked to look at the underfunding problem and they did not do so. **The most important single solution to the problem of increased access was simply not addressed by the Commission.**

Lack of funding has led to a rash of proposals from a variety of sources (California Postsecondary Education Commission, Assembly Higher Education Committee, etc.) on how to improve the community colleges and better serve the needs of California's adult population. Most of these "answers" would not even have been suggested if it were not for the severe underfunding currently being experienced. Most of these "answers" have **little to do with providing quality education to the students of the California Community Colleges. The Commission on Innovation continued this tradition.**

In keeping with the trend to suggest solutions that have little to do with quality, the Commission on Innovation presented a final report to the Board of Governors in **October of 1993.**The proposals focused on how to offer education in a **quick and cheap manner** (that may or may not involve any improvement in quality). Quality was barely addressed in any of the proposals. For example, **an expansion of television courses is proposed without a discussion concerning whether there is any solid evidence as to which students succeed using this mode and whether the approach produces persons with (in the words of the Executive Overview) "a high level of literacy and technical competence, grounded in a finely-honed ability to think critically, solve problems, and work creatively with others."**

**The Process of Investigation**

The Commission heard from a few experts hand selected by BW Associates; listened to early reports from three Task Forces composed of community college faculty, administrators and trustees appointed by the California Community College Chancellor to make recommendations in the areas of instruction, management, and facilities; and considered policy discussion papers developed by BW Associates which were derived from investigations done by BW Associates.

It is not clear how the Commission Report was written. Persons outside of the Commission itself have not been advised as to the manner of development of the final Report. **No public meeting was held** at which the Commission members voted to approve the final report. There was no indication in the Report which Commission members were still active members of the Commission (many members attended no meetings of the Commission and **only 9 of the 20 appointed members were present at the final hearing of the Commission**). Some questions still remain unanswered. Did all of the Commission members review the various policy alternatives identified by the Task Forces? They certainly did not discuss them at any open meeting of the Commission. Who originated the proposals contained in the Report? How much input did the Commission as a whole have on the process? Did all the Commission members agree with all the suggestions? Which Commission members signed off on the final report?

It should be noted that many persons outside of the Commission believe that the Report is basically a paper written by BW Associates **in congruence with their own preconceived ideas regarding education, management, governance, and economic development.**

**As a member of the Task Force on Instruction** who spent many hours on the work of the Task Force, I feel resentful that the Commission appears to have paid so little attention to our Task Force's work. We spent many hours in discussion of our ideas and suggestions. We spent many hours writing a report that we thought would be useful to the Commission, the Board of Governors, and to the field. The Commission Report does not reflect our work. I, and I am sure others, will think twice before serving on such a committee again.

I had hoped that the Reports of the Task Forces would have been included as appendices to the Commission Report or would at least have been distributed to the Board of Governors and to the field when the Commission made its final report. I am still hopeful that the Board of Governors will, at some point, distribute the Task Force Reports to the public in the same manner as they have the Commission Report itself.

**Instructional Task Force**

Assumptions

The Task Force on Instruction developed a list of basic assumptions that guided our work. We believed that anyone considering ways of improving the California Community Colleges should keep these ideas in mind. Some of the Basic Assumptions of the Task Force on Instruction, many of which are inconsistent with conclusions reached in the Commission Report, were:

* The mission statement for the California community colleges contained in the Master Plan for Higher Education is still valid.
* Technology can be very expensive to purchase and maintain. The hardware requires a considerable amount of up-front funds while still maintaining current programs until the new systems are up and operating. Without a large increase in funding it will be impossible to purchase new equipment and simultaneously continue to provide ongoing programs to students. The upkeep of equipment requires a considerable ongoing expense. Upgrading of computer software and technological equipment is a continuing cost. Technology is not cheap.
* Technology must be part of a complete instructional system, and must be tied to educational goals. The use of computers, in particular, allow for a better and more complete delivery of education. However, cost effectiveness is still an unknown.
* Using computers to help students to become computer literate differs from use of computers as an instructional tool. The human contact and connection seem to be essential elements for successful programs.
* Technology provides instructors with alternative strategies for teaching. Through technology, a variety of relevant experiences and contexts can be brought to the student.
* We must be careful to consider what is lost or what students might sacrifice when they are not on campus. An educational and intellectual atmosphere is required in order to produce educational quality in the community colleges.
* Diversifying the curriculum has been a long and difficult battle and needs to be supported.
* Curriculum change, course content, and faculty responsibility should be addressed when considering innovation.
* Student development activities have been shown to be important contributors to student success. Students engaged in college community through classroom activities, faculty relationships, working on campus, have been shown to be positively correlated with success and retention.
* Budget constraints are a consequence of conscious decisions and priorities established by the legislature, the governor, and the voters. These decisions force colleges to limit access.

**Open Questions**

The Task Force on Instruction also listed some open questions that the education community has not yet had enough evidence or discussion to answer (although the Commission Report seems to indicate that the Commission itself believes that the evidence is clear enough on some of these issues to mandate direction). These open questions include:

* Numerous studies seem to indicate a relationship between culture and learning styles. What is this relationship? Will instruction via television work well for some and very poorly for others?
* Is human nurturing an essential part of education?
* What is the relationship between the credit and non-credit curriculum? Have colleges made adult education so comfortable that students do not continue through the program?
* May the economic advantages to contract education make it tempting to devote facilities to this use which would otherwise be available to the general public?
* What risks are involved in contract education programs extending the community college umbrella over instructors potentially perceived to be part of the community colleges but actually outside its professional control? Should there be a financial cost to districts that do not meet affirmative action requirements?
* Is there a potential for academic prostitution when seeking help from a particular company? For example, does the use of a particular line of computers or software (which may be donated) compromise academic integrity?

**Task Force Suggestions**

The Task Force on Instruction answered several questions posed by Chancellor Mertes in May of 1992 when the entire Commission on Innovation project seemed on the brink of destruction. The Task Force made many suggestions. These suggestions are listed in the Task Force's Report. **Most of these suggestions are not addressed in the Commission Report.** It would serve anyone interested in the Chancellor's question to read the Task Force on Instruction Report. They do represent the consensus opinion of thoughtful faculty, administrators, and trustees. A few of the recommendations that the Instruction Task Force thought might prove useful to local districts were:

* Technology has the potential to: Engage students in the learning process and enhance skill development; Assist instructors in facilitating student centered learning with large numbers in an efficient manner; increase library access, inter-library learning and skills learning; address needs of students with language differences; provide access accommodations for persons with disabilities.
* Increased computer utilization has the potential to: Include portions of curricula and incorporate assisted instruction in more areas; provide an effective method of preparing tests and establishing evaluation banks; effectively integrate curricula and methodologies to recycle programs; use telecommunication system rather than type mail respond methods; make registration more efficient and easier for students; provide magnetic strip cards for student identification, followup, and attendance management; access records more effectively for counseling and other matriculation and student services; help students to become more computer literate; assist with compliance to mandated reporting requirements; assist with information.
* Expand the collaborative efforts of community colleges and other public agencies to provide a coordinated response to the education and support needs of students. Introduce new legislation that defines and encourages the expansion of Title 5 and Education Code provisions related to contract education. Current regulations do not clearly define provisions for contract education. Seek out businesses willing to support community colleges endowed chairs.
* Draw upon successful public and private sector experiences with affirmative action. They might provide a working model of affirmative action to the colleges that need to implement effective affirmative action policies and practices.
* Convince business and industry **that investment in education through increased taxes or other means, comes back to them many fold in terms of an educated work force.**
* Encourage business and industry to offer faculty members practica in high tech and other areas so that the faculty member can remain current in his or her field.
* Explore increasing opportunities for transfer by diverting more lower division students to community colleges.
* Establish partnerships within the college to assure a "seamless curriculum". Establish bridges between the non-credit and credit programs. Examine interfaced programs within the institutions.
* Establish a Chancellor's task force to identify those regulations in Title 5 that no longer serve a purpose and inhibit innovation.
* Recommend that non credit adult education belongs in the community colleges. Develop non credit curricula that facilitate the preparation of students for transfer or occupational programs.
* Establish a campus climate which respects diversity. Assure that all students feel welcome and respected.
* Provide effective assistance for students who are seeking support to meet basic needs such as student loans and grants, transportation, tutors, child care, health care, and counseling.
* Develop and implement pedagogical changes that will alter/modify the ways students are taught to acquire, view, and evaluate knowledge.
* Promote federal support for basic skills education for new Americans immigrants and refugees.
* Research and develop new paradigms more consistent with the changes in knowledge, skills and values necessary for effective solutions in meeting future civic, social and technological demands.

**Total Quality Management**

**The Commission on Innovation** addresses the **philosophical teachings of W. Edwards Deming as a model management theory.** The Commission might have prepared a better report had it used these methods in developing the final report. The Board of Governors itself contradicted the TQM philosophy when it **did not include persons from community colleges on the Commission itself.** It might be helpful to recall a few of the basic tenants of TQM as expressed by Deming and other leaders in this movement:

* TQM should empower everyone, including those at the lowest levels of power. Problems are attacked by teams representing people who have direct contact and knowledge regarding the problem.
* TQM works when people use statistical tools and behavioral techniques to count or collect data in order to analyze and solve problems. The data is used to see where things are not working as planned or expected. The data is analyzed to see if the underlying causes can be determined.
* I see no evidence that the Commission used any statistical tools or behavioral techniques to collect data in order to best address the problems facing the community colleges. Anyone reading the Report should be appalled by the number of references to such conclusive evidence as "experts generally give ...", "the research consensus suggests ...", "very few are trained...", "has been described to the Commission ...", "a number of faculty and administrators told the Commission" ..., "Some deplored ...", "Others pointed to ...", and "a number of administrators ...".
* A usual stumbling block [in quality improvement efforts] is management's supposition that quality control is something that you install like a new carpet. In addition, no "outside expert" can install TQM in an organization. By restricting membership on the Commission on Innovation to people from outside the community colleges, **the Commission guaranteed that their work product would end up as something which is to be imposed from outside the community colleges.**
* Quality is not improved by after-the-fact inspection but by control over the production process as it happens.
* The way to improve instruction is not to give tests at the end to determine whether people have learned what they were supposed to. **The way to improve instruction is to find ways to improve what goes on during class time and what students do outside of class. The emphasis should be on improving the quality of instruction, not the testing of results.** The Commission on Innovation took the route of after-the-fact testing at each stage of student development.
* Quality cannot be added on; it must be built in from the start.
* One role of top management is to model the behavior that is expected under TQM. If top management is not committed to creating a TQM culture, there is no hope that TQM can even work in solving those problems that it was designed to solve. Groups that preach TQM should practice the methods of TQM.
* Can the Commission on Innovation point to its process for the development of proposals as a model TQM process?
* Quality for the customer is the bottom line, all other good things (such as profit in the business world) will follow from the constant desire to improve the quality of the product.
* Instructional television and other technological delivery system "innovations" must first be approached on the basis of quality - and providing more service will follow - if TQM is a correct approach.
* **Cooperation, not competition, must be the basis for working together in a TQM environment.** There also must be a feeling of fairness.
* Compensation should be equitable. The Commission made no comments on whether the salary schedules for administrators compared equitably with those of the faculty and staff.
* Trying to bypass the union, reduce its power, or eliminate it are actions that are inconsistent with the tenants of TQM. **It is impossible to create a climate of trust when management is bent on destroying the union**. Union-management cooperation as equals is required for TQM to be successful.

**All of the faculty unions consider the call for statewide bargaining as a disguised attack on faculty unions and their ability to operate effectively on the local campus level.**

**The Commission Suggestions**

The Commission on Innovation Report suggest three major initiatives that the community colleges should pursue:

* Launch a sustained program of systemic innovations to restructure instruction, curriculum, and degree certificates in order to increase transfer and enable all students to develop the **high level of skills and knowledge needed for the 21st Century.**
* Expand the community colleges' role in state and local economic development to make them central to the state's economic renewal.
* Modernize management, governance, facilities utilization and technology use to **promote cost-effectiveness and increase the community colleges' capacity to serve more students.**

Some of the particular "strategies" suggested by the Commission include:

* Create a permanent system-level fund to stimulate innovations and professional development throughout the system.
* The proposal is to set aside $10 million of general fund apportionments as a beginning (and eventually growing to $80 million in constant 1991 dollars) to be used as seed money. The fund would be under the direction of the Board of Governors.
* Introduce an articulated system of degrees and certificates that sets **clear milestones for academic accomplishments, progress towards transfer to four-year universities, and advancement on professional career ladders.** The suggestion is to create the California Standards and Certification Council that would be responsible for developing the degrees and certificates. Members of the Council would be composed of representatives from K-12, universities, and business and industry. Community college representatives would also be included. **The Academic Senate would no longer be primarily responsible for developments in this area of academic responsibility.**
* Define the colleges' mission to include state and local economic development focused on **providing training and technical assistance to business and industry.** Although "economic development" is not well defined in the document, the emphasis seems to be on training and helping business and industry (as opposed to educating people). The increased mission seems to revolve around an increased emphasis on providing technical assistance to business.
* Eliminate barriers to the colleges delivering training to business. Some of the perceived "barriers" are **tenure requirements for faculty, limits on use of part-time employees, college hiring policies, and fees for students.**
* Adopt collaborative planning and management processes at each college to assure continuous improvements in quality and efficiency. The proposals include system-wide goals for management efficiency and College Quality Partnerships consistent with the tenants of Total Quality Management.
* Develop a pervasive technological infrastructure at and between colleges to increase productivity, enhance management efficiency, and become premier institutions for the application of technology to learning. The proposal includes the establishment of a new system-level entity which they call the I**nstitute for Technology and Distance Education** (INTECH). INTECH would make the decisions regarding system-wide technology priorities as well as funding allocations. It would negotiate with technology providers for all of the districts and would distribute courseware developed by faculty. The proposal also includes the setting of a goal that **20% of all courses be taught by distance instruction by the year 2005.** Colleges not providing extensive instruction by distance methods would not receive funding for new facilities under the plan proposed by the Commission. It is also suggested that the quality safeguards now in place for distance instruction be removed.
* Restructure community college governance to enhance local autonomy, strengthen **system-level capacity to provide overall direction, and reinforce accountability**. The Commission proposes that "**the Legislature should repeal all laws that interfere with the autonomy of local districts or the authority of the Board of Governors as the system-level governing authority.**" Under this proposal minimum qualifications for hire would be eliminated, restrictions on the use of part-time employees would be eliminated, and categorical funding would be eliminated. At the same time, the Board of Governors would establish more regulations in the areas of academic standards for student performance, technical standards, and system-wide priorities for the use of state funds. Collective bargaining would be moved to the state level.
* Implement more cost-effective facility policies that reduce the need for new facilities, support innovations, and streamline the construction approval process. The proposals include the requirement to provide distance instruction, afternoon classes, and year-round operations before building new facilities. There is no discussion concerning the lack of connection between the funding sources used to offer additional classes and the funding sources used to construct new facilities. It is also not explained how a system saves money by not expending money on projects that it would likely not spend due to state lack of funds.

**My Remarks on Commission Report Strategies**

**Deregulate Governance to Provide More Local Autonomy and System-level Authority**.

It must be remembered that each regulation and law governing the community colleges, that **was passed by the legislature or the Board of Governors, was passed for a reason. Many regulations and laws were passed to end an abuse that was taking place somewhere in the state.** Most regulations and laws were written to require the offending districts to perform in the manner that most districts were already performing. If we wish to discard the quality and other safeguards established in the past, we must have something to replace them with that is effective - if we do not want the abuses to reappear. We must look at each law and regulation to see if it is needed any longer. We should consider whether the problem that the law or regulation addressed is any longer a concern of the state. We must see if there is a better way to address the particular concern of the legislature or the Board of Governors before we eliminate a law or regulation that was written to address a real problem.

**It should be pointed out that voluntary compliance has not worked well in the past.** AB 1725 mandates that required compliance were done, those that were less stringent were either done more slowly or not at all. Last year the Board of Governors passed a weak Student Equity Policy (weak in terms of compliance requirements). Most districts have not, to date, done anything to implement the policy even though they were directed to do so by the policy. **It appears that state policy and mandates are not well observed at the colleges unless backed up by rewards or punishments.** We have yet to experience much success with goals for student access, faculty diversity, and improved full-time/part-time faculty teaching ratios absent any rewards or punishments. How deregulation will address the needs for gains in these areas is not at all obvious.

At the same time that the Commission calls for less regulation from the state government, it calls for more control of academic programs by the Board of Governors. The Board of Governors, under the Commission plan, would "establish and support system-wide priorities, establish state-wide academic standards for student performance, establish technical standards" and "establish fund guidelines and allocate funds to districts for instruction and other services."

Introduce an articulated system of degrees and certificates that sets clear milestones for academic accomplishments, progress toward transfer to four-year universities, and advancement on professional career ladders.

The proposal suggests that the current degrees offered by the community colleges (based as they are on a series of successfully completed courses) are not well thought of in either the academic or in the work world. The Commission suggests that a better idea would be to **develop academic and skill standards that students must reach before being granted recognition for achievement.** This approach to scholarship is still being hotly debated nationally. **There is not yet consensus in the educational community regarding the advantages and disadvantages of basing educational attainment on the passage of standardized tests.**

Before the California Community Colleges converts to a competency based degree system some important questions need to be answered concerning who develops the standards; how cultural bias can be eliminated from these tests; what skills, knowledge, and abilities are measured; and how the results should be used. The Academic Senate should begin to look at the entire area to see if it appears to be a feasible and valuable approach at the state level. It is still premature to move forward on such an approach on a statewide basis. It cannot be successfully imposed from above. First there must be some level of consensus within the educational family.

**Establish State-wide Collective Bargaining**

Collective bargaining should continue to be done at the local level**. Costs for benefits vary considerably by region of the state. The cost of living varies considerably across the state. How to create a fair system of statewide compensation is not at all obvious.**

Most of the cost of running a district is in employee salaries and benefits. If you take salaries and benefits out of the hands of local districts, you are taking away most of the ability of a local district to handle its budget.

It also must be remembered that negotiations address many more issues than just those of salaries and benefits. It is at the local level where the conditions of employment in the colleges can best be addressed. If there is a value of "local autonomy" in any area, it is in the area of collective bargaining. **Each local district has its own culture and history and their local contract reflect this culture and history.**

**Most contract issues have been worked out and no longer pose any problems at the local level.** To go back and renegotiate all of these locally negotiated articles at the state level is a waste of time and energy for all concerned. There is labor peace in most districts in the state. The process is working well in the great majority of the districts. The California Community Colleges **don't need a huge collective bargaining agent war over who will represent the employees of the community colleges at the state and local level.** The California Community Colleges don't need the friction that new negotiations will bring. If negotiations at the state level for UC and CSU are any example, state-wide collective bargaining is not the way to go. UC and CSU negotiations have not been good. The California Community Colleges should not seek to duplicate these failed models.

**Initiate an Institute for Technology and Distance Education.**

A strength of our community colleges is that local districts are able to approach education on a local need basis as determined by locally elected trustees - consistent with the concerns and priorities of the legislature and the governor as evidenced in law. When districts wish to work with other districts in collaborative efforts, they should be encouraged to do so.

The Commission Report states that "State-wide leadership is needed to plan and coordinate the expansion of distance education, identify promising technologies, chart an orderly technology investment program, negotiate the acquisition of equipment and services for the system, help design and implement faculty development programs, develop a system-wide information network, and manage other numerous tasks in order to greatly expand the colleges' technical capacities." **There is no proof offered that this is a more productive approach than the current one of each district responding to local needs and priorities.**

The districts do not need a new system-level Institute for Technology and Distance Education imposed on top of the colleges as another level of bureaucracy. The districts do not need "an independent, system-level organization that plans, oversees, and coordinates" community college investment in technology. Such a scheme is destined to get in the way of district efforts to introduce technology in a timely and cost effective manner. It is interesting that at the same time that the Commission wishes to eliminate what it sees as outside meddling in district affairs, it proposes a whole new system of state oversight of local district decision making. The districts do not need an INTECH.

If a five-year strategic plan is needed, this can be done within the current community college consultation process. **If priorities need to be made, these priorities can go through the consultation process before going to the Board of Governors**. In short, we don't need a new bureaucracy created to do a job that we are currently capable of doing - if that is what we want to do.

Any legislative "obstacles" to distance learning should first be directed to the Academic Senate for consideration of quality issues, and then go through the normal consultation process.

**Dramatically Expand Distance Learning**

Active learning involves the student in his/her education. An early draft of The Report from the Commission stated that "**Lecture methods are largely incompatible with active learning models, for they generally do not approach instruction as a collaborative learning process between teacher and student - and among students.**" The final draft refined this view somewhat but the basic premise is still present. The final report states that "While lecture methods are appropriate for the delivery of some kinds of information, they are largely incompatible with active learning models, for they generally do not approach instruction as a collaborative learning process between teacher and student - and among students." While this may be true depending on how much of the lecture is actually interactive, it is certainly true that **courses offered through television allow for no collaboration either between teacher and student or among students.** Television courses provide a learning setting that is the opposite of an active learning setting unless the student is able to work interactively with the program. The savings estimates projected by the Commission assume a traditional television approach in order to minimize costs. Canned television does not provide an opportunity for active learning.

Before the state commits itself to a strategy of increased reliance on television and other modes of distance instruction (and the expense that such an expansion would require), some solid studies should be done to evaluate the efficacy of such an approach. Some closely monitored pilot projects should be undertaken before the state leaps into this costly and perhaps unproductive direction. The Academic Senate is working on what such studies should include.

At all stages of development, television courses **must be closely monitored by local academic senates to ensure that quality instruction is being provided.** Any effort to move this oversight away from the local district is bound to produce poor results as only those with an interest in providing more television courses are likely to be involved in the oversight at the state level.

**Create a permanent, system-level fund to stimulate innovation and professional development throughout the system.**

**The Commission Report discusses different learning styles, but the field is not in agreement concerning how to address different learning styles.** Some believe that changing and modifying a learning style is a fundamental part of education. More research and experimentation needs to be done, and funds to do this would be quite helpful. Funds to help faculty to become skilled in using the new technologies would also be helpful. Increased funding for innovation and professional development should not require a whole new bureaucracy. Current methods of distributing funds and encouraging new projects could be expanded to include any new responsibilities.

**Define the colleges' mission to include state and local economic development focused on providing training and technical assistance to business and industry.**

One of the problems addressed by the Commission was the lack of funding to serve our current students. This proposal suggests that we expand our Economic Development program from its current role in the instruction of students into the area of service to business. **There is a often a difference between focusing on the needs of students and focusing on the needs of industry.** Narrow training to perform a function for a particular employer is very different from education which has as a goal the development of persons with the ability to "think critically, solve problems, and work creatively with others."

It is not clear whether it is the intent of the Commission to move toward serving business rather than serving the educational needs of employees in certain industries or whether it is just a case of a careless use of language when discussing a change to "assistance to business and industry."

If there is a change in what we will do that is being proposed something that is not now covered in the current mission of the community colleges - it should be explicitly spelled out and debated. We don't have enough money to do what we are being asked to do now. If we expand into new areas we will need to eliminate current areas of instruction. What are we being asked to neglect?

The problem with the current Economic Development program revolves around the fact that it is not well defined in law. We need to look at contract education and distinguish it from community services. **We need to address the current lack of quality control that should be performed by the faculty and the Academic Senate**. We need to assure that qualified faculty are being hired and properly evaluated. We need to assure that quality curriculum is being used. We need to assure that a diverse faculty is being hired. We need to assure that the faculty used in contract education are a part of the academic community of their colleges.

I would propose that the California Community Colleges consultation process be asked to develop a clear definition of contract education and Economic Development which includes a discussion of what regulations are required to guarantee quality, faculty and student diversity, and contract education faculty inclusion in the academic community. The general issue of what should be the limits of community college involvement in Economic Development should also be addressed. The modifications of state law, etc. could be addressed as part of these discussions.

**Implement more cost-effective facility policies that reduce the need for new facilities, support innovations, and streamline the construction approval process.**

Colleges do not have the funds to increase the number of classes offered - whether they be in the afternoon, at night, on weekends, or year-round. In order to expand the offerings at the colleges, colleges need the money to offer the classes. The Commission Report seems to indicate a belief that funding that would have been used for construction could be used to offer more classes. **Currently the sources for receiving funding for classes and funding for construction are not the same.** There is no current method for using money saved from not constructing buildings toward the offering of classes in any mode (including year around colleges, afternoon classes, and the like).

The average class size in the California Community Colleges is among the highest in the country. The use of part-time faculty (each of whom earn about half the salary of a regular faculty member and rarely receive any health benefit coverage) is among the highest in the nation. **The amount that California community colleges spend per student is among the lowest in the country.**

The California Community College Chancellor's Office reported that in 1989-90, the expenditures per FM student were:

Top 10 other states $5, 835

36 other states $4, 800

8 other large, industrial states $4,144

Calif. Community Colleges $3, 825

On a cost basis the California Community Colleges are already one of the most efficient systems in the country.

Space on most community college campuses is well utilized at the times that most students are available to take classes. The use of facilities at other times, with no increase in funding, would be a less efficient use of funds because classes would generally be smaller as colleges moved to offering classes at less popular times. The community colleges have very lean operations. Any expansion to serve new clientele will require more funding.

Colleges should use existing space, as they are funded for new students, before they build new buildings - but colleges are not going to get much more out of current budgets without further impacting the quality of their offerings.

**Issues Facing Community Colleges**

What are the issues that the Commission has not addressed that affect the quality of the Community Colleges?

**Inadequate funding**

The biggest problem facing the community colleges is underfunding. The Instruction Task Force noted that: "In a recent report on the funding gap in higher education by the California Community Colleges (required by supplemental language to the 1991 Budget Act) it was estimated that the California Community Colleges are **underfunded by approximately $2.3 billion.** The entire amount that the California Community Colleges received from 1991-92 Proposition 98 funding was **$1.7 billion.** Partnerships with business are only a minor contribution to the funding. The major cost of community college growth will need to be financed by the State of California."

Even though this is the most important problem facing the community colleges, the Commission on Innovation Report does not even address the issue of how we might seek to receive more funding from the state.

I have already indicated how underfunded the community colleges are relative to other community colleges nationally. They are even more underfunded compared to the other institutions of higher education in California.

**Inadequate diversity of faculty**

In Fall of 1991, 81% of the community college faculty was White. The Commission on Innovation does not even address this issue, much less offer suggestions on how to make progress in this area.

**Overuse of Part-Time Faculty**

Even though AB 1725 directed the community colleges to move to a position where 75 % of the hours taught in the community colleges would be taught by full-time faculty, the colleges have made little progress toward that goal. In Fall of 1992, the percent of hours taught by full-time faculty was still only 63.4% (in Fall of 1988 the percentage was 62.2%). One district had as few as 41.2% of their hours taught by full-time faculty. The national average for community colleges is about 75%.

In Fall of 1992 there were 16,612 full-time faculty and 27,038 part-time faculty. **The over use of part-time faculty puts tremendous time pressure on the full-time faculty to do curriculum development and other department work, academic advising of students, office hours (most part-time faculty are not required to hold office hours), shared governance, and other faculty responsibilities.**

In Section 4, of AB1725 the legislature stated that "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. ... 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."**

The Commission on Innovation does not even address the issue of the overuse of part-timers - except to suggest that all mandates be removed regarding the minimum number of hours that should be taught by full-time faculty.

At the Fall 1992 Academic Senate Session, the delegates to the Session passed a series of resolutions (based on quality considerations, leaving the equity issues to the collective bargaining agents) regarding the improvement of the status of part-time faculty in the California Community Colleges. I recommend that persons interested in increased quality read the Senate's Educational Policy Committee paper on the subject.

**Diverse Student Population**

The California Community Colleges enroll a diverse student population. The proportion of diverse students in transfer programs does not generally reflect this diverse population. As one goes higher up the educational ladder, the diversity declines. This is a real problem for higher education and the Commission on Innovation does not adequately address the issue except to propose access tests which would likely eliminate many students from underrepresented groups from community college programs. The Commission further proposes the elimination of basic skills and ESL programs that traditionally have served as avenues to higher education for these underrepresented groups.

To illustrate how bad the problem is, consider the following information provided by CPEC in a report on September 13, 1993:

Percent Black and Latino

1992 Public High School Students 42.2%

1992 Public High School Graduating Class 34.3%

1992 Entering Freshman Class (CCC) 33.0%

1992 Entering Freshman Class (CSU) 32.3%

1992 Entering Freshman Class (UC) 17.5%

1992 Community College Transfers (to CSU) 22.3%

1992 Community College Transfers (to UC) 16.8%

1992 BA Degrees (CSU) 14.1%

1992 BA Degrees (UC) 13.7%

1992 MA Degrees (CSU) 11.7%

1992 MA Degrees (UC) . 6%

1992 PhD Degrees (UC) 6.3%

Martin Hittelman

President, Community College Council

October 29, 1993
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