



RESPONDING TO THE CALIFORNIA PERFORMANCE REVIEW

September 2004

Community College League of California
2017 O Street
Sacramento, CA 9584
916.444-8641
www.ccleague.org

SYSTEM RESPONSE TO THE CALIFORNIA PERFORMANCE REVIEW

ETV01: Restructure the Role of the Secretary for Education

Recommendation: The Governor should restructure the role of the current Secretary for Education. The Secretary should be charged with synchronizing education and workforce preparation and advising the Governor on education policy and programs. The Secretary should report directly to the Governor, and manage a new Department of Education and Workforce Preparation.

Comment: This recommendation would appear to add workforce preparation as a key element – and a more broadly-tasked agency called the Department of Education and Workforce Preparation – under the Secretary of Education. This could theoretically be helpful in providing a primary point of accountability for the management of K-20 education and workforce preparation in lieu of numerous state entities performing these functions under the present structure.

However, it appears that this would result in the new department focusing on the policy aspects of workforce preparation for K-20 while retaining the role of administrator of K-12 programs, with UC and CSU as the administrators of higher education programs separately. This is likely to result in a different and more unworkable division of functions rather than greater coordination.

An additional concern is the loss of authority for the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI). The people of California have voted three times in recent years to retain the elected SPI. This proposal retains the SPI because he/she is a constitutional officer and the review authors undoubtedly recognize the citizens of California simply do not support eliminating this as an elected position; however, this proposal skirts that issue by recommending a new agency which would assume some of the responsibilities now held by the SPI.

As an alternative, we suggest placing workforce education under the community colleges and the Board of Governors (BOG) since community colleges are the largest providers of workforce education in this state. If this alternative were enacted, both the proposal to eliminate the Board of Governors and recommendation ETV03 which would place community colleges under a Deputy Secretary, would be eliminated. Community colleges are too large and too complex to be subsumed under a Deputy Secretary of Education. The alternative of placing workforce education under the community college “umbrella” would provide the coordination sought by the review while assuring the public access and responsiveness to both local communities and state needs that are essential for the success of workforce preparation programs.

ETV02: Create an Education and Workforce Council

Recommendation: The Governor should issue an Executive Order establishing an Education and Workforce Council whose members should be executive leaders from the state’s education segments and the cabinet secretary responsible for labor market information studies and workforce development programs. The Education and Workforce Council should be responsible for developing the Workforce Preparation Strategic Plan by December 2006 and biennially thereafter, including a blueprint of how California will synchronize its education system with economic development plans and improve the supply of an appropriately skilled, educated workforce.

Comment: California needs a forum for discussion of issues involving coordination of education, workforce preparation and economic development. The Chancellor, or his/her nominee, would be a

member of the new council as it is currently structured. Representatives of business should be added to the list of members.

If this Council is formed, it should provide vision and coordination and develop new external funding sources, while the systems retain their fiscal responsibilities for program development and curricular innovation such as Tech/Prep. Such an approach to coordination among providers of workforce preparation would be more likely to implement the review's intent than would the recommendation to develop a new department and division and expand the authority of a cabinet official appointed by, and solely responsible to, the Governor.

Also in the area of workforce preparation, we note that on page 99 of "Prescription for Change," the CPR report criticizes the community colleges for not basing many courses on any current analysis of labor force needs. We find such criticism inappropriate and unwarranted as community colleges are an open access comprehensive system. Simplistic solutions are not a good fit for a democratic, locally-drive, flexible-response system. There are many check systems used to keep programs and courses current and this is a market-driven system. If students are not receiving what they need, they have many other choices. Colleges use industry advisors, grant funds, regional approaches and other mechanisms for labor market monitoring and to ensure responsiveness and relevance. These include:

- Local and state-level advisory boards that monitor Career Technical Education offerings and current market demands;
- Career Technical Education faculty members who are engaged in their industry sector and forecast industry trends through their work with industry;
- Economic development initiatives for "R&D" in emerging markets. These projects target labor market responsiveness and provide guidance to the overall college program offerings; and
- Longitudinal studies on community college students after graduation via unemployment insurance wage data matches to determine employment outcomes for community college students and college programs are adjusted accordingly.

Some specific examples of the colleges' responsiveness include:

- Local decisions, based on market demand, determine whether programs at a particular college should specialize or generalize. Some colleges in "Silicon Valley," for example, are responding to new information technology labor demands by consolidating focused programs into generalist programs. Conversely, as biotechnology matures, new subspecialties of programs are growing.
- Depending on market demand, programs proliferate among colleges, or regionalize. For example, GIS programs are growing on many campuses while interior design programs are regionalizing due to insufficient demand.

As an alternative, we suggest again that this Council be centered under the authority of the Chancellor and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the largest workforce providers in the state and that this new authority also carry funding with it.

ETV03: Consolidate Selected State Higher Education Agencies

Recommendation: The California Community College Chancellor's Office, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the California Student Aid Commission and the Bureau for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education should be restructured and consolidated into a

single, unified Higher Education Division which should be responsible for strategic planning for each of the consolidated entities and for coordination of policy, programs, resources and services across these systems.

Comment: While we believe that some consolidation of departments may be useful for government efficiency, we question the reasoning behind this consolidation. First, the link between the Chancellor's Office, CPEC, CSAC and NPPVE is quite thin – there is no logical connection between the Chancellor's Office and the other three offices. The strongest link for community colleges would be with the University of California and the California State University and additional coordination among the three segments of higher education would be a wiser choice for any proposed higher education linkage.

Secondly, the Chancellor and the Board of Governors (BOG) of the California Community Colleges – which would be eliminated by this proposal – have considerable authority over the allocation and distribution of capital projects, the approval of programs of study and the formulas that allocate budget appropriations. The present separation of the BOG and the Chancellor from the Governor guarantees that these powerful actions are taken after public hearings and addressed in a nonpartisan manner. They should not be placed under a Deputy Secretary of Education within a political process with public intervention limited to a single quadrennial vote for the officeholder who appoints the Deputy Secretary. If this were to occur, the public would lose an important part of their access to government which would be antithetical to the general intent of this report.

Thirdly, System Consultation has been a valuable part of the governance process under the Board of Governors. This process allows all stakeholders within the system and the public to assist with the development of policy and have the opportunity to comment on policy recommendations prior to decisions by the BOG. This coordination would undoubtedly be lost if the BOG were abolished.

Fourth, the California Community College system is one of the most successful and respected in the entire nation, despite funding at or near the bottom of the states. Thirty percent and 65%, respectively, of the graduates of UC and CSU commence their higher education at a community college and those who transfer do so with upper-division grade point averages and retention levels similar to students who were UC- or CSU-eligible directly out of high school. It would not be in the public interest to radically change this system that has attained such powerful and remarkable results and subsume it within a political office.

Fifth, there are important functions (including research and policy, fiscal administration, leadership, etc) that require a significant increase in staffing, rather than a reduction that must be shared among three other needy groups with varying missions.

In response to this recommendation, the locally elected trustees of several large community college districts in the state – Los Angeles Community College District, Coast CCD, Pasadena CCD, and San Diego CCD – have issued resolutions expressing their opposition; the *SF Chronicle* editorialized that this idea should be,

“flunked because although there is sometimes an awkward balance between local and state control [it] has allowed individual colleges to respond to the needs of their local communities. Turning them into an appendage of the governor's office is not the reform they – or California – need.”

The *LA Times* Capitol reporter described this proposal as “a power grab and an effort to shut up dissident voices at budget time, further suggesting that “[Governor Schwarzenegger] may ...consider community colleges as special interests when they disagree with him....”

The *Sacramento Bee* editorialized that, under this proposal,

“The voice of the community colleges, their system’s chancellor, would become an expendable position. A new higher education czar in the education department would assume the responsibilities. The community colleges are overshadowed as it is by the University of California and California State University systems. What does defrocking the community college system actually accomplish?”

Patrick Callan, president of the San Jose-based National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education said he would support any proposal that would help the community colleges better serve students, but he fears the review’s plan might politicize the college system. “There’s a long tradition in this country of colleges and universities having at least one degree of insularity from the state,” he told the *Los Angeles Times* when asked about this recommendation.

As an alternative, we suggest freeing the system office to function in a manner similar to the UC and CSU system offices. The Legislature should increase the authority of the system to govern its affairs by:

- Authorizing the Board of Governors to employ and fix the compensation of employees it appoints, including managerial and professional employees, without Department of Personnel Administration (DPA) approval and without requiring DPA approval for the BOG to allocate its employees’ positions in appropriate civil service classifications;
- Authorizing the Board of Governors to determine whether a state mandate exists and to declare that determination final, and not subject to review by the Commission on State Mandates;
- Establishing state policy that system office employees be compensated at a level commensurate with similar employees in the local districts; and
- Establishing legislative intent to enact legislation authorizing the BOG rather than the Governor, to appoint up to six deputy and vice chancellors who would be exempt from civil service.

Doing so would be fiscally sound, allow work to be accomplished more efficiently, and encourage coordination of higher education issues among the segments on an equal basis.

ETV07: Eliminate Unnecessary Reports Required in the Education Code

Recommendation: The Governor should work with the Legislature to sunset mandated reports in the Education Code. Specifically, new legislation should:

- *Establish a sunset date of January 1, 2007 for all currently mandated reports within the Education Code, unless specifically identified by the Legislature; and*
- *Require all future legislation creating a mandated report to include a sunset provision with a maximum of two years.*

Comment: We agree with this recommendation as a means to reduce the number of reports to those that are useful and valuable. We also would urge adoption of two related recommendations contained in the California Community College Chancellor’s Office/system office “Agency Review Preliminary

Report.” Recommendation II.3 of that report proposes “reducing the reporting burden on colleges and the system office by maximizing the use of automatic data collection via the statewide MIS [Management Information System] and utilizing electronic reporting for any data that cannot be obtained through MIS because of timing or structural issues.” Recommendation II.5 of that same report proposes elimination of several unnecessary but legally mandated reports including:

- Persistently Low-Transfer Colleges
- District Contracts with Vocational Schools
- Economic Development.

In another related matter, we recognize that there are other Education Code provisions that could be eliminated to reduce unnecessary reporting burdens on community colleges. These should be reviewed and included as part of the CPR review. [N.B. This listing is under development using documents compiled from the most recent Education Code Review and the system office review from several years ago.]

ETV08: Reform Concurrent Enrollment Funding and Options

Recommendation: The Governor should work with the Legislature to improve California’s concurrent enrollment programs. New legislation should include the following changes:

- *Modify the intent of concurrent enrollment to state that it is an educational choice for any student that can perform college level work and specify that the benefits include socialization into college;*
- *Allow participation by any student who passes the accepted college placement criteria and obtains parental permission. Do not require school district or school permission to participate;*
- *Require high schools to notify 10th and 11th grade students of these options by March 1 of each year;*
- *Require community colleges to assess whether high school students are ready to take college level courses as criteria for admission, and encourage them to use pre-existing student assessments, such as SAT, ACT, or CSU Early Assessment tests;*
- *Limit Concurrent Enrollment to classes taught at the postsecondary institution (including satellite locations);*
- *Allow high schools to contract with community colleges to provide college courses on the high school campus, but require school districts to pay contracted fees out of their regular ADA allocation, and do not allow community colleges to claim FTES for these courses;*
- *Limit high school students to 10 percent of the enrollment in any college class;*
- *Provide a higher weight of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) funding for concurrently enrolled high school students, but require distribution of the ADA allocation based on a formula that provides a percentage to the high school for administration and counseling, and prorates the remainder to the high school and postsecondary institution as payment of instruction costs;*
- *Eliminate funding for noncredit and basic skills courses for concurrently enrolled high school students; and*
- *Specify that special admit students are given the lowest enrollment priority to ensure they do not displace regularly admitted students.*

Comment: We thank the review for recognizing the important role that community colleges play in the area of concurrent/advanced education for high school students and agree the intent of this

recommendation is “right on target.” In coordinating programs with the high schools for advancing their students beyond the level of instruction available at many high schools, community colleges and high schools can coordinate to provide better services more efficiently and effectively so these students are better prepared as they begin their collegiate years. Given this, every effort must be made to assure that the parameters governing these programs are not too restrictive.

Another important use of concurrent/advanced education is for students who have been unable to complete a course in high school, sometimes due to family problems or health reasons. These students are able to re-take these courses at community colleges during the summer and keep up with their classmates upon returning to their high school in Fall.

As an example of the importance of these programs, during budget hearings in 2004, UC officials reported that 25% of UC-eligible high school graduates had at least one community college course on their transcript. This occurs because many high schools, especially those in rural areas, rely on their local community colleges to provide advanced placement and honors classes for their students. Also, high schools increasingly rely on community colleges to offer a full range of technical and vocational programs, fully staffed and with state-of-the-art equipment that high schools can no longer afford. In addition, concurrent enrollment has proven very successful in bringing onto campus students whose families are unacquainted with higher education and preparing them for matriculation on college campuses.

ETV15: Make it Easier for Students to Transfer from a Community College to a University

Recommendation: The Governor should work with the Legislature to develop core, lower division, general education and major requirements that are recognized and accepted by all California public universities, as well as a conditional acceptance process that guarantees a transfer student's admission to a specific campus and major if the student meets the state requirements.

Comment: We strongly support this recommendation that would assure course articulation between campuses and ease transfer for students. However, we are uncertain of how this recommendation could be accomplished if the governance recommendation (ETV03) of this report were adopted since it would shift community colleges under K-12 auspices and a Deputy Secretary for Education with a workforce focus. This recommendation clearly recognizes the significant higher education role that community colleges do, and should continue to, play; however, it is in conflict with the governance recommendation (ETV03) that proposes a major reorganization.

We also are not sure of the Governor's role in this matter. But we are clear that there should be mandates upon UC and CSU to develop consistent core, lower division, general education and major requirements as proposed in this recommendation; to guarantee admission to students who meet specific requirements for transfer; and, most importantly, to increase the numbers of slots available for junior transfers so that transfer-prepared community college students have access to a baccalaureate degree as promised in the Master Plan for Higher Education.

This is an important component of transfer and is likely to assure the articulation of more courses to allow for faster completion of degree requirements.

Elements of this recommendation are currently on the Governor's desk (SB 1785 and SB 1415) and thus, he can assure that a significant portion of this recommendation takes effect through his signature on these two important initiatives. Proposition 98 resources may be required to be shifted to support articulation in both the Chancellor's Office and the system.

ETV16: Provide a Fee Waiver in Lieu of a Cal Grant Award

Recommendation: The Governor should work with the Legislature to amend relevant Education Code sections replacing portions of the state's current Cal Grant A and Cal Grant B programs with a new fee waiver program at the state's public universities. Beginning in 2006-07, Cal Grant funds for financially needy students at California community colleges should be appropriated directly to the community colleges.

Comment: This seems to be a proposal with merit because it would result in making Cal Grant funds campus-based; this would require funds for the campuses to distribute the grants and assist students, but would be less costly than at present. However, it is important to recognize that we must not eliminate financial assistance above the fees, but instead, replace a portion of the Cal Grant with a fee waiver. It is also critical that Cal Grants for community college students continue to be funded outside of Proposition 98; otherwise, this recommendation would result in a significant reduction of resources for community college students.

ETV17: Make Higher Education More Affordable by Reducing the Cost of Textbooks

Recommendation: The Governor should work with the Legislature to enact state law in an effort to reduce the cost of college textbooks.

This law should require college and university faculty to:

- *Consider the price of textbooks when making textbook selection decisions;*
- *Give preference to the least costly textbook option when the education content of textbooks is equal;*
- *Inform students as to whether previous editions of the chosen textbook for the course will be adequate and sufficient for the course, and*
- *Select textbooks from only those publishers who have agreed to sell their textbooks and supplemental materials in an "unbundled" format.*

This law should require college and university administrators to:

- *Notify their faculties about various textbook options, textbooks publishers that have agreed to sell their textbooks in an "unbundled" format, and the costs of alternatives;*
- *Explore the feasibility of implementing textbook rental programs similar to those in place at several universities in Wisconsin and Illinois, and*
- *Facilitate and publicize to students the availability of online books swaps so that they can buy and sell used textbooks at their own prices.*

Comment: We commend the CPR for recognizing the high cost of textbooks and citing the CalPIRG recommendations for reducing costs. Legislation, (AB 2477 – Liu and AB 2678 – Koretz) currently awaiting the Governor's action, implements similar recommendations.

College administrators, local governing board members and faculty are aware of these issues and are engaging in various activities on their campuses to assure that students can obtain books at a lower cost. Perhaps as a result of legislative hearings in California, publishers are not advertising their – "buy-back" programs to make even out-of-print textbooks available to students online at reduced rates. Among efforts of local colleges are these mechanisms: Taft College provides free textbooks (at a district cost of approximately \$170,000 per year) to all students – although one must remember that this is a very small, yet basic-aid district with high per-student revenues; and City College of San Francisco which provides textbook funds to needy students from Partnership for Excellence funds and

student fees. Furthermore, entrepreneurial students in the Los Angeles area have formed co-ops and offer materials – including used books – at much lower rates on-line. These free-market arrangements will, in the long-term be more successful than any mandated solution that may harm colleges’ relationships with booksellers and threaten the timely exchange of intellectual materials and information for the classroom. Ultimately, the selection of appropriate textbooks must remain a faculty decision.

We have considered the program cited in Wisconsin (University of Wisconsin at River Falls) and do not believe that the model, which involves renting textbooks to students, is workable in California. This model was attempted at LA Pierce College several years ago, but halted after one semester due to the large numbers of students who did not return their rented books and whose credit card accounts had been closed by the end of the semester, thus leaving the college with the inability to recover its costs or provide books for the following semester.

Some colleges’ student organizations have entered into contracts with booksellers as a mechanism to fund student activities and priorities on campus. Any model that limits such arrangements would be to the overall detriment of all students.

As an alternative, we suggest that the Commission amend this recommendation to urge, rather than require, particular actions since different solutions will fit different districts. Size, geography, demography, and faculty need will determine which solutions will fit different districts and will encourage faculty and districts to devise appropriate solutions under such permissive recommendations.

We also suggest that the Commission add a recommendation that publishers continue to make available the older version of a textbook for a specified time period even if they are publishing a newer version. This would allow instructors to continue use of the older version and students to purchase used copies.

ETV18: Increase College and University Tuition for All Non-Resident Students

Recommendation: The Governor should work with the University of California Board of Regents, the CSU Board of Trustees, and the CCC Board of Governors or its successor to increase non-resident tuition at all state colleges and universities by 45% above 2003-04 rates.

Comment: While we recognize the fiscal issues behind this recommendation, we are concerned that this recommendation would lessen the number of international students who add valuable perspectives and serve to advance goodwill and global understanding.

We would be concerned about any state mandate which would remove the local governing boards’ current prerogative of setting fee levels for non-resident students based on their local circumstances.

ETV19: Establishing Community College Enrollment Priorities

Recommendation: The Governor should work with the Legislature to enact state law that establishes the following statewide California Community College enrollment priorities:

- 1. Students who will graduate or transfer at the end of the semester or quarter;*
- 2. Current students who have accrued less than 90 units (including courses in progress at the time of enrollment);*
- 3. New students and returning students who have accrued less than 90 units; and*

4. *Current students who have accrued more than 90 units (including courses in progress at the time of enrollment) or hold a bachelor's degree.*

Comment: We share the review's concern about students unable to obtain necessary classes, but do not believe that establishing priorities at the state level is the appropriate solution. Rather, the state should provide the community college system with its fair (i.e., statutory) share of Proposition 98 and then, if priorities need to be established, they should be set by each locally-elected governing board after receiving input and comment from their citizenry regarding the highest needs within their own communities.

While it is appropriate for the Governor and Legislature to set the mission and provide funding for the colleges, the bilateral governance nature of the community college system with its dual role in meeting state needs while also providing for local differences is an important element of the community college system. Local needs must be balanced with state needs and state priorities which appear attractive may create unintended consequences in some local communities and not reflect the diverse needs of the populations served (One such unintended consequence is likely to be the tendency of students to enroll in multiple institutions to maintain some priority).

Just as local boards must be responsive to establishing curricula to meet local needs, development and implementation of state priorities must also be accomplished through a public process. While the Legislature provides one venue for the public to provide input, the Community College Board of Governors is the essential body for hosting focused and detailed discussions of this nature. Through BOG discussions, ideas can be developed for local districts, the Legislature or the Administration, ultimately easing barriers to transfer and assisting students in their educational progress.

This recommendation is also fiscally troublesome since implementation of these priorities would lead to significant costs for the elaborate tracking mechanism which would be required to determine enrollment eligibility.

Finally, this recommendation conflicts with the Master Plan for Higher Education, which was intended to provide higher education opportunities to all who could benefit from instruction. This proposal deviates rather dramatically from this long-held tradition of higher education for all in California.

ETV21: Improve Higher Education Accountability to Meet the State's Needs

Recommendation: The Governor should issue an Executive Order containing a clear set of statewide goals and expectations for the state's system of public colleges and universities;

The Secretary of Education, or his or her successor, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission, or its successor, should work with key stakeholders to develop an enforceable state-level accountability system that produces meaningful information to measure progress toward the state policy goals established by Executive Order.

The Secretary of Education, or his or her successor, should publish a report with the results of this state-level performance measurement. The report should be provided to the Legislature by November 15 of each year.

The Governor should support the concepts contained in Senate Bill 1331 to establish a statewide California postsecondary accountability structure.

Comment: We agree with the review that accountability is important for all segments of higher education, and we support the review in its recognition of the important structure and concepts contained in SB 1331 (Alpert and Scott) currently awaiting the Governor's action. In setting any further or alternate accountability expectations for the system, the Governor and Legislature should rely on the advice and counsel of educators and those knowledgeable about this complex arena. For example, two economists (Andrew M. Gill and Duane E. Leigh) recently completed a study entitled, *Evaluating Academic Programs in California's Community Colleges* for the Public Policy Institute of California. This report concluded that,

“groups which advocate accountability measures for community colleges must recognize a critical point that community college administrators have historically voiced. A simple, universal tabulation of a few commonly measure outcomes (such as the number of transfer) can lead to inaccurate and inequitable evaluations of community college performance because community colleges vary substantially in their missions...”

SB 1331 should be used as the structure for the goals and expectations established by any Executive Order that may be drafted. The contents of this legislation were developed by staff at the Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy at CSU Sacramento with considerable comment and input from the community college and university communities. It reflects the best scholarship to date on accountability and was drafted in such a way that as methodology improves to provide better measures of outcomes, they can be used to meet the goals of SB 1331.

In addition, Chancellor Mark Drummond is initiating a comprehensive review of accountability across the system and intends to make further recommendations in this area in Spring 2005.

ETV23: Expand Options for Obtaining a Bachelor's Degree

Recommendations: The Governor should work with the Legislature to create a pilot program allowing approved community colleges to offer bachelor's degrees. Under the pilot program, individual community colleges interested in offering a bachelor's degree would submit a proposal for approval by the Secretary of Education or his or her successor.

Comment: We believe that the issue cited here is one of “access to the baccalaureate,” and we support the efforts of the review. The primary concerns with community colleges providing the bachelors' degree, however, are: (1) It would entail a significant expansion of mission beyond those already defined in the Master Plan for Higher Education; and (2) Community colleges do not have sufficient funding to provide upper-division education, when there is insufficient funding for lower-division students seeking classes.

The Legislative Analyst's Office has expressed concern about this recommendation in "An Initial Assessment of the California Performance Review" which states:

"The proposal to permit community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees runs counter to state law and the state Master Plan for Higher Education, which assigns CCC the role of offering lower-division instruction to students, who then may wish to transfer to a university to earn a baccalaureate degree. State law assigns to CCC a variety of other responsibilities as well, such as vocational education, remedial education, and local economic development. Consideration of this proposal raises broader issues of the Master Plan's basic division of responsibility among the three public segments of higher education."

We note, however, that the CPR report recognizes programs in which CSU and UC currently provide some upper-division instruction on community college campuses. The review further states “these models could be implemented in other rural regions, if resources were available,” and we hope the Commission will work with us to provide those essential resources.

As an alternative, we suggest the Commission should consider and support the following recommendations from, “Improving Access to the Baccalaureate,” a report published by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and the American Association of State College and Universities (AASCU), with support from the Lumina Foundation for Education including: providing for baccalaureate instruction on community college campuses by CSU and UC staff, which are already in place in California at selected colleges; dual admission programs; joint faculty appointments at community college and bachelor’s-degree programs; joint admission programs to coordinate academic advisement and financial aid administration; creation of transfer agreements, transfer guarantees for those who meet requirements; dual financial aid packages so that aid is “portable” upon transfer; and others. We welcome the opportunity to work with the Commission and the Governor to implement more of these recommendations in California with the goal of increasing the number of students who receive their baccalaureate degree.

ETV25: Balance Career Technical Education and College Preparation in High Schools

Recommendation: The Governor should work with the Legislature and the State Board of Education to adopt high school graduation requirements that allow a choice of courses of study including university preparation and academic/career technical education.

- *In concert with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the state Board of Education, the Secretary of Education, or his or her successor, should develop a “strategic Plan for Academic/Career Technical Education.”*
- *The Governor should requires that the Superintendent of Public Instruction to review career technical courses for compliance with the standards and framework now being developed.*
- *The Governor should recommend that the Superintendent of Public Instruction revise the Academic Performance Index to include consideration of career technical education.*

Comment: We believe that this recommendation should be connected with the workforce strategy plan in a cooperative way. We also suggest that before these measures are implemented, consideration should be given to the possible outcomes and complications. These would include: the potential for tracking students while still in high school, thereby limiting their future choices; and the impact upon community colleges. We are concerned about the possibility of students being “tracked” into vocational fields at an early age, before they are mature enough to make an informed decisions; our experience is that students frequently move between academic and vocational tracks as they acquire more wisdom and have a better sense of their innate skills and gifts, and we would not want to foreclose these options.

The Commission also should recognize that, if this recommendation were adopted, it would have major impacts on adult education and apprenticeships as well as community college vocational programs. Specifically, it would create a significant shift in focus by generating more demand for complex and advanced programs while reducing demand for lower-level adult education and apprenticeships. Full review of these and other potential consequences should be considered before this recommendation is accepted or implemented.

ETV 26: Expand Training Partnerships with Private Industry

Recommendation: The Governor should issue an Executive Order that reinforces the priority of the economic and workforce development role of the community colleges.

The Executive Order should:

- *Reinforce the priority of the economic and workforce development role of community colleges, as it enables community colleges to partner with private employers, build a skilled workforce and contribute to California's economic competitiveness;*
- *Direct the Chancellor's Office to establish one or more development positions through loaned executives from business partners and/or inter-jurisdictional exchanges (IJE) with local community colleges;*
- *Direct the community colleges to give systemwide priority to contract education, which is fee-based customized training provided to businesses.*
- *The Board of Governors or its successor should direct the Chancellor's Office to expand the initiatives for Competitive Technologies and International Trade by \$600,000 each, for a total of \$1.2 million.*

Comment: We do not know why an Executive Order is suggested since community colleges are well aware of the importance of their economic and workforce development role for partnering with private employers and building a skilled workforce that contributes to California's economic competitiveness. The colleges already provide as much contract education as they are capable of; and it is unclear where the funding would come from to expand the initiatives for Competitive Technologies and International Trade. It appears the review is suggesting that no additional state funding would be available for this or the other purposes listed in this recommendation; rather, it indicates that expansion of the community college efforts, so rightly praised in the report, would occur only if federal funds could be secured. And then this recommendation would require the community colleges to develop the ability to match federal dollars with local private industry partners.

In addition, to restrict the Chancellor's Office to hired "loaned executives" from business partners and/or inter-jurisdictional exchanges appears to prohibit hiring faculty and/or administrators on leave from a community college who meet minimum qualifications for these developed programs.

The community college system would be very interested in working with the Commission in increasing partnerships, funding inter-jurisdictional exchanges and increasing contract education programs as much as feasible. In fact, the new Chancellor for the California Community Colleges, Mark Drummond, commissioned a review of the Chancellor's Office soon after his arrival in January. Like the CPR report, the review of the Chancellor's Office recognized the essential and central role of the community colleges in the state's workforce and economic development efforts. Among the recommendations which have emerged from the review is the following:

"Recommendation 1.3: We recommend that the System Office take leadership in establishing community colleges as the lead agency in developing strategic partnerships to address the State's economic interest in five priority areas:

- 1) High wage/high skill/high growth occupational sectors;
- 2) Removal of barriers to enable low-wage workers to move up;
- 3) Arenas of statewide concern such as allied health, life sciences and the special needs of the state's distressed areas;
- 4) Emerging economic sectors and the continuous need for training of incumbent workers;

5) Small business development.”

ETV27: Modify the 75 Percent Full-time Community College Faculty Requirement

Recommendations:

- *The Governor should work with the Legislature to sponsor legislation to modify Education Code Section 87842 to exclude career/technical courses for the 75:25 requirement, with the provision that departments maintain a stable core of faculty to perform necessary tasks. The definition of career/technical courses should be provided by the Community College Chancellor’s Office.*
- *The Chancellor of the California Community Colleges should modify the Procedures and Standing Orders of the Board of Governors, section 378 and California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Division 6, Chapter 2, Subchapter 1, Section 51025 accordingly.*

Comment: This recommendation establishes a false dichotomy between academic and career/technical faculty, and reveals a misunderstanding of the “75-25” goal, which seeks to have 75% of the hours of instruction taught by full-time faculty. Progress toward this goal has been defined as the “full-time faculty obligation,” which is the number of full-time faculty required as calculated by the System Office annually based on the adequacy of cost-of-living and growth funds provided to the system in a given year. It is unclear how this recommendation would be implemented within the current framework since it would be difficult to determine the change to the current number required in any district. It also is unclear whether the intent is to set the current ratio of “technical” to “academic” faculty in perpetuity. Every department creates curriculum which requires full-time faculty. No matter where the line is drawn, some faculty will fall into both categories and it is unclear how they would be counted. Every community college instructor also is part of the “academy,” and this false dichotomy could lead to a situation in which some faculty may not be considered as part of the “real” college. This proposal is likely to widen the currently-perceived gulf between “academic” and career/technical” faculty.

ETV33: Require Community Service of Public College and University Students

Recommendation: The Governor should work with the Legislature to require all students enrolled in California’s public colleges and universities to perform a minimum of 16 hours of community service in order to receive their degree or certificate.

Comment: This is another recommendation that, while well meaning, could prove extremely onerous for community college students. The average community college student has a quite different profile than the average UC student, for example. While the typical UC student is under 22 years of age, unmarried, and dependent on his/her parents; the median community college student is 29 years old, independent of his/her parents, working full or part-time, has a family, and is attending night classes. In addition, many are the sole parent in their family-unit. Given these circumstances and the hardships that many of our first-generation college students must endure, this could be an unmanageable burden.

Also, while there are institutions, such as CSU Monterey Bay, that include a service requirement for graduation, that program is effective because it integrates the service component into the curriculum which can be quite costly. Others have questioned whether service should be mandated rather than voluntary. It is not clear that those who are mandated to serve will learn the same lesson as those who do so voluntarily.

Other costly features of this proposal would include establishing an infrastructure to place and support students in the community and meeting the requirements for fingerprinting and background checks required for some volunteer positions.

We also believe that, among those who are able, many community college students and graduates will volunteer during their lifetimes as a way of “giving back” for their education. For example, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* recently reported that the Peace Corps is turning to community colleges to recruit a broader variety of applicants. The Peace Corps has learned that those with community college education and experience represent “more-skilled” applicants and the Peace Corps has begun actively recruiting community college graduates. Specifically, the organization has announced a campaign to recruit applicants from 200 community colleges throughout the nation, because the fields needed in the Peace Corps are those – agriculture, construction, information technology and nursing – which are expanding at community colleges. The article cites the experience and education of a recent graduate and volunteer from Cerro Coso Community College in Ridgecrest, California as a model of the type of volunteer they seek.

As an alternative, we suggest that local districts consider whether this proposal could be implemented in their college and integrated into learning and the curriculum without placing an undue hardship on the neediest students. This is occurring already in some of our colleges.